

Belief Quotient as the Matrix of Doxastic Intelligence

A distinction needs to be made between epistemic and existential truth. For beliefs posit epistemic truths, and belief-decisions posit existential truths. As such, there are beliefs and belief-decisions-- decisions associated with beliefs. To be human is to be a believer. All humans choose to either believe or disbelieve in the distinct self, the facticity of freedom, and the essence of God. Those who choose to believe in the self, freedom, and God do so for justified reasons. Similarly, those who choose not to believe in the self, freedom, and God do so for justified reasons. Both belief and disbelief are justified belief-decisions. While IQ measures cognitive intelligence and EQ defines social intelligence, BQ aims to qualify, rather than quantify, doxastic intelligence. Doxastic intelligence enables us to address phenomenological questions and to make metaphysical claims, thereby leading to belief formation. This existential dialogue can be understood as the self (what is distinct to each) speaking to the soul (what is common to each). No matrix measures the decisions for or against metaphysical claims leading to existential truths. The human condition is best defined by what we choose to believe. In 2001/2007, I defined Belief Quotient as Justified belief-decisions (JBD); now I would like to propose a comprehensive definition and formulation of BQ. BQ is defined as the Matrix of Doxastic Intelligence. IQ defines cognitive intelligence as a ratio of one's mental age to one's chronological age. (Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scales, 1916), EQ defines social intelligence as a measure of interpersonal and intrapersonal competence. (Daniel Goleman, 1995). BQ purports that doxastic intelligence is required to distinguish between belief and believing intelligently. It extends beyond IQ by emphasizing that accurate intelligence lies not merely in thinking but in believing intelligently. Truths based on empirical justification are mandatory, and truths based on phenomenological conjectures are volitional. Establishing epistemic truth leads to the birth of knowledge; establishing existential/metaphysical truth leads to the birth of believers. BQ can be considered strong or weak. Strong BQ refers to those who make belief-decisions and define/defend their decisions both in word and in deed, whereas weak BQ refers to those who do not. This paper revisits Kierkegaard, Sartre, and Pojman.

Keywords: *Belief Quotient, Justified True Belief, Justified Belief Decisions, Kierkegaard, Sartre*

Introduction: Metaphysics: The Basis For Belief Quotient (BQ)

The mind is the author of metaphysics and the creator of existential truths. The mind is intelligent, intentional, volitional, and a phenomenal decision-making self. As a decision-making self, it creates metaphysical or existential truths. What is fundamental to truth is understanding the nature of reality. And what is fundamental to the understanding of the nature of reality is the acknowledgment that the mind is

1 intelligent, intentional¹, volitional², and subjective³. Doxastic intelligence enables
 2 both comprehension and making phenomenological conjectures/decisions in belief
 3 formation. However, beliefs about God and the self are unfalsifiable conjectures
 4 that require intelligent decisions. Unfalsifiable does not mean these conjectures are
 5 not justifiable; only that justification is extra-empirical or phenomenological. In
 6 current thinking, reductive justification is considered mandatory; non-reductive
 7 justification is not⁴. Hence, the debate continues. The attributes associated with God
 8 and the self are considered both intrinsic and extrinsic⁵. Do the attributes, such as
 9 intentionality, intelligence, and freedom, associated with God and the self, pertain
 10 to a particular substance? If there is some substance because of which God or the
 11 self has these attributes, we are not aware of it. Regardless of whether such a
 12 substance exists, we assume that these attributes associated with God and the self
 13 are non-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 metaphysicians when we understand the nature of reality⁶.
 16 We are metaphysicians because of the two features of the mind, namely intelligence
 17 and freedom. The intelligence of the mind permits us to make the following
 18 metaphysical distinctions⁷, namely, the temporal/timeless, the contingent/necessary,
 19 the particular/universal, the essence/existence, and the reductive/non-reductive
 20 distinctions. Freedom of the mind, as a decision-making self, considers these
 21 metaphysical distinctions and allows us to become believers who choose to believe
 22 or disbelieve in God, freedom, and the self.

23 Reality and the nature of reality are metaphysical distinctions made possible
 24 because of the intelligent mind. While physics deals with what is⁸. Metaphysics
 25 deals with the nature of what is⁹. Metaphysics begins when we start to question and
 26 define the nature of reality in the context of phenomenological concerns.¹⁰ The
 27 acknowledgment of the intelligent, intentional, and indeterminate mind is the basis
 28 for metaphysics. However, the features of the mind, namely, 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.

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

⁵Apart from what role non-reductive intrinsic features play in understanding reality, we want to also know what role does extrinsic features like locality and time (when and where) play with identity. And what role does the extrinsic features of temperature and pressure play in terms of the emergence of consciousness. The importance of both the non-reductive aspects of reality and the extrinsic necessary conditions remains a mystery.

⁶Dipanwita 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>

⁷Ibid.

⁸Willard Quine, *Word and Object* (Cambridge MA: MIT Press 2013) 23-72.

⁹The essence/existence; Time/space, contingent/necessary, particular/universal, reductive/nonreductive, Why there is something instead of nothing—Leibnitz

¹⁰Paul Tillich, *Dynamics of Faith* (New York: Harper & Row, 1957), 1.

intentionality¹¹, subjectivity, and freedom,¹² are not reductive properties; they are phenomenological or directional forces that orient an agent toward the world¹³. Humans are intertwined with everything within the world.”¹⁴ These properties of consciousness as vectors are not only directional, but can also be thought of as a continuum, on a multidimensional scale, with each axis representing an increasing spectrum from its origin¹⁵.

While IQ measures cognitive intelligence, BQ¹⁶ measures doxastic intelligence. While traditional analysis of knowledge (TAK) defines knowledge as justified true belief¹⁷, TAK does not differentiate between empirical and extra-empirical justification. With the rise of logical positivism¹⁸, justification was restricted to empirical or verifiable grounds. If justification is restricted to what is empirical, then the acceptance of the truth of justified true belief becomes mandatory. Bertrand Russell, speaking about truth and falsity, seems to suggest that accepting truth or falsity does not involve consent¹⁹. However, it appears that there are two types of justification, namely empirical and extra-empirical, that lead to either mandatory or volitional justified true beliefs. In other words, there are beliefs we must accept, and there are beliefs we must choose to accept²⁰. That is because while all beliefs are either true or false, not all can be reductively affirmed as true or false. As such, the acceptance of verifiable and falsifiable beliefs/truths is mandatory. On the other hand, unfalsifiable beliefs require a decision, a justified belief-decision, as opposed to mandatory justified true beliefs. Since beliefs related to phenomenological conjectures cannot be verified as true or false. Beliefs about God and the self are an either/or matter²¹. Either/Or matter does not mean that these beliefs are neither true nor false. It simply means they cannot be verified or falsified as true or false. Since the advent of positivism, empirical truths, what is considered verifiable and

¹¹Franz Brentano, “The Distinction between Mental and Physical Phenomena” in David J. Chalmers. *Philosophy of Mind*, (New York: Oxford University press, 2002) 479

¹²Jean-Paul Sartre. *Being and Nothingness*, Tr. Hazel E. Barnes, (New York: Washington: Square Press, 1977) 28.

¹³Eva Alerby, Erica Hagstrom, Susanne Westman, “The embodied Classroom –A phenomenological discussion of the body and the room” *Journal of Pedagogy* 1/2026 (JoP (1): 13) DOI 10:2478 / jped-2014-0001

¹⁴Ibid: 13.

¹⁵Pandala, Dania. “Vectors of Consciousness.” Burman University Undergraduate Faculty Research Conference, March 14, 2024.

¹⁶Tennyson 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 one’s success (Lisa Van Allan *Your Belief Quotient* 2013

¹⁷Alvin 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.

¹⁸Vienna circle of scholars 1920s–30s, included, Moritz Schlick (leader) Rudolf Carnap, Philip Frank, Otto Neurath, Hans Hah, Herbert Feigl

¹⁹Bertrand Russell, “Truth and Falsehood”, in Michael F, Goodman and Robert A. Snyder, *Contemporary Reading in Epistemology* (New Jersey: Prentice Hall. Inc. 1993),170.

²⁰Louis P. Pojman, “Believing, Willing and the Ethics of Belief” in *The Theory of Knowledge*, ed. Louis Pojman, (Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing company, 1993,) 527.

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

1 reductive, have been what mattered, hence mandatory²². However, the acceptance
 2 of the veracity of existential or metaphysical truth is a matter of volition. Because
 3 of the lack of empirical/phenomenological justification equivalence, empirical
 4 truths must be believed, existential truths must be chosen to be believed.

5 A central phenomenological concern is the origin of the universe. If there is a
 6 beginning to cosmology, then we must assume the need for a timeless conceiver²³,
 7 perceiver,²⁴ and observer²⁵ for its origin. While Schrödinger argued that to be is to
 8 be observed, we must go further: Before an observer can observe, there must be a
 9 conceiver who conceives and a perceiver who perceives. Further, once created,
 10 created things must be constantly observed to retain their properties.²⁶ All beings
 11 that have a beginning have their beginning in the beginning. However, the
 12 fundamental cause for all beings having a beginning itself cannot have a beginning;
 13 it must be beginningless. If there is a beginning for the universe, then there must be
 14 a conceiver, perceiver, or observer that exists without a beginning. What
 15 necessitates a conceiver, perceiver, and observer without a beginning? Beginning
 16 implies beings; being does not imply beginning. Triangles, as concepts, can subsist
 17 without a beginning or an end. The nonlocal mind²⁷ in whose cognition such
 18 timeless forms exist must be beyond being, becoming, and beginning, to house such
 19 realities.²⁸ As such, non-local consciousness is beyond space, time, and identity. In
 20 fact, space, time, and matter are only there because of consciousness²⁹. It is
 21 fundamental to begin with. We can argue for the necessity of the timelessness of
 22 nonlocal consciousness, for the birth of the universe, in that the universe is not the
 23 result of algorithmic chance but of conscious choice. We can also maintain that there
 24 is a link between local and nonlocal consciousness, even though their locality and
 25 causality are difficult to determine. What must be noted is that, while there are many
 26 studies on the origin of the universe, there are only a few on the origin of
 27 consciousness. The study of consciousness is important because intelligence,
 28 intentionality, subjectivity, and freedom are phenomenological givens we must deal
 29 with.

30 The attributes of consciousness, namely intelligence, freedom, intentionality,
 31 and self/subjectivity, are considered fundamental to both God and humans.
 32 Understanding the nature of consciousness is metaphysics at its best. We cannot

²²For some reason we have told ourselves that what is reductive should be mandatory and what is non-reductive should be non-mandatory.

²³ Berkeley *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.

²⁹Non-local consciousness.

count the number of protons freedom has, nor can justice be boiled down to a residue. If the laws of conservation established the mass/energy equivalence, we could also establish the neural mass/consciousness equivalence by demonstrating the correlation and contingency between mental states and brain states³⁰. So far, the correlation, contingency, and causation have been central in understanding the relationship between brain states and mental states. What remains to be explored is the question of conversion or metamorphosis of neural mass into consciousness. The brain is a chrysalis in which neural mass transforms into consciousness. We know from the mass/energy equivalence that energy is released when atoms are split. However, we do not know how, from the neural mass/consciousness equivalence, consciousness is generated. But we can be certain that the brain functions like a chrysalis, transforming neural mass into consciousness. In the mass/energy equivalence, energy is manifested as motion, heat, and radiation. Similarly, we can argue that, in the neural mass/consciousness equivalence, consciousness is manifested as intentionality, subjectivity, and freedom. The difference between these two equivalences is that one is a reductive given and the other a phenomenological given.

If mass and energy are interchangeable, it would be difficult to establish which comes first.³¹ Most studies argue that the universe comes first and that consciousness appears later in its history. However, many studies now show that consciousness comes first, and the universe is a result of consciousness³². Why is this important? Only if there is a beginning can we state that essence precedes existence, and that essence is intentional/nonreductive. Two fundamentals of reality are reductivity and locality. Two fundamental properties of consciousness are intentionality and non-locality³³. For George Wald, consciousness has no place or location.³⁴ For Stuart Hameroff, since anesthetics can negate consciousness, it must be located somewhere in the brain³⁵. To Sartre, consciousness is real but not a thing; it does not have a place or location. Nonlocality is best illustrated in the essence/existence distinction. For, while what exists has a place or location, the essence of what 'is' has no place nor location. While reducibility and locality are fundamental to what exists. Irreducibility and nonlocality are fundamental to essence. While the content

³⁰Since anesthetics can temporally negate consciousness we can safely conclude that neural mass and process have a part in the generation of consciousness.

³¹If Mass and energy are interchangeable, then it is difficult to establish which comes first. Like asking which comes first ice or water. —especially if each can transform into the other. Further if mass/energy equivalence is a given, then we can also argue for neural mass/consciousness equivalence. And if energy is considered as being immaterial then we can also consider consciousness as being immaterial. Energy is understood as in motion, temperature or as in radiation. Similarly consciousness can be understood as intentionality, freedom and qualia/subjectivity.

<https://chatgpt.com/c/6a0f04f9-5e84-83e8-9107-2911ab8c8df6>

³²Consciousness 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)

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

³⁴George Wald, "Life and Mind in the Universe", in John Pickering and Martin Skinner, *From Sentience to Symbols* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990) 72.

³⁵Stuart Hameroff, Quantum Consciousness and the Origin of life <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XA9Q5p9ODac> 7:19.

of both local and nonlocal consciousness can be about what exists, what subsists, or what absists,³⁶ what each chooses to be intentional about is different, because we are free to choose what to be intentional about. However, what is most important to note is that, regardless of whether essence is related to what exists, what subsists, or what absists, our understanding of all essences is non-reductive and thus can have no place or location. Those who argue for a reductive basis for essence point to Gold or Iron as being defined by the number of protons each possesses. However, if or when Gold or Iron is further reduced to quarks, the essence of both Gold and Iron disappears.

The Existential Self: What Appears at Birth and Disappears at Death

Belief in the existential self involves a decision, a justified belief-decision. The existential self or subjectivity is an irreducible and invisible reality³⁷, like the invisible reality of gravity.³⁸ We can argue for the immateriality of the self³⁹ because when self-consciousness ceases to exist, it does so, leaving every atom in one's body intact. This implies that the self is not only nonreductive but immaterial. To be is to be aware of the conscious, nonreductive, invisible self. How local consciousness, which is common to all humans, transforms into self-consciousness is a mystery. Or, how the soul (what is common in each), becomes the distinct self is again a mystery. Local or self-consciousness appears at birth and disappears at death⁴⁰. However, the self can either choose to die or wait to die, in that the self has 'freedom from life' or possesses the freedom to die. So, the self is undetectable, invisible, irreducible/nonreductive, immaterial, and free. While the features of local consciousness, namely intelligence, intentionality, and freedom, are the same in each human being, the memory of local self-consciousness will be different. MRI can only determine whether one is alive or dead, but cannot detect who is alive or dead, or detect one's BQ. MRI cannot detect or locate the self. In defining the human condition, the self does not exist (as the body does) nor subsist (as the mind does); rather, it functions as the irreducible condition for human experience. This is the "absistent" mode of being found in transcendental philosophy. That is why some accept the self, others reject the self: while the body exists, the mind subsists, and the self absists. As such, belief in the existential self requires a decision, a belief-decision.

³⁶Alexius 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

³⁷Kierkegaard, 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..."

³⁸Tennyson 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. 5.

³⁹Jean-Paul Sartre, *Being and Nothingness*, Tr. Hazel E. Barnes, (New York: Washington: Square Press, 1977) 562, 650.

⁴⁰Søren 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

1 The correlation⁴¹, contingency⁴², or causation⁴³ of mental states/consciousness
 2 can only establish a relationship between mental states to brain states; it cannot
 3 account for the existential phenomena of the self. However, to truly understand the
 4 self, we must recognize the connection between local consciousness and non-local
 5 consciousness. Socrates argued that death is not the death of anything—it is the
 6 separation of the soul from the body⁴⁴. As such, the existential self, which appears
 7 at birth and disappears at death, leaves every atom behind. This implies that
 8 consciousness is not only non-reductive, immaterial, and indeterminate⁴⁵, but
 9 connected to the immortal non-local consciousness.

10 Regardless of whether mental states are a physical state, an emergent
 11 property⁴⁶, a quantum phenomenon⁴⁷, a substrate-suffused given, a transduced
 12 given, or a neural mass/consciousness conversion, the question of how the self
 13 transforms into an individual person at birth and disappears at death remains a
 14 challenge to explain. It is a brute given. It appears that the self has no place or
 15 location. As such, we have to decide whether to believe in the individual self. The
 16 question is not whether there is a self, but why we choose to believe in an individual
 17 self. Again, how what is common-- be it the soul, consciousness, the Christian
 18 notion of the breadth of God, or the Hindu notion of “Thou art That”, becomes the
 19 individual self is a mystery. This is what results in solipsism⁴⁸. As such, we must
 20 choose to believe that each one of us is distinct. Usually, people who deny the self
 21 also deny freedom and God. The path to atheism seems to start with the notion that
 22 there is no self, then this leads to the notion that there is no freedom, and ends by
 23 rejecting God.⁴⁹ The opposite holds true. Those who believe in the individual self
 24 also believe in freedom, and this usually leads to belief in God. Since we can only
 25 see the physical eye that sees, but not the conscious ‘I’ that sees, we have to make a
 26 decision for or against the notion that we all have an undetectable, irreducible/
 27 nonreductive, and invisible individual self. Although the self is understood as non-
 28 reductive, it is associated with the individual's DNA. However, as long as the
 29 features of consciousness are considered nonreductive, the identity of the

⁴¹David Chalmers. *Philosophy of Mind*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002) 248

⁴²D. M. Armstrong “Casual Theory of the Mind” in David Chalmers. *Philosophy of Mind*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002) 87.

⁴³U.T. Place, “Is consciousness a Brain Process” in David Chalmers. *Philosophy of Mind*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002) 55-60. (What role does the extrinsic condition namely, pressure and temperature play in the emergence of consciousness will remain a mystery)

⁴⁴Plato. *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.

⁴⁵David Chalmers. *Philosophy of Mind*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), 248-249

⁴⁶John Searle, “The Irreducibility of Consciousness”, in John Heil, *Philosophy of Mind* (Great Britain: Oxford, 2004) 700.

⁴⁷Roger Penrose, “Quantum Physics of Consciousness “Closer to Truth. Oct 8, 2020 (4:50-6:03)

⁴⁸René 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.

⁴⁹Richard Dawkins, *The God Delusion* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2006). Sam Harris, Daniel Dennett also reject both freedom and God

body/DNA cannot provide the self's identity. Case in point, identical twins have two separate selves.

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

Belief in freedom is a decision, a belief-decision.⁵⁰ Why does the acknowledgment of freedom require a decision? Though freedom is associated with the neural world of matter/consciousness, it is a non-reductive given; hence, accepting freedom requires a decision. The reality of freedom is best understood in the context of the nature of consciousness. The nature of consciousness is such that we cannot define consciousness independent of freedom, nor can we define freedom independent of consciousness. To choose is to be conscious, and to be conscious is to choose.⁵¹ Brentano argued that all consciousness is consciousness about something.⁵² In that, while all consciousness is about something, consciousness itself is not a thing. But what is most important to note is that we are not only conscious of something; we can choose what to be conscious of. To be conscious is to choose what to be conscious of. To choose what to be conscious of is to be conscious. In Sartre's words, consciousness "is what it is not and is not what it is",⁵³ because to Sartre, the immateriality of consciousness is the basis for the indeterminacy of consciousness⁵⁴. Consciousness is real but not a thing. To be free is a brute given. The facticity of freedom⁵⁵ purports that to choose is to have to choose. Freedom, Sartre argued, is the freedom of choosing, and not a freedom of not choosing. But while one is not free not to choose⁵⁶. One is free to choose not to choose.⁵⁷

The reality of freedom is an irreducible existential given, as such, non-reductive. The brain, which houses the mind, is approximately 65 percent water, but we cannot excrete consciousness or freedom from a glass of water. Freedom is real, but not a thing⁵⁸. It is non-reductive and intentional. It is metaphysical and a phenomenological given. If the essence of science is verifiability, falsifiability, and predictability, the essence of intentionality is freedom and creativity, both of which are non-reductive features. Creativity is strongly linked to freedom. What is

⁵⁰A 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>

⁵¹Jean-Paul Sartre, *Being and Nothingness*, Tr. Hazel E. Barnes, (New York: Washington: Square Press, 1977) 595.

⁵²Franz Brentano, "The Distinction between Mental and Physical Phenomena" in David J. Chalmers. *Philosophy of Mind*, (New York: Oxford University press, 2002) 479.

⁵³Jean-Paul Sartre. *Being and Nothingness*, Tr. Hazel E. Barnes, (New York: Washington: Square Press, 1977) 28.

⁵⁴Jean-Paul Sartre, *Being and Nothingness*, .568

⁵⁵Jean Paul Sartre *Being and Nothingness*, 625

⁵⁶Jean Paul Sartre *Being and Nothingness*, 710

⁵⁷Jean Paul Sartre *Being and Nothingness*, 607

⁵⁸Jean-Paul Sartre, *Being and Nothingness*, 568

interesting about this phenomenon is that it allows us to choose what to be conscious of. That is the definition of creativity. To be free is to choose what to think, believe, or act. The argument for the freedom of consciousness is related to the nature of intentionality, in that we can choose to direct our thoughts to what exists, what subsists, or what absists. We can think of concrete objects like tables that exist, abstract objects like triangles that subsist, and imaginary objects like Pegasus that absist, as well as contradictions such as round squares, and ideas that lead to inventions. To be free is to conceive, perceive, or observe what we choose to conceive, perceive, or observe. This freedom we cannot renounce⁵⁹. Genuine freedom includes both the freedom to choose to do something and the freedom to refrain from doing what one chooses⁶⁰. As it is said of science, verification or confirmation is meaningful only when falsification/disconfirmation is also possible⁶¹.

God: An Ontological Necessity and Existential Choice

We choose to believe in God's existence based on our understanding of God's essence. A Theist is not a Theist because he or she has seen God, nor is an Atheist an Atheist because he or she has not seen God. Comprehension of the essence of God is the basis for the birth of believers. We are not born as Theists and Atheists. We choose to be Theists or Atheists. Two reasons often cited for belief in God concern (1) the origin of the universe and (2) the need for a non-contingent being.⁶² Two reasons often cited for disbelief concern (1) the problem of evil/suffering⁶³ and (2) the idea that God and human freedom cannot co-exist⁶⁴. As such, the real debate about God is not over God's existence but over God's essence. That is why Theists define and defend the reasons for their 'belief decision,' while atheists define and defend the reasons for their belief-decision⁶⁵. The question about God is not whether God exists. If that were the case, it could be easily answered when and if God decides to appear before us, if we demand so. Our requests for God's appearance rarely come true, because the proof of the existence of God is not a guarantee of belief in the essence of God. The real question is whether God necessarily exists and whether empirical proof can establish it. Proof for the existence of God cannot be proof for the essence of God. Without *a posteriori* specificity, the search for empirical proof for the existence of God is a meaningless exercise, because belief in God is based on the essence of God. We choose to accept or reject God, not on whether God's existence is verifiable, but because the essence of God is

⁵⁹Jean-Jacques Rousseau in *The Social Contract* (1762), Book I, Chapter 4.

⁶⁰Benjamin Libet, Gleason, C. A., Wright, E. W., & Pearl, D. K. (1983). *Time of conscious intention to act in relation to onset of cerebral activity (readiness-potential)*. *Brain*, 106(3), 623–642.

⁶¹Karl Popper argued that falsification is the demarcation between genuine science and pseudoscience

⁶²Allen Plantinga, *The Nature of Necessity* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1974) 218.

⁶³J. 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)

⁶⁴Jean Paul Sartre, *Existentialism and Humanism*, trans. Philip Mairet, (London: Methuen & Co Ltd, 1949), 26

⁶⁵Sam 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)

1 unfalsifiable. Of course, some people choose to believe in God because it is a
2 wager⁶⁶.

3 We can talk about essence only if there is an ontological split between essence
4 and existence, and if there is a mind to conceive the essence. In other words, talking
5 about essence implies not only having a beginning, but also the necessity of having
6 a mind to conceive the essence. For if there is an essence, it must not only precede
7 existence but must be conceived as an essence in the mind of someone. If God has
8 no beginning, then it is impossible to define the essence of a being that has no
9 beginning. God is a brute given. The *de re*⁶⁷ essence of God is inexplicable because,
10 in understanding the nature of God, we cannot make an ontological split between
11 essence and existence. With God, essence and existence are intertwined. As such,
12 we cannot be sure whether the *de dicto* essence that God is immortal, love, and the
13 creator are part of the 'is' of existence, or the 'is' of essence. For instance, if God is
14 God before creation and not because of creation, how can creatorship be part of
15 God's essence? God can be understood to exist, subsist, or absist⁶⁸. God can exist
16 (within a being, as in the Christian incarnation) in that God can be a reductive given
17 with an identity; God can subsist (beyond becoming) in that God is timeless, as
18 triangles are, and definable as immortal. God can absist (beyond being) in that God
19 can be a being without having a being, that is not contingent on either existence or
20 subsistence, but rather transcends both⁶⁹. As such, God is a transcendental being;
21 God is beyond being, beginning, or becoming. Since God can manifest in any form
22 God chooses⁷⁰, looking for some identification without any *a posteriori* specificity,
23 for the 'is' of essence, or for the 'is' of existence, is a meaningless task. In the case of
24 water, we know it is H₂O. What we want to know is whether the 'is' of composition
25 defines the 'is' of essence or the 'is' of existence/identity? As such, even if we
26 discover the identity of God, what we want to know is whether it is related to the
27 'is' of essence, or the 'is' of existence.

28 We can define the *de dicto*⁷¹ necessity of God, independent of knowing the *de*
29 *re*⁷² identity of God. Because the *de re* identity of God is neither reductive nor a
30 revealed given, belief in God is a belief-decision. God, like Gold, is definable, but

⁶⁶Ada, Prisco, "The Wager of God by Blaise Pascal: Blaise Pascal Bet on God" Athens Journal of Philosophy - Volume 3, Issue 4, December 2024. – (Pages 215-222). <https://www.athensjournals.gr/philosophy/2024-3-4-3-Prisco.pdf>

⁶⁷(Latin: "about the thing") means that a property, necessity, possibility, or belief is attributed to a specific object itself)

⁶⁸From 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.

⁶⁹Samraj, 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.

⁷⁰Paul Tillich, *Systematic Theology*, vol. 1 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951), 235.

Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae* I, q. 3, a. 4:

⁷¹(Latin: "about what is said") marks a way of attributing a property or modality to a *statement or proposition*

⁷²(Latin: "about the thing") means that a property, necessity, possibility, or belief is attributed to a specific object itself,

1 God, unlike Gold⁷³, is not identifiable⁷⁴. Ascribing identity to God's essence is
 2 impossible if God's essence is non-reductive⁷⁵. In Christian Scripture, God is
 3 defined as being invisible⁷⁶. The question is, what aspect of God is invisible: is it
 4 the essence of God or the existence of God? It appears the essence of God cannot
 5 have any identity ascribed to it. because the essence of God, namely, immortality,
 6 creator, love⁷⁷, freedom, and truth, are all non-reductive attributes. The two main
 7 attributes of God, namely immortality and freedom⁷⁸, do not have any reductive
 8 substance linked to them. Only God, who is immortal, can possess true freedom.
 9 However, God does not have freedom from life because God does not have the
 10 freedom to die.⁷⁹ As long as the attributes of God's essence are considered non-
 11 reductive, the search for the identity of God's existence is meaningless. All
 12 arguments for God's existence and all information from revealed sources do not
 13 provide any information about God's identity. Of course, the existence of God must
 14 have an identity. However, the question is not whether God has an identity; rather,
 15 whether we have any information about God's identity. We do not have any *a*
 16 *posteriori* information about God's identity⁸⁰. Should we encounter God, we would
 17 have to, in faith, choose to believe that what or who is before us is God. Establishing
 18 the *de dicto* necessity of God does not establish God's *de re* identity. Without *de re*
 19 identity, we are left with only one option: we must choose to believe or disbelieve
 20 in God, regardless of whether we encounter God. The *de dicto* certainty that the
 21 fastest runner will win the race can be held without knowing the *de re* identity of
 22 the winner. Similarly, we can argue for the *de dicto* necessity of God even if we do
 23 not have the *de re* identity of God. For the existence of the universe demands the
 24 *de dicto* necessity of God, while God's essence demands the *de re* necessity of God.
 25 *A priori* necessity, causal necessity, and metaphysical necessity can establish

⁷³Gold having 79 protons defines Gold as Gold

⁷⁴Speaking of the identity Leibniz argued that the identity of the indiscernibles, is such, that shared properties are tied up with a particular space and time. Locality and time are part of defining identity even though both locality and time are non-reductive aspect of specificity. two distinct things can never be exactly alike, because of locality and time. Only when two entities share all the same properties, are they identical. Two entities can have the same identity (be exactly the same) but not be identical if they do not share the same space and time. (as AI would put it, must share both intrinsic and extrinsic features. Why and how/why non-reductive extrinsic features i.e. locality and time (when and where) define identity will remain a mystery.

⁷⁵ God's attributes cannot be quantified using biometric measures

⁷⁶1 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..."

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

⁷⁷God is love means is that when one believes in God, one believes in freedom. For only where there is love there is freedom. We cannot separate love from freedom.

⁷⁸Only God, who is immortal, can possess true freedom. Immortality and freedom are inseparable. Only an immortal being that cannot die or be killed, (unlike us that can die or be killed), can be free.

⁷⁹The fact that humans can choose to die says a lot. Because God by definition cannot choose to die.

⁸⁰We 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 does not mean one can identify one should we see one.

1 ontological necessity, but none can establish the factual or *de re* necessity/identity
 2 of God⁸¹. This leaves us with no choice but to accept God as a factual necessity.
 3 God is a brute fact, like the brute fact of the existential self. The factual necessity
 4 of God, why God cannot have a beginning, cannot cease to exist, or why God must
 5 exist, is inexplicable. So, while the physical eye can establish the 'is' of existence,
 6 given *a posteriori* information, only the metaphysical 'I' can establish the 'is' of
 7 essence, regardless of whether we have information about God's *de re* identity.
 8 Obviously, anything that exists would have a reductive identity; the question is, can
 9 the identity of God's existence establish the identity of the essence of God,
 10 especially if the attributes of God are considered as non-reductive?⁸² What is
 11 interesting about belief in God is that we can have *de dicto* certainty that God exists,
 12 even if we have no information about God's *de re* identity.

13

14

15 **Morals: Existential Truths**

16

17 Another existential truth arising from the mind's role as a decision-making self
 18 is morality. Moral stance involves a decision, a justified belief decision. Believing
 19 in right and wrong requires taking a stance for or against a moral position. Moral
 20 stance does not deal with empirical truths but with existential truths. Truths that
 21 define individuals. So the question is not whether there are moral absolutes, but
 22 whether there are individuals who hold them. Is right conduct right because we say
 23 so, or do we say so because it is right?⁸³ It is a difficult question to address. This is
 24 like trying to address the question of whether $2+2=4$ by saying it's true because we
 25 say so, or by saying it's true because it is. What is important about moral truths is
 26 not knowing whether something is right or wrong, but knowing why we believe it
 27 is right or wrong, and living by such truths. Knowing thou "shalt not kill."⁸⁴
 28 becomes relevant only when one affirms "I will not kill". The existential claim "I
 29 will not kill" is the strongest argument for the veracity of the statement thou shalt
 30 not kill. What we can answer is to note why people choose to be moral or why they
 31 choose moral absolutes to live by. As such, while we cannot answer the question of
 32 whether there are moral absolutes, we can ask why people choose to live by moral
 33 absolutes. Marrying once, marrying one at a time, marrying five at a time, all are
 34 moral options. If Christians argue for monogamous relations because God said so,
 35 then Muslims would be right if they marry more than one because God said so. If
 36 what is right is what God said so, an interesting question can be posed. If God said
 37 we could marry many, how many of us would marry many? God does not create us
 38 as good or bad people. We must choose to be good or bad. To be moral is to be able
 39 to understand right and wrong, discern right from wrong, and have the freedom to
 40 choose right or wrong. We were moral, we are moral, and will be moral because we
 41 have the freedom to choose. So, the question is not whether there are moral

⁸¹Richard Swinburne, *The Existence of God* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2004), 95.

⁸²Like 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.

⁸³Plato, "Euthyphro" in George Sher *Moral Philosophy* (Belmont Ca: Wadsworth Groups 2001) 166.

⁸⁴Exodus 20:13.

absolutes; it is whether we, as individuals, choose moral absolutes. Life is a test only for those who choose to uphold moral absolutes. To choose to have or not have an abortion is a decision—a justified belief-decision. The question is not whether abortion is right or wrong; the question is when and why it is considered right; when and why it is considered wrong.

We are free; therefore, we are moral. The first important moral option is the choice to live or die. To choose to live is a decision to live a life of making choices. To choose to die is a decision to end a life of making choices. Both birth and death are impositions; however, the fact that we can choose to die rather than live means that while birth is an imposition, life is not. The fact that we can choose to die before natural death means that death is not an imposition. Both waiting to die and choosing to die are choices. Only those who choose to live will have to address how to live and whether to believe in God, freedom, and the self. To Tolstoy, to choose to live is to believe in God, for only in those moments he believed in God, did he want to live⁸⁵. Freedom to live or die is an ontological matter, granted only to creatures that are aware of both being and non-being. The liberty to live or die is a political matter in which citizens grant each other the liberty to choose to live or die. The right to live or die is a legal matter: when both to live and to die have *de jure* recognition. Both rights carry expectations. If we have the right to life, we must provide civic services to one another. If we have the right to die, then society must provide such services as euthanasia. Those who choose to live have to address the question of how we choose to live. How we choose to live is determined not only by what we have to believe but also by what we choose to believe.

IQ, EQ, and BQ

While IQ measures cognitive intelligence, EQ measures social intelligence, and BQ measures doxastic intelligence. IQ defines cognitive intelligence as the ratio of mental age to chronological age; it indicates one's cognitive intelligence relative to others. EQ defines social intelligence as the ability to have and maintain proper intersubjective relationships. BQ⁸⁶ defines doxastic intelligence as the basis for making justified belief-decisions, thereby shaping one's belief formation. Why do we choose to believe what we choose to believe? The truth of what you choose to believe is in knowing why you choose to believe or disbelieve what you choose to believe. Justified belief decisions avoid cognitive dissonance. Authentic life involves BQ. There is no matrix to ascertain the acceptance or rejection of metaphysical truth. The matrix of doxastic intelligence involves the dialogue of the existential self with itself over phenomenological concerns, such as the question of whether life has meaning. How does one develop a matrix to assess one's belief quotient—doxastic intelligence? It is argued that we need a trifold basis. (1)

⁸⁵Tolstoy, Leo. *A Confession*. Translated by David Patterson. (New York: W.W. Norton, 1983) 58-62

⁸⁶Tennyson Samraj, *What is your belief Quotient* 2001 and 2007. Liza Van Allan purports that certain beliefs sabotage or support one's success (Lisa Van Allan *Your Belief Quotient* 2013) James Kay writes that beliefs in general control and shape us for better or for worse. (James Kay *The Belief Quotient* 2017.

Ascertain and address fundamental questions that require answers. (2) Entertain and comprehend metaphysical answers or claims. (3) Make justified belief-decisions for or against metaphysical claims and phenomenological conjectures. As such, cognitive intelligence accounts for epistemic truth, and doxastic intelligence accounts for existential truths. And if there is one thing AI (artificial intelligence) cannot have, it would be doxastic intelligence. AI cannot have a BQ.

Belief Quotient: The Matrix of Doxastic Intelligence

The purpose of BQ is not the quantification of beliefs but the qualification of beliefs. As such, the BQ matrix or calculus should be understood as a philosophical or structural framework rather than a mathematical summation or a scalar measure. While cognitive intelligence accounts for epistemic truth, doxastic intelligence accounts for existential truths. For the mind is the author of metaphysics, and a decision-making agent that creates existential truth. The BQ matrix uses a question-and-answer structure to evaluate the integrity of justified belief-decisions. How would such a matrix be defined? BQ is not measured by correctness, but by the integrity of the belief-decision (existential truth). BQ can be considered strong or weak. Where strong BQ refers to those who define and defend their belief-decisions after they have addressed questions and confronted answers. Weak BQ refers to those who make belief-decisions but don't define or defend their belief-decisions, even though they have addressed questions and confronted answers. As such, BQ provides each with a paradigm for an authentic life.

A possible structure for defining the BQ Matrix can be expressed by the following formulation⁸⁷

$$Q_i, A_i, J_i \rightarrow BQ$$

Q_i =Questions

A_i = Answers

J_i =Justified belief-decisions

Q_i represents the metaphysical questions that require our attention; A_i represents the answers and phenomenological assertions that define reality as we understand it, and J_i represents justified belief decisions for or against metaphysical claims. The purpose is not to assign numerical values to beliefs, but to examine the quality of belief formation through the iterative relationship between Questions (Q_i) and Answers (A_i) and Justified belief decisions (J_i).

In defining the relational matrix of belief formulation, we pose questions, propose answers, and promote justified belief decisions for or against metaphysical claims. Here are some questions that human beings have to address. Does the universe have an intelligent beginning? Why can't God have a beginning? What is

⁸⁷The Belief Quotient (BQ) framework, including the formulation (Q_i, A_i, J_i) $\rightarrow$ BQ, was developed by the author through a series of exploratory dialogues with ChatGPT (OpenAI, 2026).

consciousness? What is the self? What is freedom? What is the essence/existence distinction? What is the necessary/contingent distinction? Why does God allow suffering? Here are some answers that demand acceptance or rejection through intelligent decision-making. (1) The universe has a beginning. (2) The universe has an intelligent beginning. (3) The universe exists by chance/choice. (4) Essence precedes existence. (5) God necessarily exists. (6) The appearance of the self at birth and its disappearance at death. (7) The invisible, conscious, and intentional self. (8) The freedom to do something and the freedom not to do something. (9) The neural Mass/Consciousness equivalence. (10) “I will not kill” (existential truth). (11) Intentionality of consciousness. (12) Subjectivity/Qualia. (13) Free will. (14) Birth is an imposition. (15) Freedom is a phenomenological given.

The content of one’s BQ is made up of one’s belief-decisions. Belief-decisions are the basis for one’s belief formation or paradigm. One’s paradigm provides the basis of how we live our lives. Life is a test only for those who have made belief-decisions. We are constantly making belief-decisions, defining and defending them in word or in life. Hence, BQ can be considered as being strong or weak. Where strong BQ refers to those who make belief-decisions and define/defend their decisions in word or deed, weak BQ refers to those who make belief-decisions but don’t define and defend their decisions in word or deed. What really matters is dealing with questions and making decisions about metaphysical claims, which, in turn, define us as individuals⁸⁸. I think at one stage in one’s life, we have to address certain questions and be intellectually honest in accepting or rejecting metaphysical claims. To that end, we can be proud of our BQ. What must be noted is this. While IQ defines one’s intelligence in terms of others, EQ defines one’s honest relationship with others. BQ defines one’s honest relationship with oneself. Being intellectually honest is being honest with oneself. If one is intellectually honest, there will be no mental dissonance with oneself. BQ as the measure of one’s intelligence in believing — the self’s ability to make conscious, free, and responsible belief-decisions. It extends beyond IQ by emphasizing that true intelligence lies not merely in thinking but in *believing intelligently*. Choosing to believe intelligently. What artificial intelligence lacks is doxastic intelligence, or the capacity for belief formation, because only beings endowed with intentionality and freedom can engage in belief formation. BQ is the matrix/structure of Questions, Answers, leading to Justified belief decisions.

Conclusion

BQ is the matrix of believing intelligently. So, while IQ and EQ refer to one’s scores in cognitive and social intelligence relative to others, Doxastic intelligence accounts for justified-belief decisions about phenomenological conjectures that lead to existential truths. BQ is a result of dialogue between the self and the soul. All individuals make decisions for or against God, freedom, and the self. Hence, BQ can be considered as being strong or weak. Where strong BQ refers to those who

⁸⁸On one end, we can question everything and believe in nothing, or on the other hand we can question nothing and believe in everything.

1 make belief-decisions and define/defend their belief decisions in word or in deed.
 2 Weak BQ refers to those who make belief-decisions but don't define/defend their
 3 belief-decisions in word or in deed. Individuals not only make belief-decisions, but
 4 ought to also define and defend them. So, we can define BQ as the matrix of one's
 5 intelligence in believing. It goes beyond IQ by emphasizing that true intelligence
 6 lies not merely in thinking but in *believing intelligently*. Because the nature of
 7 consciousness necessitates that we, as authors of metaphysics, make decisions for
 8 or against metaphysical claims, BQ postulates that we are the authors of belief-
 9 decisions. That is why we can only justify our belief-decisions, never beliefs
 10 themselves. Why we choose to believe or disbelieve in God, the self, and freedom
 11 defines us as human beings.

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

38 While IQ defines cognitive intelligence in the context of others, BQ defines
 39 doxastic intelligence in the context of oneself. Here, what is important is not being
 40 honest with others but being intellectually honest with oneself. It is a dialogue one
 41 has with oneself. BQ is linked with IQ in terms of what is common, namely,
 42 intelligence, but is constricted to metaphysical beliefs that require a decision for or
 43 against existential claims, because metaphysical/existential claims related to
 44 phenomenological concerns of life cannot be verified as true or false.
 45 Phenomenological conjectures are non-reductive assertions. As such, what
 46 distinguishes BQ from traditional epistemology is that, while knowledge is defined

as justified true belief (JTB), BQ defines existential/metaphysical knowledge as justified belief-decisions (JB-D). While justified true beliefs result in the birth of knowledge, “Justified belief-decisions” result in the birth of believers. Hence, there is a need to qualify one’s metaphysical skill and claims. The mind, as the author of metaphysics and a decision-making agent, is the creator of metaphysical and existential truth. So, while cognitive intelligence accounts for epistemic truth. Doxastic intelligence accounts for existential truth.

Bibliography

- Armstrong, D. M. “A Causal Theory of the Mind.” In *Philosophy of Mind*, edited by David J. Chalmers. Chalmers, 87–102. New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Alerby, Eva. Hagstrom, Erica. Westman, Susanne. “The Embodied Classroom –A phenomenological discussion of the body and the room” *Journal of Pedagogy* 1/2026 (JoP (1): 13) DOI 10:2478 / jped- 2014-0001
- 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.
- Brentano, Franz. “The Distinction between Mental and Physical Phenomena.” In *Philosophy of Mind*, edited by David J. Chalmers, 479–486. New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Buber, Martin. *I and Thou*. Translated by Ronald Gregor Smith, 82. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1958.
- Chalmers, David J., ed. *Philosophy of Mind*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Chandogya Upanishad. Translated by Swami Prabhavananda and Frederick Manchester, New York: Harper & Row, 1957.
- ChatGPT. “Definition and Formalization of the Belief Quotient (BQ) Matrix.” October 6, 2025. OpenAI. <https://chatgpt.com/>.
- ChatGPT. “Response on the Nonlocal Mind as Absistent Ground.” November 26, 2025. OpenAI. <https://openai.com/chatgpt>.
- ChatGPT. June 2026. <https://chatgpt.com>
- 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>
- Chakrabarti, Dipanwita, “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>
- Consciousness May Have Created the Universe - This Is Very Strange https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_dP3XOwhozg (Anthropic principle)
- Chopra, Deepak. “Local vs. Non-Local Realism.” Video.
- Dawkins, Richard. *The God Delusion*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2006.
- Dennett, Daniel. *Breaking the Spell: Religion as a Natural Phenomenon*. New York: Viking, 2006.
- Dennett, Daniel. *Elbow Room*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1984.
- Descartes, René. *Meditations on First Philosophy*. In *The Philosophical Writings of Descartes*, Vol. 2, 17–25. Translated by John Cottingham et al. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.
- Goldman, Alvin I, “What is Justified Belief” in Michael F. Goodman and Robert A. Snyder,

- 1 *Contemporary Reading in Epistemology* (New Jersey: Prentice Hall. Inc. 1993. Harris,
- 2 Sam. *The End of Faith*. New York: W. W. Norton, 2004.
- 3 Hitchens, Christopher. *God Is Not Great*. New York: Twelve Books, 2007.
- 4 James, William. "The Will to Believe." In *Philosophy of Religion*, edited by William L.
- 5 Rowe. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- 6 Stuart, Hameroff. Quantum Consciousness and the Origin of Life. [https://www.youtube.](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XA9Q5p9ODac)
- 7 [com/watch?v=XA9Q5p9ODac](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XA9Q5p9ODac)
- 8 Kierkegaard, Søren. *Either/Or II*. Translated by Howard V. Hong and Edna H. Hong, 176.
- 9 Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1987.
- 10 Kierkegaard, Søren. *The Concept of Anxiety*. Translated by Reidar Thomte, 42–44. Princeton, NJ:
- 11 Princeton University Press, 1980.
- 12 Kierkegaard, Søren. *The Sickness unto Death*. Translated by Howard V. Hong and Edna H
- 13 Hong, 13. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1980.
- 14 Kripke, Saul. *Naming and Necessity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1980.
- 15 Mackie, J. L. "Evil and Omnipotence." *Mind* 64, no. 254 (1955): 200–212.
- 16 Meinong, Alexius. "The Theory of Objects." 1904. The Stanford Encyclopedia of
- 17 Philosophy.
- 18 Pandala, Dania. "Vectors of Consciousness." Burman University Undergraduate Faculty
- 19 Research Conference, March 14, 2024.
- 20 Parfit, Derek. *Reasons and Persons*, 260. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984.
- 21 Penrose, Roger. "Quantum Physics of Consciousness." Closer to Truth. Video, October 8,
- 22 2020.
- 23 Place, U. T. "Is Consciousness a Brain Process?" In *Philosophy of Mind*, edited by David J.
- 24 Chalmers, 55–60. New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- 25 Plato. *Phaedo*. Translated by G. M. A. Grube, revised by John M. Cooper, 9–15.
- 26 Indianapolis: Hackett, 1992.
- 27 Plato, "Euthyphro" in George Sher *Moral Philosophy*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Groups
- 28 2001 1
- 29 Plantinga, Allen. *The Nature of Necessity*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1974
- 30 Pojman, Louis P. "Believing, Willing and the Ethics of Belief." In *The Theory of Knowledge*,
- 31 edited by Louis P. Pojman, 527–540. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company,
- 32 1993.
- 33 Prisco, Ada, *Athens Journal of Philosophy - Volume 3, Issue 4, December 2024*. – (Pages
- 34 215-222) <https://www.athensjournals.gr/philosophy/2024-3-4-3-Prisco.pdf>
- 35 Quine, Willard Van Orman. *Word and Object*, 23–72. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2013.
- 36 Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. *The Social Contract*, Book I, chap. 4. 1762.
- 37 Russell, Bertrand. "Truth and Falsehood", in Michael F, Goodman and Robert A. Snyder,
- 38 *Contemporary Reading in Epistemology* (New Jersey: Prentice Hall. Inc. 1993),170.
- 39 Ryan, David L. "The Conscious Universe: Nonlocality and Its Implications." *Journal of*
- 40 *Psychiatry and Psychiatric Disorders* 8, no. 3: 98–110.
- 41 Samraj, Tennyson. *What Is Your Belief Quotient?* Lacombe: Monograph Publishers, 2001;
- 42 Author House, 2007.
- 43 Samraj, Tennyson. "Delineating Consciousness and Freedom as an Ontological
- 44 Entanglement and Existential Phenomenon." *Athens Journal of Philosophy*, 2025.
- 45 Sartre, Jean-Paul. *Being and Nothingness*. Translated by Hazel E. Barnes, 28–710. New
- 46 York: Square Press, 1977.
- 47 Sartre, Jean-Paul. *Existentialism and Humanism*. Translated by Philip Mairet, 26–50.
- 48 London: Methuen, 1949.
- 49 Schrödinger, Erwin. "The Present Situation in Quantum Mechanics." *Proceedings of the*
- 50 *American Philosophical Society* 124, no. 5 (1980): 323–338.

- 1 Searle, John. "The Irreducibility of Consciousness." In *Philosophy of Mind*, edited by John
- 2 Heil, 700–712. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- 3 Swinburne, Richard. *The Existence of God*, 95–120. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2004.
- 4 The Holy Bible.
- 5 Wald, George "Life and Mind in the Universe", in John Pickering and Martin Skinner,
- 6 *From Sentience to Symbols* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990) 69-76.
- 7 Tillich, Paul. *Dynamics of Faith*, 1–20. New York: Harper & Row, 1957.
- 8 Tolstoy, Leo. *A Confession*. Translated by David Patterson, 58–62. New York: W. W.
- 9 Norton, 1983.

ONLY FOR REVIEW