PEITHOLOGY:

The Nature and Origin of Belief

Fourth Edition

By William Thomas Sherman

Copyright, 2002, 2005. William Thomas Sherman
TXu-1-060-787, 12/12/2002, and TXu1-265-565, 10/10/2005
Note: This work may be freely copied and distributed. However, under no conditions may copies be sold without the permission of the author and copyright holder
William Thomas Sherman.
1604 NW 70th St.
Seattle, WA 98117
206-784-1132
wts@gunjones.com
http://www.gunjones.com
Peithology; Christ and Truth; and A New Treatise on Hell (hardbound)
ISBN for "*Peithology*; *Christ and Truth*; and a *New Treatise on Hell*," 0-9787684-1-8

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE…2

I. THE ROLE AND FOUNDATIONS OF BELIEF…5
II. BELIEFS OF THE MIND…13
a. First Principles and Primary Criteria…13
b. Subjective and Objective Belief…20
c. Signs and Language…25
d. The Dialectic, Principles of Inference, and Logic…28
e. Secondary Criteria…30
f. Objective Truth versus "Real" Truth…32
g. Science and Objectivity…35
h. Honesty and Reality…40
III. BELIEFS OF THE HEART…42
IV. BELIEFS OF THE SPIRIT…53
V. BELIEF, ACTION, AND PURPOSE …59
VI. THE GOOD…63
VII. MORALS…69
VIII. THE MIND'S ROLE IN MORAL FORMULATION AND OBSERVANCE…73
IX. THE HEART'S ROLE IN MORAL FORMULATION AND OBSERVANCE…75
X. MORAL PRINCIPLES AND PROBLEM SOLVING, As based on selfless versions of the higher good…76
XI. SOME CONCLUSIONS…81
XII. APPLIED PEITHOLOGY…84

Appendix

On Form and Desire, an Epistemological Excursion…88

Preface

In the pantheon of ancient Greek gods and goddesses, Peitho (pronounced "Pie-tho") was the goddess of persuasion. While relatively unknown to most of us, her significance was perhaps much greater then one might be led to think since from her name derives a number of quite consequential Greek words relating to persuasion and belief, including "pistis," or faith. Starting then from this the etymological basis of faith and belief, *peithology* is a proposed branch of both philosophical and scientific study whose fundamental purpose is to examine and esteem the nature, origin, role and importance of belief.

One can observe that when we make a factual or value judgment, particularly under the influence of strong emotions, or otherwise find ourselves coming to some dramatic and powerful conclusion, more prudent thinking tells us that we should ask, "why do we believe this to be so? On what assumptions is it founded? What alternatives are there, and what good does it do for ourselves or anyone to believe that such-and-such is the case (and or what it assumes)?" Not so surprisingly therefore, when we make judgments without reflecting on their basis, we risk doing ourselves or others great injury.

If then we ever experienced a problem anywhere, it came about, in some degree, due to certain wrong assumptions, either co-present with, or just prior to the given problem's actually taking place. As a *practical gauge* for thinking, peithology, as proposed here, offers an easy to understand method for examining and scrutinizing those remote and latent assumptions which can tip the balance of our judgments into error, while bringing attention to the extraordinary power of belief with respect to all our judgments.

As a *philosophy* peithology is offered as a skeptical idealism, which like transcendental and critical idealisms, relates merely to our faculty of knowing and cognition, not "real things," using "real" in the mundane, conventional sense of the word. It insists that we closely – as much as possible -- question all assumptions, and more that we should question them to their possible limit. If it persuades people to do nothing else or more than this (or more than they have previously), it will have achieved one of its primary purposes.

As a *science*, it is a critical pragmatism which, in as uncluttered and straightforward a manner as possible, examines and classifies *beliefs* while allowing all views as potentially and ultimately valid. In this way, it helps to free all sciences from dogmatism, thus expanding the horizon for giving science the widest and clearest possible vision. If "peithology, " as presented in this work, is not -- as it most certainly isn't -- anything new or original in its parts, hopefully it is so in its focus on and arrangement of certain points and links in the history of philosophical thought and principles of investigation established by modern science.

If we are to speak about a specific peithological method, it might be this:

1. Recognize the finitude and limitations of objectivity
2. Frame the belief(s) we want to assess in the form of explicitly and unambiguously worded assertions. Incommunicable truth, if possible, is of no value to this process.
3. By analysis identify, sort, and catalog all assumptions relating to the given claim or belief (as much as this is possible.)
4. Question and hold in doubt all assumptions as long and as much as possible
5. Identify and categorize all true/false criteria to be applied to the belief.
6. Attempt to assess the probable truth of the assertion based on prior assumptions and criteria chosen and accepted.

Knowledge and belief, according to what follows here, are essentially identical, and the only real difference between the one in the other is our attitude. Knowledge is simply belief with more conviction than ordinary belief, otherwise they are ultimately choices of whether or not to believe a given assertion.

This having been said, there are, as best we know, three possible kinds knowledge or belief available to human beings.

1. Absolute knowledge. A knowledge hypothetically confirmed by God or "the Absolute," but otherwise unknown to us.
2. Subjective Belief
3. Objective Belief

The validity of objective belief is classified and measured in (rough) terms ranging from *practical necessity* (or certainty), to *theoretical possibility* (including that which is highly unlikely), with a number of other tiers of certainty and probability ranging in between. As in determining the mean, as say in a given excellence, such measuring is not always easy, nor can it expect to be too specific. It is understood, therefore, that normally it is the sincere, honest, and reasonable effort towards determining practical likelihood that matters most, not the close precision of the probabilistic calculation.

The above three beliefs (absolute, subjective, objective) are of two basic kinds, those pertaining to Value, and those as to Fact. We can have (Value or Factual) beliefs about abstract concepts; beliefs about (potentially) real things with the understanding that for us they are really concepts (not the real thing in itself); or, lastly beliefs about notions in which we confuse a concept for a real thing (whether or not our doing so has harmful or helpful implications.)[1]

Granting these working distinctions, we go on to say there is never a factual belief(s) without an accompanying value belief(s), and vice versa. Though common sense understandably assumes an object's being prior to its being evaluated,[2] both ultimately are in one way or another connected with the other.[3]

Beliefs, if not necessarily arrived at by judgments, are validated by means of them. Judgments are believed or not believed, yet they are not necessarily belief themselves. Though a belief implies a judgment, a judgment does not necessarily imply a belief, that is ordinarily, or unless we are scraping to get to the bottom of a deeper epistemological understanding

To give us something to go on, we will say beliefs have their beginning or source in Mind, Heart, and (as an objectively problematical, yet potentially viable concept) "Spirit." What exactly I use these terms to mean, and their relation to subjective and objective belief, will attempt to bring out in the course of the main text. However, we can and should note that a feeling is not a belief because a feeling, most of the time, is involuntary. Yet there are levels of awareness and volition where feelings can affect beliefs and, alternatively, beliefs can affect feelings.

Henri Poincaré in *Science and Hypothesis* writes*:* "No doubt at the outset theories seem unsound, and the history of science shows us how ephemeral they are; but they do not entirely perish, and of each of them some traces still remain. It is these traces we must try to discover, because in them and in them alone is the true reality." Peithology, in this vein, says that there is some truth, howsoever tiny and miniscule, to all viewpoints, and preferable to the wholesale dismissal of any given one is the extraction of that truth from what else is false or less true about it. In practice, this also is not always so easy a thing to accomplish as one would wish. Yet in fostering an impartial and objective frame of mind, is a goal which any earnest truth seeker will strive for as much as possible.

Finally, it will be argued and emphasized in this work, that for a belief to be valid someone who asserts something as true, and if they are to be believed, must be fundamentally honest. Honesty is a moral principle, and all valid truth claims and knowledge presuppose some elementary kind of trust. Consequently, a due appreciation of essential moral rules is, in the final analysis, prior to or simultaneous with all adequately valid or true beliefs.

In attempting to grapple with issues relating to ultimate assumptions, as I do in this work, one faces the difficulty of being forced to rely on certain assumptions. Though I have tried to identify and adequately address these, it at times becomes necessary to go and allow this or that assumption which a given reader might understandably take exception to. Yet, for what it's worth, I have made an pointed effort to provide an approach which comprehensively considers all possible sources and grounds of belief. How successful I have been in this is for others to say.

I am inclined to agree with Aristotle "things are intelligible in proportion as they are separate from matter,"[4] and tend to take this sort of attitude when looking for explanations. Though it would be wrong to say I have been exhaustive in my presentation and analysis, I do believe that this work offers an at least rudimentary foundation on which to build a primary understanding of beliefs and their origins, from epistemological, meta-logical, scientific, poetical, and religious standpoints.

There is, obviously, no overlooking the incalculable range and variety of beliefs, and ways of believing, and here I in no wise insist that my own point of view is the only correct one. There are many ways of believing. Let each think and decide prudently what is the "truth." It is our undeniable right as a human being. One has a right to choose for themselves whatever they want to believe, what ever is true or false, whatever is right or wrong. This said, on the other hand, one has no right forcing this on another, unless perhaps by just and due process of law. If then, I express what might be seen as subjective views in language that

---

[1] I take it for granted that real things as we know and speak of them are known by means of *concepts*, though naturally our understanding of a concept is not necessarily an understanding of a real thing as such. All our cognitive knowledge then I assume takes the form of concepts (using the term broadly), though some conceptions are more reality verified or based than others (based on certain criteria.) A quality arguably is not an object as such, but an effect, or event. Yet as a concept (and events in general for that matter) it can become an object, for which reason serious confusion might be said sometimes to arise. An idea I would distinguish from a concept by saying it is a concept or concepts of heightened character, order, emphasis, and or arrangement. Images, as in say an engraving, are secondary to concepts and must in some way be conceptualized, that is turned into concepts, before they can be properly meditated on.

[2] The Greek word for judgment, axiomos, is synonymous and derived from a word meaning "worthy" and "evaluation."

[3] Maimonides: "(B)elief is only possible after the apprehension of the thing; it consists in the conviction that the thing apprehended has its existence beyond the mind [in reality] exactly as it is conceived in the mind. If in addition this we believe it to be, and that no reasonable argument can be found for the rejection of the belief or for the admission of any deviation from it, then the belief is true." *Guide for the Perplexed*, I. 50.

[4] See *On the Soul*. III. 4. 429, 21.

presumes objectivity, or assume something that is believed by the reader to be inadequately grounded, such questioning and doubt are welcome. Far from resenting these, I welcome them. If such criticisms are thoughtful and sincere they are in the true spirit of this study, and, needless to add, of true philosophy and science in general.

This work has been written with a view both toward those somewhat new to philosophy and those who are more familiar. It is with respect to making things more clear for the former that I will on occasion be addressing points the latter will already be familiar with. Similarly, I have made repeated use of quotations, not so much as for argument by authority, but to provide a historical context and background with what is presented, and also as reference for further exploration of points and topics raised. In addition, the quotations serve as (so I believe) unifying links in otherwise differing schools of thinking. This said, I am well aware a given philosopher I quote might well disagree with me, perhaps strongly, so I do not mean to mislead by ignoring that this might be the case. But at least by occasionally citing them, it will provide some readers a supplement or contrast to the given notions as I address or consider them.

No doubt many writers will have felt the same with respect to their own work as I do when I say that *Peithology* might have been written differently to better suit different tastes and concerns. In other words, how this work is written here is by no means the *only* way it could possibly have been written or put together. Time and circumstance, however, require an author to select that manner and approach to their subject which, for the given age and culture they live in, seems most effective for attaining its end.

I. The Role and Foundations of Belief

"Man in truth is made of faith. As his faith is this life, so he becomes in the beyond: with faith and vision let him work…

"When a man has faith then he thinks. He who has not faith does not think: know the nature of faith. Where there is no progress there is no faith: know the nature of progress."

~~~~~~*Candogya Upanishad*

Can one book contain all knowledge, understanding, and wisdom? Certainly many a philosopher, sage, saint, scientist or poet, has attempted something of this kind. Sometimes such ambitious works are presented in an explicitly or implicitly qualified way, while at others the author seems rather confident that he has sufficiently covered every and any point of real significance.

No books (or series of books) have ever been written which claim *all* knowledge and understanding. It is assumed that as knowledgeable and educated as any man is that he is not omniscient or all wise. This is a given. What some books have attempted to do, however, is provide a "framework" (should we say "form and forms"?) in which everything can or could be known or understood. This framework might be founded in poetry, metaphysics, philosophy, empirical science (in its many various branches and facets) and religion. In any one or combination of these ways, efforts have been made to bring supreme wisdom, or "a" supreme wisdom (*of some kind or other*) into one work or collection.

Nothing can be written that will be necessarily understood by all, and certainly not understood to the same depth of meaning. People come from different kinds of experience and different levels of education. They think, feel, and conceptualize differently -- all the more so as the subject dealt with is complex and or extensive in its content or implications. Hence it is that given writers will utilize a different literary structure or arrangement, calculating that his or hers will be most truth possessing, most audience gathering, or both. It is interesting, in this regard, to speculate how different authors might have written their work if they used a different style or addressed a different audience then the one they did use or speak to. This, of itself, tells us how necessarily limited any book or books are in getting at absolute or ultimate truth. Books are culture contingent, even books of geometry, and none escapes a need to express values, and some arbitrary and idiosyncratic mediums of thought and expression. However, without books are there other means of encapsulating wide reaching truth and understanding? Art, both visual and audible, is frequently thought of as capable as well of doing this. Yet, even allowing such, works of art have limitations of convention similar to written works.

Odd, or perhaps not so odd at all, as well it is to realize how one earnest thinker can write a volume which aspires to explain "all," or a version of all (say an existentialist), yet another equally serious in his intellectual ambition ignores or brushes asides completely that first thinker's views, as if not only were they not valid with respect to "all," but not even valid or relevant with respect to much of anything!

As wonderful as any books we might name are, none can encompass "wisdom" or truth in one volume or volumes, anymore than any single volume can encompass all possible knowledge. Life simply has too many variables and circumstances, in which concerns and values can change, fluctuate, and take on different shades enormously -- or so I would argue at any rate. While perhaps not in and of itself categorically proving the fact, this does suggest to us the boundless nature of the truth. If truth then is, in this practical sense, infinite or immeasurable can our understanding and knowledge ever be completely one with it? The answer – in this mortal state of things – would seem to be clearly no.

Thoughts flow and are dynamic, and writings, for this reason, are like photographs, or at least representations, of movement. Words can describe truth, but words alone are not truth. The truth, if we ever know it, is in our thoughts, and feelings as well. Words signify thoughts and feeling, but they are merely the necessary shell, so to speak, not the essence of truth and understanding (though greater truth and understanding, we ordinarily assume, can be built of and from them.)

The writings of a philosopher offer us a model for our own living thought, but living thought can only be something exclusively our own. He can prompt us to think like him, if we so agree. But we can never think his thoughts, nor is his book *actually* his thoughts. The book endeavors to *represent* his thoughts, but they are not literally his thoughts. His thoughts are strictly and solely within himself, ongoing and ever living, even beyond this life as some believe. The book itself, by contrast, comes to a point where it must close, though the variety of ways it might be interpreted are potentially infinite.

In philosophy, there seem to be essentially two kinds of work, and ways of forming multiplicity of thought into a unity. There are *systems* of truth, usually based in logic, such as that of Aristotle, Locke and Kant, which offer a solution. Alternatively, there are *critical outlooks*, which though they invariably involve a certain amount of principle and method, are even so presented as more open ended and ever evolving views of
~~~~~~

truth, as reflected in thinkers such as Hume, Rousseau, or Nietzche,[5] and which raise questions, and perhaps deny an objective system is possible or feasible.

In this way, philosophers *tend* to be Parmenidian or Heraclitean in their overall outlook of what the truth is supposed to be, or how it should be known. Sometimes, the former will view the latter as "rhapsodists " the latter the former as "dogmatists" Yet there are no pure "systemitizors" or pure critical thinkers. Every "systemitizor" has his own idiosyncratic flourishes, just as every open-ended thinker has his fixed principles other are familiar with. We easily can think of (or have known) how say a "systemitizor" might intersperse his fine unity with loose reasonings, or how a "rhapsodist" might take time out to bring his views to a invoke some formalism at some point in his work. What makes people like Plato, Fichte and Hegel unique as thinkers is that they very pointedly try to have it both ways. How well they succeed, people can judge for themselves. In any case, it is well to be careful in considering whether a viewpoint *tends* toward a perspective of stasis or motility – though never will we find a view which is entirely one or the other.

Any human thought as a finite manifestation or articulation, is contingent, and falls short of the Absolute (or infinite, if you prefer, to help get a grasp of the notion), and, for this reason can be said to contain some amount of error. Anything is in someway connected with everything else, yet in speaking about one person or thing, we cannot at the same speak about all else they might be linked or connected to.

If this is so, would it be possible to take the thread or threads of truth in any and all known given views, and weave them into one whole greater and ultimate known truth? Not a few will have tried. Yet a synthesis of all the major philosophies of the world which would please everyone is unlikely because the criteria for truth which any given one uses, any interpretation of key terms, and arrangement and relation of concepts and their emphases will invariably diverge. Understanding requires that we arrange our ideas in hierarchy of emphasis and importance, and it is this difference in value focus or emphasis that disagreements ultimately arise. If this is correct, it would seem that the way to truth, in philosophy and science at the very least, requires that we regularly see ourselves as always, in some way, in error, blinded by or ignoring something, and endeavor to discover what that something is, whether it exists internally or externally, and which we are blinded to or ignore. Such self-checking and skepticism can be accomplished without being flustered by uncertainties or alternative possibilities, which we will attempt to make clear as we proceed.

Although expressed in many ways for ages and more or less universally, it was Hegel who first gave the West the *formal* notion of the Absolute.[6] He also used the word God, and was religious man. Yet in speaking with reference to the Absolute he used the term God in a qualified way, and avoided having it become confused with the Absolute. In the previous Western thinkers mentioned, reality, totality, all thought, all forms, all substance, all existence, all possibility, all qualities, and all relations (assuming any one of these is somehow distinct from another) were co-existent or dependent on God, and had no true being or meaning without or outside of Him. In using the notion of Absolute, Hegel and his various followers, without in any way rejecting God, wanted to avoid intellectually simplistic and cut and dried assumptions. The "Absolute" has the advantage over "God" in that it can be more easily be identified and used as a theoretical concept, and thus one easier for use in objective discussion and speculation. The term "Absolute" is our hope of knowing the Absolute. God, by comparison, suggest we already know him, which is fine subjectively and as a matter of religious faith, but not so much so for objective discourse, which sees the Absolute as a problematical concept inasmuch as we have the potential choice to reject or accept it as a notion , and this on the grounds that all our objective knowledge is (arguably) contingent.

Consequently while we will allow usage of the term "God," as when some express religious sentiment on occasion, we will still want to keep the concepts God and Absolute separate to insure better objectivity and clarity of the *intellectual* notion, Absolute, which neither affirms or denies "God" (a person) as such. For the same reason, and in order to avoid both confusion and what might be seen as an improperly subjective and biased kind of religious approach in rational analysis, we, like Hegel, will want to use the term Absolute without any necessarily assumed religious reference. I myself do believe in God, but for metaphysical and epistemological purposes I do not believe it is necessary to assume His existence for purposes of discussing the Absolute, even though *personally* and *subjectively,* I fundamentally concur with the many who see the two as inseparable. My difference with these thinkers is that I do not believe the connection between God and Reality can be made so objectively knowable in the way they have it, and that to assume so, because of the varied meanings the term God brings with it, only makes things more confusing and unnecessarily controversial. Indeed the term Absolute itself in its presumption that ALL could fit into one word, and further that the Absolute is assumed as "one," indeed that it can be posited at all, are themselves possibly objectionable. But we allow use of the term and the concept itself for purposes of convenience, and logical and practical considerations.

---

[5] These are offered as caricatures or short hand, and not formal classifications.

[6] Neo-Confucianism, at least as early as the 11th century A.D., speaks of "li," or the universal principle which is very like if not identical to our "Absolute." "li" also traces back to Buddhist and Taoist thought, but neo-Confucians like Chou Tun-I (or Chou Lien-his, 1017-1073 A.D.) endeavored to give it more philosophical substance. Prior to all of these, of course, Hinduism's "Brahman" can be thought of as one of the very earliest formulations of the Absolute, perhaps attaining its most notable philosophical and rational expression in the writings of Indian thinker, Shankara (or Sankara, 788-c.820 A.D.)

Spinoza, Leibniz, Hegel and others have in some way argued or seemed to imply (perhaps unwillingly) that if one cannot know and confirm everything, one cannot know or confirm anything (or most anything), at least not in an absolute sense. For example, Spinoza, states: "I do not know how the parts (of Nature) are really interconnected, and how each part accords with the whole; for to know this it would be necessary to know the whole of Nature and all its parts."[7] The notion that all concepts and concept-realities are brought together in one unity is what is known as the Absolute.[8] Any given view or belief of our own is limited with respect to totality. The Absolute serves the logical and emotional role,[9] whether in reality or a necessary construct, of being in a position to determine whether our finite view is consistent with totality, that is the fullest unity of thought, being and activity. Because the Absolute is a unity, yet it is somehow capable of encompassing all, including itself, it is often thought of as being and or possessing the One and the Many.[10] Likewise, in logic we formulate truth on the basis of simple-complex, element-predicate, particular-universal, so that we might infer then that if there is the Absolute (i.e. that on which all other truth depends), it is and must be consistent with logic, and notions of the One and the Many.

If we assume the validity of logic, all it seems we can say with confidence about the Absolute (in this writer's opinion at any rate) is:

1) The Absolute, for purposes of belief or knowledge, is our highest authority, highest knowledge and highest understanding. If there is unchanging truth there must be an unchanging standard of the truth. That standard is the Absolute. It is necessary if it is possible for any knowledge or belief to be confirmed as irrefutably true. Otherwise nothing is absolutely true, there being no highest authority to decide or determine what is absolutely, or perhaps even mostly true.
2) We, any one or all of us, and our understandings are not the Absolute, though there is probably a sense in which we can legitimately speak of being part of it..
3) We do not have authority to make categorical or absolute statements in its behalf, and consequently nothing we say carries with it absolute necessity, except the statement that there is "something" called the Absolute which determines ultimate truth (and truths.)

Fichte says in his *Introduction to the Wissenschaftslehre :* "For it is only insofar as they themselves [given thinkers] are certain of something that they are in any position to know what it means to 'be certain.' But if all certainty is merely conditional, than nothing whatsoever is certain – not even conditionally. If, however, there is a final member of this series, something whose certainty is simply not open to any further inquiry, then there is also something indemonstrable lying at the basis of all demonstration." Josiah Royce describes the role of the Absolute by saying: "all truth is known to One Thought, and that Infinite."[11] If all truth isn't known this way, then how can there be unchanging or final truth? And if there is no unchanging or final truth is all our knowledge nothing more than opinion, and therefore a guess?

---

[7] Letter XXXII, to Henry Oldenburg. Also Leibniz: "The operation of spiritual automata, that is of souls, is not mechanical, but it contains in the highest degree all that is beautiful in mechanism. The movements which are developed in bodies are concentrated in the soul by representation as in an ideal world, which expresses the laws of the actual world and there consequences, but with this difference from the perfect ideal world which is in God, that most of the perceptions in the other substances are only confused. For it is plain that every simple substance embraces the whole universe in its confused perceptions or sensations, and that the succession of these perceptions is regulated by the particular nature of this substance, but in a manner which always expresses all the nature of the universe; and every present perception leads to a new perception, just as every movement that it represents leads to another movement. But it is impossible that the soul can know its whole nature, and perceive how this innumerable number of small perceptions, piled up or rather concentrated together, shapes itself there: to that end it must needs know completely the whole universe which is embraced by them, that is, it must needs be God." *Theodicy* .III.

[8] Aristotle: "If man wishes to become the master of an art of science he must go to the universal, and come to know it as well as possible." *Nichomachean Ethics*. X.9.

[9] As when Happiness or salvation require what is infinite or eternal.

[10] In his *Appearance and Reality*, (I.6) Bradley wrote: "Let us suppose the impossible accomplished; let us imagine a harmonious system of ideal contents united by relations, and reflecting itself in self-conscious harmony. This is to be reality, all reality; and there is nothing outside it. The delights and pains of the flesh, the agonies and raptures of the soul, these are fragmentary meteors fallen from thought's harmonious system. But these burning experiences – how in any sense can they be mere pieces of thought's heaven? For, if the fall is real, there is a world's outside thought's region, and, if the fall is apparent, then human error itself is not included there. Heaven, in brief, must either not be heaven or else not all reality. Without a metaphor, feeling belongs to perfect thought, or it does not. If it does not, there is at once a side of existence beyond thought." *One* response to the problem he raises is to say that existence does not by itself imply true reality, and that only by the Absolute conferring true reality on an existent does it possess it. We might put this another way and say there is quasi-existence (evil) and true existence (good.), while allowing for various grades and shades in between. Only that which is true existent (or a sufficiently true existent) partakes of the Absolute, and only the Absolute can confer on an existent the "quality" of true or real. In the vein of Plotinus, there is a 'something' (matter) which will not truly exist or have form unless God chooses to confer existence or form on to it. For matter then to be considered part of the Absolute could only happen with God's permission, therefore that which does not have such permission is not part of the Absolute. This, at least is one possible explanation.

How a given individual will view the Absolute can differ. Normally, the Absolute is seen in terms of the unity and totality of all existents and their relations. However, there may be other attributes or qualities, which are more important, to make something properly one with the Absolute, such as Spirit and Ideality. For Spirit and Ideality, mere physical existence might be seen as something inferior, and without Spirit or Ideality mere existence does not "somehow" partake of or is not validated by the true Absolute. Note in formal logic False may be True, but True may never be False. The reason for this is that a part of something may be true, and yet another part false. If something is already true, it is assumed that there is or can be no false in it.

[11] *The Religious Aspect of Philosophy*, Ch. XII.

Some have spoken of the Absolute as Being and all Beings, such as Parmenides, Duns Scotus, and Hegel did. For others, such as some Buddhist and Taoist thinkers, have seen it rather as Non-Being. Non-Being is greater than Being, some of these would argue, such as the Taoist Wang Pi, from the 3rd century B.C., because it is above all distinctions, and possesses all possibility and all that Being might be.[12] Even so, we can know Non-Being by means of *li*, the universal rational principle, which makes possible and brings together all knowledge and concepts, including the concept of Non-Being.

If we reject the notion of the Absolute, and we are free to do so, we will end up concluding, as someone who rejected the notion did: "It is absolutely false there is an Absolute" -- which is an obvious contradiction. Bertrand Russell argues that relations are not logically necessary, hence the Absolute is not necessary.[13] Yet even if the Absolute is not, strictly speaking, *logically* necessary (since when did logic of itself compel anything in reality), it is intuitively and causally necessary. All experience tells us what is real is caused by or bears a causal relation to something else. Such relations and our cognitive understanding of such relations do not cease, nor do they escape contingency, unless we presume an Absolute. If we disallow the Absolute, we will have to deny there is any highest or higher truth outside of mere speculation and opinion. And if there is no highest authority, who or what will give Schopenhauer peace, bring Hegel's Spirit to its realization, make Nietzche an overman, validate Russell's standards for truth? They, as mere mortals, cannot really do these things of and by themselves, and if they tell us they can few will believe them.[14]

On the other hand, it has been reasonably objected (by such as Wang Pi) that the Absolute (which is often spoken of ore usually as "God"), cannot be described or spoken of, even though we do speak about it just the same. Thus was the contention of Plotinus, for example. Yet even with him, there is a great difficulty in getting away from referring to the Absolute as one. The logical reason the Absolute is thought of as one is, says Royce, "because in mere multiplicity there would be no finality of insight."[15] Further, Melisus of Samos could add, if the Absolute were two or more, it would or could be joined or united by something, and then that something would be one thing, which then would be the Absolute. The Absolute, as well as being one, is also infinite, it is argued, because there can be only *one* infinite. To say the Absolute is finite would be to suggest it is dependant on something else, hence Wang Pi's characterization. For St. Augustine, "no corporeal object is a true absolute unity."[16] It is the absence of such unity from corporeal objects that causes our understandings to seek it in thought. The Absolute, therefore, is that unity, bringing together the real and ideal, usually by means of Being, Non-Being, or somehow both, depending on your perspective.

Is activity or an event Being, Non-Being or both? Just as with the Absolute itself, there does not seem to be a clear and irrefutable answer. Perhaps therefore the Absolute can be characterized as all (and or the basis of all) activity and events.

A Kantian might contend that the grounds of necessity, such as is posited in the concept of the Absolute, is a priori cognition, and we cannot apply necessity, beyond the mere underlying principles of thought, to experience, let alone "ultimate" reality. Fichte, Schelling and Hegel as well have views about the Absolute peculiar to their own unique perspectives, which we have not the leisure to get into, but can only note.

Otherwise, but for conjectures of this sort, the view that the Absolute cannot be adequately described or spoken of, except conjecturally, would seem the most prudent. Yet if we take this tack it will have to be as a matter of degree, more so here, less so there, or else, perhaps like skeptical or theological purists, resign ourselves in humility to complete, or near complete, silence on the subject.

From an epistemological standpoint, all propositions, and claims (at least outside of formal logic) are hypothetical insofar as their opposite cannot be *categorically* refuted. To be able to assert or refute something categorically, in a pure sense, would presume universal knowledge of all objects, relations, events and possibility, or in other words, presume omniscience. As obvious as any piece of knowledge or understanding we hold up for scrutiny might be, unless we can take into account all possible, ideas, intuitions,[17] sensations,

---

[12] What-Is-Not (or Non-Being) has potential to be any and everything, and is (by definition) free of Being (yet in our being able to conceive it) still seems to possess it (i.e. Being.)

[13] See *Problems of Philosophy*, XIV.

[14] It might be urged that inasmuch as Russell believes in higher standards for truth, he in a left handed way recognizes the Absolute, but simply doesn't like the term or else is playing games with language about its usefulness and validity as a concept. Be this as it may, there seems no getting around the logic that if we say there is a truth there must be someone or something that defines and demarcates it as such. What that someone or something we think does this ,that someone or something is the Absolute according to my meaning.

[15] *The World and the Individual*, Vol. II, Lecture VIII

[16] *On Free Will.*.

[17] By intuition I mean noetic, and otherwise non-sensory data and or principles, from which a priori concepts, such as existence (being), true (and false), good, concept, time, space, number, rule (or principle), truth, universal, particular, and identity have their innate, or most immediate cognitive origin in us. In a sense, intuitions may be seen as kinds of (inner) sensations, but the data they report is drastically different from the information sensation provides us with. In addition, while sensation can provide data, intuitions, as well as being a source of data, can (according to some at least) provide us with a principle or principles of thought. They, in effect take part in overseeing and provide the means of processing sensory data. This said it is open to question in a given instance whether a concept is derived from a pure intuition, and is therefore an actual primary intuition, or whether a purported intuition is really only a more secondary concept constructed out of a number of other concepts derived from primary or actual intuitions (the concept of "logic" might possibly be considered a good example of this.) Otherwise, and

persons, objects, events, phenomena, and the relations of each of these (to every other person, object, etc., that exist, will exist, or have existed), there always remains the possibility that we are in some way mistaken.

Someone might respond that analytical and definitional truths, such as we know "100 inches is greater in length than one inch" do not require all knowledge. Yet this definitional statement is only necessarily true if we assume our base concepts in the proposition. Those concepts do not exist isolated, sprung from nothing, but are inevitably and always part of the greater whole, and in that way, answerable to it. Such definitional truths always implicitly begin with a "let's assume," which *then*, in turn, analytically imply a something else. The statement "100 inches is greater in length than one inch" presupposes the validity of language as a medium of truth, and logic, neither of which we are ipso facto compelled to believe. All analytical statements then, and *as we know them*, are contingent – though keep in mind that from the perspective of the Absolute they might still be absolutely true, only we have no non-contingent way of knowing this.

In this way, all knowledge and understanding, logical, analytical, rational, practical, empirical are ultimately dependant, relying for their validity and meaning on a standard of belief separate from themselves. If we were to say we are capable of infallible knowledge and understanding, then on what grounds do we know this to be true? When we make any claim there is always something latently assumed, and that assumption in turn requires another assumption, and so on into an endless or else circular regress. Those ultimate assumptions, logical, metaphysical, linguistic, empirical, historical, which as a practical matter, we fall back to are always kinds of guesses we allow ourselves to take for granted, and hence there is an inherent uncertainty in any purported necessary claims we might make. This is one reason why many philosophers, including Duns Scotus, have insisted on the reality of God, since he is the only "something" which is *not* contingent or dependant, and is that on which all contingency and dependency ultimately rest. [18]

We might express this by saying, as many have done, that what *only* is necessary then is the Absolute (or God.) While it may be possible for our minds to partake of the infinite, we can never, given our finite natures, encompass it, and therefore while we might be able to approach the infinite we will ever fall short of it (at least in this life apparently). Thus any claims to knowledge or understanding we might make, insofar as they are not absolute, cannot, in the pure sense, be necessary, except that until we are somehow "one" with the Absolute all our knowledge and understanding are contingent, and hence risk uncertainty (not excepting my assertion here.) This is not to say our knowledge that there is an Absolute is absolutely and necessary knowledge, but that such knowledge is at least necessary only as a logical inference, following upon our assumption that there is such a thing as objective reality, and which can ultimately be known, realized and understood.

No more obvious an illustration of the contingent (and subjective) nature of our knowledge and understanding is found than that found in empirical science. The different areas of empirical science are to some extent arbitrary, and merely classifications of practical convenience based on what we, as human beings, are capable of knowing, and what we feel we need to know. Where after all, for example, do we draw the boundaries between physics, chemistry, astronomy, geology, biology, and psychology? On some level these will all (at least theoretically) interconnect in one greater empirical system. Such a system is for us incomprehensible, and the implications of one branch on science to another we can hardly speculate on and explain, let alone, each with branch with all the others, and all the others with each branch. On the other hand, logic and mathematics seems to suggest a basis for such a unified system of the known natural universe. Yet an inquiry into their meaning and applicability leads us into metaphysics, which, outside any hoped for or speculated validation by the Absolute, at best gives us merely a subjective understanding or interpretation of what knowledge and reality are.

Aristotle declared that every argument rests on an unproven premises, and so as well we have Epictetus saying:

"Since it is reason that analyses and brings to completion all other things, reason itself should not be left unanalyzed. But by what shall it be analyzed?

"Plainly, either by itself, or by something else.

"Well: either that too is reason, or it will be some other thing superior to reason, which is impossible. If it be a form of reason, what, again, shall analyze that? For if it can analyze itself, so could the reason that we began with. If we are going to require another form of reason, the regress will be endless and have no stop." [19]

It is not hard to see great caution and skepticism is warranted in any philosophical or scientific conclusions we might arrive at, at least when viewing a claim which purports to be something approaching necessity. As certain as something might be, there nevertheless might be an exception allowing its exact opposite to be true, which will therefore qualify it. With respect to logic and mathematics, on the other hand, we

---

broadly speaking, intuitions (as known by a concept or concept) might take the form of either a transcendental object or event, a principle (of thought), or perhaps some combination of these (depending on your point of view, of which there are many.) In any case, they are a kind of innate knowledge and or way of knowing understood as being essential and fundamental (if not literally prior) to all other cognitive thinking, knowing and awareness.

[18] Every one and every thing, but God, is contingent, and one thing which every one and every thing is contingent on both for their value and existence, is someone else's judgment.

[19] *Discourses,* Book I.

seem to be safe in asserting the absolute validity of certain rules and conclusions, such as the bare notion of equivalence, the laws of contradiction, modus ponens, and modus tollens. Yet this is only possible if we view logic and mathematics as something isolated within their own systems. Logic and mathematics, experience tells us, however, do not exist in isolation, are part of something greater, and are therefore contingent. So that for all we know, what they claim might be superceded, mollified, or modified by God or the Absolute -- that is to say by who or whatever is ultimately non-contingent.

A mathematical conclusion will be in error if we get even one number in our equation incorrect. And the greater the value of that number, the greater is the error. Or even if the error is a minuscule one, numerically speaking, that error might (in certain circumstances) result in terrible harm. So fragile is a mathematical equation. How fragile as well is a piece of scientific reasoning when one assumption wrong in its calculations could entirely upset all or some of its conclusions. What then is the something that will direct judgment towards a point at which such error is minimal or non-existent, and which itself is beyond such vulnerability?

We ordinarily understand reason (in some way or other) to lie at the base of all sound and correct judgment. Yet what actually is reason? Reason to my mind is the application of logic relations to a priori intuitions (such as the concept of "one"), abstract thought and thoughts about physical experience, and of relating abstract thought and such experiences with each other, and which forms conclusions based on these relations. Others have described it as a faculty of perceiving relations clearly, including the power of formulating the principle of identity (found in logic), and our judging in conformity with these.

Charles S. Peirce said: "I do not reason for the sake of my delight in reasoning, but solely to avoid disappointment and surprise."[20] For this "reason," we could say that in reason there is a certain seeking of rest, and therefore has, perhaps, a necessary emotional basis.

Types of reasoning will differ according to the amount of importance placed on logic, that is logical thoroughness and consistency. Some *forms of reasoning* are punctilious when it comes to logical precision, and others, to varying degrees are less so. For some, assertions of what is true must conform as closely as possible with what is logical. For others, the standard is not so stringent, perhaps insisting that experience, conventional wisdom, or inspiration will easily pick up where logic leaves off. It is the range of possible discrepancies between the two approaches that makes "reason" such an amorphous term, so that what makes one form of reasoning different than another is the choices one makes as to what constitutes adequate criteria, which in turn is based on what one values.[21]

In their emphasizing or lack of emphasizing logic in their reasoning, do philosophers make a choice -- not so entirely dissimilar to the way a person might choose a dish or suit of clothes. Our emphasizing or not emphasizing logic (or experience or inspiration for that matter) is, if we grant free will, a *choice* we make. There is nothing about logic or experience in themselves which dictate what choice (as to emphasis) we should make. Rather the emphasis in our outlook arises out of an inexplicable faith and belief which we have arrived at and chosen. In this way, all purported truths expressed by philosophers are ultimately founded upon their subjective, personal, values choice. It might be argued that these choices have certain traceable causes.

Be this as it may, there is no denying the choice itself. If we do argue that choice is an illusion and that there is no real free will, that we are just automatons, then truth has no meaning, and true and false claims are equally valid. "Intelligence without liberty," as Samuel Clarke so well put it, "is…no intelligence at all." [22] Yet some have and do contend there is no free will. But if claims of something as either true or false have meaning, then they assume a certain amount of at least potential choice on the part of the thinker, to know or believe otherwise. As one of the principle doctrines of Epicurus states: 9. "Necessity is an evil thing. But there is no necessity to live beneath the yoke of necessity."[23]

There are common rules of thought, a common need for some kind of unity of thought, and common experiences and desires. Yet the prominence which someone bestows on these principles has no compelling necessity beyond their own personal choice. Certain motives, it is true, will prompt certain emphasis, often unconsciously. Even so, the act of emphasizing one factor (or factors) over another is, experience tells us, is still ultimately a matter of the thinker's volition. If not, in a given instance, their own direct volition as such, strictly speaking, than that of another, who chooses the emphasis for them.

Does this mean there is no higher truth that is truly objective and necessary? Or is such truth merely personal whim? By higher truth, I mean those of an analytical, metaphysical, philosophical or scientific character. No, it merely says our means for discerning truth requires subjective choice on our part. To what extent our choice conforms and is consistent with reality we have no means of knowing, unless we assume God or an Absolute who or which can be hypothecated as a highest authority to decide the matter. Otherwise, our notions as to whether a purported higher truth conforms with all or most of reality can only be a guess.

---

[20] *The Criterion of Validity in Reasoning.*

[21] The same is true of formal logic for that matter, i.e. there are choices made there also, only with "reason" the latitude of choice is (conventionally speaking) much greater.

[22] *A Demonstration of the Being and Attributes of God*, IX.

[23] Principle no.9., as found in Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of the Philosophers*, X.135-138.

In this way, all knowledge is at last faith, belief, or conjecture. Absolute and necessary knowledge ever eludes us. Says Jacobi: "Every assent to truth not derived on rational grounds is faith." [24] Why not go further and say even rational knowledge is, in final consideration, a faith?[25] If so, then this would men that in philosophy or any of the sciences, whenever we claim to believe or know something we are actually only making a guess and taking our chances. It was perhaps for this or a very similar reason that one of the unknown authors of the Tao de Ching (or Daodejing), wrote:

> "To know that one does not know is best;
> Not to know but to believe that one knows is a disease.
> Only by seeing this disease as a disease can one be free of it."[26]

If one objects that this skeptical conclusion is itself questionable (and therefore not necessary), so be it. We are still in conformity with the principle, a principle which best conforms our finite thought with the incomprehensibility of totality. The same could be argued of more mundane, or "matter of fact" knowledge, namely that its determined validity requires that is be a *chosen* belief, or based on chosen belief. If I see the sun and feel the sun shining in me, is there choice involved in my believing or knowing the sun is shining in me? This, by contrast with the conclusion concerning higher knowledge, is a more knotty kind of issue which will be taken up later. In the meantime, we can say that if we do allow of necessary truths, they will needs be thought of as *practical* necessity, not truths of *apodictic* necessity, even though in conventional l usage we will still use necessary and absolutely for convenience sake.

Again, complete skeptical silence might just as well, or better, be justified. Yet let us permit ourselves to theorize what grounds we have for believing something rationally speaking, and especially that which we can believe or know that might carry with it necessity. In using belief and knowledge somewhat synonymously what is meant is that anything we call knowledge requires a certain amount of belief or faith. Some of what we will think of as knowledge requires little effort of belief and some much. Some belief is seemingly forced from us. Other belief is such as to constitute merely a guess, a suspicion, or perhaps a wish. But since we have no knowledge (or the assumptions which such knowledge is premised on) which we cannot (at least potentially) choose to disbelieve, it will be the contention of what follows, that all that we call knowledge requires or implies real or potential belief, and therefore choice and an act of will, and further than the two are inseparable. The question for us now then to be addressed, however, is what makes a given *belief* true and or correct?

To begin, we can observe that, based on experience, it is not possible to consider something true with out some number of assumptions already in place. When Descartes says, "I think therefore I am,"[27] it is already assumed that the notions of language, relation, existence, unity, consistency, logical inference, and self-consciousness in thought are valid. Says Descartes in regard to this point: "First principles themselves are given by intuition alone." But are these intuitions correct, i.e. consistent with reality? And how exactly would we know this if they were? How sure could we be?

Our logical and causal inferences presuppose data based on intuitions or sensations which are givens. Jacobi saw our acceptance of these intuitions and sensations as the result of faith, and for this reason believed that all human cognition derives from revelation. Fichte, Schelling and others insist that all knowledge, or belief, must begin first with the "I" (or ego) and then "the other" (that is, the "not I"). While this may not be a necessary truth seeing that its very assertion presupposes language and a sense of relation, it would seem to be an intuitive truth possessing practical necessity, since without a someone who thinks, and a someone or a something he can think of we can have no thought whatsoever. Yet might not Fichte have posited Malebranche's "God," as neither an "I" nor an "other," which is, nevertheless, necessary to thought? If this should turn out to be so, then Fichte's thesis might be reassessed in this light.

It would seem, based on the foregoing, that in attempts to identify the foundation of thought and knowledge, we must assume that any theory or explanation we might apply must be qualified and accompanied by a recognition of the potential uncertainty of the claim. That the basis of any rational knowledge is a leap-of-faith "given." This, of course, is what Descartes acknowledges. Yet how very strange it is to think that intellectual truth should spring from clouds of obscurity! And does this not perhaps suggest that there is something greater than the cognitive truth we are capable of?

Thus it is with knowledge or belief as it pertains to the intellect. Yet beliefs, ultimate aims, and our attitudes to and conceptions of the Absolute and ultimate aims are not ever purely founded in the intellect. The intellect confirms, rejects, guides and admonishes our beliefs, but does not *by itself* prompt or finalize belief. States William James: "Our non-intellectual nature does influence our convictions. There are passional tendencies which run before and others which come after belief, and it is only the latter which are too late for

---

[24] *David Hume on Faith*

[25] While "belief" is the assent we confer on an assertion pertaining to fact and or value, "faith," by contrast is simply belief which possesses more of our conviction.

[26] Ch. 71.

[27] Compare with Augustine: "everything that knows it lives is necessarily a living thing." *On Free Will*, Book I, 16.

the fair….*Our passional nature not only lawfully may, but must decide an option between propositions, whenever it is a genuine option that cannot be decided on intellectual grounds*."[28] As best we can tell, *primal* belief arises from feeling and inner longings and impulses. In a sense, we only know inasmuch as we desire or love, and all knowledge and belief is directly grounded in some feeling or love. We endeavor to raise up and or become in some way what we most truly desire and love. But why we ultimately desire or love one way and not another perhaps remains one of the greatest mysteries.

Of course, it is common for any one of us to validate our beliefs on the basis of our mere feeling without resorting to our intellect as such. There are, we all know, conscious states in which we could hardly be said to be thinking, yet in which we are still aware of a feeling. Yet we do not know an state of thinking in which some feeling is not present.

There are beliefs which arise from mere subjective feeling and habit which are necessary to our survival, as Hume made the case for. Indeed, most people feel their way through life rather than think through it, acting on the basis of beliefs which arise from feelings and inexplicable intuitions and instincts rather than deliberated thought, and there is none who does not believe and function to some degree on such grounds. This said 'feeling" is a very broad term, and may be used to refer to casual reflexive reaction, inbred biological and social temperament, deep sprung desire, and other related classifications. Naturally the importance of given beliefs will vary depending on the nature, and the strength, of the feeling which prompts them. Despite the wide range of states and impulses which can be characterized as "feeling," here I will us the very un-scientific term "heart," to denote it, though with a particular emphasis on what might be called deeper or deepest feeling.

Where mind based belief and heart based belief are or can be joined or synthesized I will use the term "spirit." Like "feeling," "spirit" applies to a very wide range of experiences, some relatively trivial, some profound. Exactly how spirit should be seen is open to question, and the term has meant many different things to people. Some might deny it has any real meaning altogether. But if we do assume it, is "spirit" merely a manifestation of heart and mind? Is it co-joint (with another) but, nevertheless, independent entity or process? Is spirit something individual to us? Or might it be also something mutually possessed by people, as well as being borne in us as individuals? Some combination of these? Such and sundry questions we will consider in what follows.

For purposes of peithology there are three main sources and or validations of belief:

1. Mind
2. Heart
3. Spirit

The function and significance of these I will, as we go along, try to demonstrate and reveal, addressing the questions of what, say, a belief based in mind is, and how possibly it might arise.

Among the points I will argue is that insofar as our natures are finite and our judgments are hypothetical, all our judgments are technically and in the final analysis subjective. However, there is, of course, an extent to which kinds of practical objective judgments of mind (given some logical and a priori assumptions) are possible. Whether objective judgments of heart or spirit are possible is an interesting question which we will want to explore also. Yet, in what follows, if for convenience sake and nothing else, we will normally view the mind only as capable of objective judgments, with the understanding that objective means merely a superior kind of subjective belief which is held in common by more than one person. It is possible to talk about objective knowledge of the heart or spirit with relevance and meaning, and again it may be possible ultimately to demonstrate or characterize them as being capable of forming objective beliefs. But, as a more simple rule of thumb, we will assume only the mind as capable of such.

Normally, belief is something concluded by a single individual. Certainly it requires at least such. Belief, like thought as William James described it, is something owned and personal. That individual's belief may be influenced or controlled by other individuals or circumstances. Yet, when all is said and done, belief seems to be decided or resolved by one individual. If what we think of as belief is not, at least potentially, an individual choice then all philosophy and thinking is in vain. We will then assume that all belief involves individual choice. In cases where one individual's belief becomes to some extent subsumed under the will and power of another, that other becomes the one that forms belief. Belief always involves the choice of *someone*. Whether the individual self, or another individual dictating to the former, it is *someone* who forms the belief. Though one person's belief may in a sense be involuntary, its original manifestation comes from someone else who forms and chooses it as a belief. All belief then, when it comes right down to it, arises from the *choice* of someone.

As well as being something arrived at by an individual, belief is something no one of us can avoid. It is our nature that we must believe something. Only to this extent was Epicurus (cited earlier) wrong. In this sense, while someone who believes possesses, at least the potentially, the choice of beliefs, one cannot choose to not believe *something*.

---

[28] "The Will to Believe"

II. Beliefs of the Mind

a. First Principles and Primary Criteria

In determining whether a judgment or conclusion resulting from a judgment can be characterized as apodictically necessary, practically necessary, likely, or unlikely, etc. we observe or apply certain rules and criteria.

The following is a roughly list of rules or criteria commonly applied to a given assertion, i.e. potential cognitive judgment, to determine whether it is valid and or true or real. The demarking into Primary and Secondary is simply my own preference, and there is admittedly is perhaps a certain amount of arbitrariness to the specific sequence given, but this is a relatively small matter here.

Primary criteria (Mind)

1. Logical consistency, and logical inference
2. Causal inference and association which are innate as principles, but whose full use is realized in practical experience.
3. Classification and categorization of concepts and the data from which they originate.
4. Signs and language inasmuch as they comport with the above. Sensations and perceptions might be considered signs in this sense.
5. Morals, as in honesty and sincerity, as applied to the person making the judgment.

Secondary Criteria (perceptions, acquired and second hand judgments)

1. Our own previous judgments and beliefs
2. The previous judgments and beliefs of others

If we can know higher, absolute, and more universal truths we know them by Primary Criteria. While there is sensation without mind, and while mind requires sensation and or intuition, sensation and intuition have no identification and categorization without language, logic, and the causal principle which are of the mind, and are all but incomprehensible and incommunicable without mind. Sense data, intuition and experience are different from the ideas by which we realize them in that they involve matter whose nature we cannot assume admits of direct or actual apprehension by us. At best, sense data, etc. are known by representations, having their reference in the mind and heart, and that at the least is how it is possible for them to be intelligible to us.

To the extent representations fall short of the real, it is, nonetheless, of value to remind ourselves of the fact, and thereby enhance our appreciation and understanding of how they are like or unlike reality (i.e. insofar as it is possible for us to know and conceive reality to begin with.) We have no reason to assume that *our* (capacity for) ideas can represent or accompany all accurate and better realizations of sense data, intuition, or experience, inasmuch as these partake of what is physical matter – whose very essence and nature is so different from ideas. Atomism is this problem in reverse: not all matter partakes of ideas, because the very nature, definition, and essence of ideas is opposite or complimentary to what is physical. Matter could be said to have its physical being in minute particular and their relations. Ideas seek their source in greater universals (concepts) and the relations to other universals. Yet we ultimately have no knowledge of ideas without some degree of corresponding matter, just as we have no knowledge of matter without some corresponding degree of ideas about it. We can even say this without necessarily denying either idealism or materialism, by offering the distinction of mind and matter as a practical one.

We start off in life with inborn value and factual judgments. They are in a sense imposed on us initially. "I exist," "To live and be happy are good," "peace is preferable to inordinate strife," are examples of such. Despite this, as humans we potentially have the power to reverse everything or most everything we know and believe if, with real resolve and determination, we choose to do so.

Value judgment and factual judgment depend on each other. Any factual assertion by a person is ultimately connected to an idea they have of what is good, otherwise, they would not make it. At the same time one's idea of what is good naturally is connected with some kind of knowledge or belief as to what we think of as being a fact. Using those facts and values we are born with, we arrive at others. Whether those we are born with or those we grow into are justified we typically seek for confirmation in others. Since logic, language and morals, for many at least, do not originate from people, they look to God, or else a similar notion such as the Absolute, for the ultimate validation and improvement of their judgments, and, as is often the case, other people as well. Other persons might reject God or the idea of God and seek the ultimate validation or improvement of the judgments from other people.

In speaking of mind, and for *most* purposes, I will take it for granted to be understood that, generally, I mean mind *and* brain,[29] unless the context in which I use the word mind suggests a distinction from this

[29] "Brain," in effect I interpret to be the central collecting area, if not actual or real source, of identifiable sensations, perceptions, and intuitions known through cognition.

preliminary mind-brain definition. "Thought without content, " states Kant, " is empty, and intuitions without concepts are blind…(t)o neither of these powers may preference be given over the other."[30]

Mind as a self-existing and self-functioning entity, if such is possible, will later be referred to as Spirit, or Mind-spirit. Mind as it is commonly thought of implies the presence of a brain. Mind outside the brain is for us an otherwise speculative notion, one often posed or insisted on by philosophers, but nothing we can readily point to in actual experience in any as yet indisputable way. Arguments such as Berkeley's while persuasive, do not (at least to my mind) possess compelling necessity. This is not, by any stretch, to suggest that the notion of mind independent of brain is somehow an impossible one, or that the mind is something completely physical either. Rather it is to say that mind independent of brain or body is, for human thought, a relatively speculative theory, and far more problematical than mind, as something like the life, consciousness, or soul of the physical brain. In saying this, I do not mean to dismiss the contentions of transcendentalists or idealists as somehow ipso facto invalid or irrelevant. The views of the idealist may, as it turns out, very well be true. But based on a preference for simplicity and to avoid what seem to me unnecessary assumptions, I have, for purposes of the following analysis, opted for the more common sense view: incorrect or misleading though it might turn out to be.

A good analogy for the difference between a mind and a brain, and how they work and interact together, is between a pianist and the piano. Neither can function or have meaning without the other. The mind is the person playing the music of thought and the dialectic, while the brain is the instrument which provides the notes of intuition and sensation to be sounded. Both mind and brain have their own rules which makes it possible for them to function. The mind being is ruled by logic and certain regulations of thought. The brain – as best the mind can know it - is governed by certain laws of physiology. Whether they converge at some point need not concern us here. Neither the mind or brain having any purpose or ability to express themselves without the presence of the other. Exactly where one draws the line between where the mind ends and the brain begins and vice versa, has always been a matter of some dispute between idealists at one extreme and materialists at the other. Despite these differences, experience makes it is fairly plain that mind needs brain (or at least some physical body), and vice versa for either to be able to function. Yet this admitted, any science, including physiological science such as can describe the brain and its functions, requires a basis in an epistemology of one kind, or other, if that science is to be clear and consistent. By epistemology I mean a study and consideration of the initial principles by which we discern the differences between reality and appearance, truth and falsehood. A given epistemological viewpoint may be slanted to either a more traditional metaphysics or idealism, or else a more of an empirical or outward confirming approach, such as Russell's correspondence theory. If a philosopher or scientist is to make best sense to his readers or listeners, he must provide an epistemology of one kind or other, on which his overall view of science can be coherently established. If not, we will feel he is carelessly cutting corners or otherwise short changing us.

Is the notion of a belief being potentially true or false unavoidable and to that extent necessary? The answer would seem to be yes, assuming we are equipped with judgment to begin with. For this reason, it would seem that the faculty of judgment is something inborn in us as a kind of instinct. And there are no doubt primitive levels of belief which are to some extent compelled by our physical natures. Yet though we inherit these biologically or as a matter of experience, the mind is of such a nature to have the potential capacity to choose to reverse these natural assumptions, except for the fundamental and innate assumption that there are beliefs which are true and beliefs which are false (while allowing for, as well, the possibility of there being gray areas in between true-false judgments.).

Does this mean we could, for example, simply choose to believe we don't exist? The answer is that in a certain sense and to some degree we could. For one thing, we could decide that either nothing exists or that everything exists is outside ourselves, that is to say by playing with the definition of existence. Similarly, if we choose to reject the definition, we can consequently reject the concept altogether. This does not mean that by doing so we would avoid error. It merely means that we could see (what we can here call) our existence and experience in a way that need not conform to how others see things. No one but God or the Absolute could tell us we were absolutely wrong. Someone might object that such a person might believe they don't exist, but the very fact that they arrive at a conclusion contradicts the very assertion. This objection will no doubt be valid to others, but to the person who chooses to believe they don't exist there is no overriding necessity, outside the Absolute, that they should have to agree. Such is the potentially incalculable power of choice with respect to belief.

Malebranche states: "The power our soul has of directing its inclinations therefore necessarily contains the power of being able to convey the understanding towards the objects that please it." And "we have this freedom of indifference by which we can refrain from consenting."[31] Likewise, William James calls consciousness "a selecting agency." [32] Even if we can't choose immediate consciousness, we can choose to direct our immediate conscious, and further have (at least some) power of belief over what our consciousness is directed to. It is this pronounced power of choice in thought and thought-belief, and its self-conscious

[30] *Critique of Pure Reason*. Introduction. The Idea of Transcendental Logic.
[31] *The Search for Truth.*
[32] *Principles of Psychology, vol. 1, page 139.*

realization, in addition to our capacity for higher universals, that perhaps makes the human mind most distinct from and superior to that of animals.

Behaviorists and certain determinists might argue that beliefs are completely forced on us by heredity, cultural circumstances or divinity. There is no easy way of refuting this out of hand except to say that if we accept that all thought and belief are forced on us, which (even so) we might do, then thought and belief are meaningless and effectively irrelevant.

The proof of our free will has been approached by a variety of thinkers, and whenever I have read them I have usually felt like someone in the cheering section of their efforts. Yet when it comes right down to it, I must, like Kant, not find the results all that convincing. If I believe in free will, and consequently free choice in thought, it is a preference or practical belief of mine, no doubt based on the idea that we or anyone are in a position to confer value on someone or something. For without choice, what is value?

Yet to either categorically prove or refute free will in some irrefutable sense seems otherwise quite impossible. This said, it is worth observing that those who incline not to believe in freedom of will or thought, most definitely do manifest the lack of any such freedom. Henri Bergson's contention that we possess free will as fundamental to our being, but that such will is only realized in degrees, and that much of the time our actions and beliefs are a product of other wills (or forces) is probably the correct view, yet a view which is more itself a faith or theory than an absolutely incontrovertible fact. But more of this topic we will look at later.

With beliefs, such as those found in empirical science, we endeavor to make thoughts and phenomena somehow *agree* in our understanding. That is we endeavor to achieve a kind of unity and equivalence between different objects and events as we both experience them *and* then how we know them in our thoughts. There are three different kinds of agreement: agreement in thought, agreement in fact, and agreement in thought and fact. Such agreement or harmony forms the basis of our ideas of truth or what is true.

Ordinarily for us, agreement in fact is a practical, working kind of knowledge. We believe a certain thing or other about persons, physical objects and events and this belief facilitates out interaction with what is physical. It is knowledge or belief which though it "works" for us and has a practical value and does not seem to require *absolute* necessity (in the sense of full epistemological verification) to fulfill that function. Why experience seems to agree with thought, and thought with experience, is no little mystery which the vast majority of people accept without wondering why such should be so.

Agreement of thought and fact, meaning "physical" fact, in the above sense, as apodictic knowledge, based on what has been said earlier with respect to the Absolute, is not for us possible. It is the insoluble problem of reconciling thought with the physical that has prompted theories of pre-established harmony, various monisms, monadism, materialism, atomism, Hegel's "Geist," and Schopenhauer's Will and Idea -- to name some of the most famous. Typically, much of the linking of thought with what is physical takes the form of abstract inferences, usually taking the form of causation.

For Hume, the *notion* of cause arose in our observing how we habitually join seemingly related objects with certain events. His view seems to imply that somehow experience "caused" or brought about the notion of causation – which is, after all a sort of circular argument. For Kant causation can only be properly applied to phenomena perceived in space-time terms, and does not apply to the non-physical, such as what is transcendental or what is noumena, i.e. things that are purely of or beyond thought.

There are certain similarities and differences between knowledge based on logic and knowledge based on experience which may be of help here. Both rely on memory and assumed beliefs as to existence and identity. Both, in some measure, presuppose a unity or harmony of some kind. Both use an "if-then" form. In the case of logic, "if-then" refers to deductive inference. In the case of experience, including induction which draws data from it, "if-then" refers to a causal inference. On the other hand, logic assumes principles of pure identity, and that something cannot be and not be at the same time (the law of excluded middle.) Unqualified identity (or equality) and the law of excluded middle, in their pure form, are not found in experience. Arnauld, in his correspondence with Leibniz, gives the example of "can one be and not be who they are they are at the same time?" Traditional formal logic tells us no, we cannot do this, if we say A is equivalent to A, we cannot then say A is not equivalent to A. But there is nothing in experience to force this conclusion with necessity. Logic allows for single, pure entities, whereas in experience everyone and everything is a composite of some sort or other, and there are no single pure entities (except in theory.) In formal logic, what is *is*, while experience makes it possible that something may (in some sense or other) be what it is not. Experience then allows us a broader ranging of definition as to who we, as individuals are, so that, in our example, it is theoretically open to question whether we can be someone and someone else at the same time, or (put differently) whether we need always be the same person.

It is debatable to what extent logic and physical reality conform or are consistent with each other.[33] As mentioned, we have the theory of pre-established harmony, first raised by the idealist Geulincx. This view,

[33] If the physical universe disappeared would logic and mathematics disappear?

generally understood, says there is a correlation between reason (and ideas) and the physical world which God has pre-ordained. Various rationalist and idealists have maintained that logic or reason, and our intuition of them, is (aside from God) all there is that is truly real: physical experience being merely a shadow or the dross of true reality. A proof of this might be when an engineer uses abstract concepts, including those of a scientific and mathematical nature, in order to build, say a bridge, rather than say attempt to build the bridge from simply looking at mere pictures of one. Though images have their value, it is the concepts and abstraction based in ideas that ultimately makes the bridge stand, and less so impressions drawn from surface physical images of other bridges.

In opposition to the idealists, are materialists, and also radical empiricists, for whom logic has only a tenuous or remote connection either with physical reality, and that in feeling, sensation, and perception collected to together in the course of habit and memory are the more necessary and correct determination of what is real. The bridge is built based on what others, through trial and error have learned. The engineer merely copies what they did, and uses abstract logic, and concepts of engineering and mathematics to simply quantify and draw a useful picture or plan of what experience told them can be done (in this case build a bridge.) Logic and abstractions *describe* but they do not really explain or hold the real answer to what is required to build a bridge.

Although there are certainly a number of plausible theories why, more ordinarily, we think logic "works," and why causal inferences seem somehow capable of corresponding with physical experience, the exact truth of the matter cannot be said to be really known. Causal inference is embraced universally, so much so that it would be hard to imagine someone who thinks without this capacity at some level. In fact, a monad such as Leibniz poses can be thought to possess it.

Does our innate true and false sense allow for an alternative to logical and causal inference in judgment? If so, it is difficult to see what such would be, since as soon as we say that chance, brute physical force or the will of another resolve our cognitive determinations, we still can fairly ask what determined chance, brute physical force, or the will of another" If then there is a substitute for logical and causal inference in our arriving at judgments, it must be viewed as a something unknown.

The commonality of "if-then" to both formal logic and empirical science is an interesting phenomenon. In the former it refers to logical inference. In the latter it refers to causal inference, usually respecting physical phenomena. In logic, if-then is seen as innate or else something inexplicably given. In natural science, the "if-then" of empirical formulation originates from experience, habit or experimentation. The explanations for what is supposed to be the correlation between these two "if-thens" are various. We might posit a pre-established harmony between the mind and the physical world, brought about by God, who synchronizes the logical "if-then" with the causal "if-then."

Some will differ as to whether the causal "if-then" refers to a real relation between phenomena, or as merely a practical construct designed to suit reason, which is seen as the all-ruling seat of objective judgment, while God is the only *true* cause. With Kant, the "if-then" of experience is merely a derivation of the given "if-then" of a priori intuition. With empiricists the two "if-thens" would appear to be taken as a merely happy coincidence. Another interpretation might be that if the two did not somehow exist simultaneously then the logical "if-then" is really and merely the by product of causal "if-then." Yet if our knowledge of causality arises from the principle of induction, then our notions of causality are a by product of innate or a priori logical inferences. There may be certainly said to be an instinctive sense of causality, but its usefulness and application, without induction, is highly restricted. While Kant, in my opinion, has so far won the palm for the most coherent and circumspect explanation, there are still arguably significant weaknesses to his view – most notably the concept of the thing-in-itself. The question of the correlation between the logical and causal "if-then" therefore remains a most interesting one for speculation and reflection.

Two essential processes or mechanisms of thought which the mind uses to find agreement are analysis and synthesis. On its most basic level, analysis is looking within and breaking down into its parts a

---

If it is possible for mind to be separate from matter, the answer could well be yes. Yet if logic and mathematics required physicality in order to exist, and more than just any physicality (i.e. any given physical object or objects) made them possible, what specific physicality would be required? Off hand the answer seems to be that no particular physical object or objects make logic and mathematics possible. And even if we assume say a physical brain is required to make them possible, what physical object is and or is not required to make a brain possible? One possible answer to both this and our original question might be that you need not only a full bodied person, but an entire universe to make a brain possible. But short of an entire universe no given physical objects or objects otherwise, and by themselves, could make logic or reason possible. For this reason we might say that the universe is the soul of logic, or alternatively that logic is the soul of the universe.

Plotinus, interestingly, speaks of the universe (or else associates with the universe) the "All Soul," which is the third part of his trinity, and which makes the universe seem as if it were the bodily extension of the First (the "One," the "nameless") and Second Principle (or Intellectual or logical principle). Yet even if the "All Soul" is interpreted this way, it would seem to be a body which the First and Second Principle are ultimately independent of.

In other words, the First and Second Principle could exist without the All Soul as a body, and that the All Soul or body is only necessary because the First and Second Principle choose to make it so. the same would also seem to be true of the Second Principle with respect to the First Principle, yet only because the First is prior to logic (i.e. the Second or Intellectual Principle), and therefore is a greater mystery to us.

concept we have fixed upon (whether looked upon the concept as a concept, or as taking the concept and seeing it as a literal thing. Synthesis, on the other hand, refers to taking concepts or objects and constructing them into a new concept or object. Either will involve some amount of identification, joining, separating, and classification of concepts, and will presume some notion (or notions) of unity is possible, whether a unity of thought, what is physical, or both.

To illustrate a possible instance of simple analysis, lets imagine a plastic toy truck placed on a table in a room. The truck consists of a plastic body, four wheels, and two metal rods which attach the wheels to the body. A person coming into the room and told to analyze the truck would mentally or physically take the truck apart and examine its separate parts, and attempt to find their function and relation with each other. If the person is a more deep thinker, they might go beyond the mere immediate parts present and break down the parts into sub-parts, for example, plastic for the body, rubber for the wheels, metal for the rods. They might go further and determine what the molecular composition of the plastic, rubber and metal is. Etc. As well, they might look at the object from without, and do a sort of analysis in reverse. They might see the truck as part of something larger or greater (e.g. "toys which are manufactured in China.") In this reaching up to higher categories or classes, these higher categories and classes may then in turn be broken down or analyzed, and this might or might not tell us more to enhance and make more correct, and or more useful, our *intended* conceptualization of the toy truck.

Synthesis, conversely, would be someone else coming into the room, later finding the disassembled truck, and endeavoring, by means of imagination to construct something or some *things* from its parts, while drawing from their prior knowledge of things and relations. In "synthesizing" the parts, the person might do a variety of things. They might assemble the parts into the original toy truck. They might pile the parts into a clutter and call it a worthless heap. They might create what they thought was a work of art by placing the parts together in an unusual way. Kant believes that mathematics is a cognitive act of synthesis, and uses the term, a priori synthetic judgment for mathematical judgments, since in mathematics we *construct* and discover, by means of a priori equations and methods of calculation, yet with input from intuitions and larger concepts based on those intuitions.

Analysis and synthesis will, in practice, involve one partaking of the other to some extent. How and how far this is so is beyond our purpose here to examine, so we simply make note of the fact. Both analysis and synthesis will use certain criteria to find the agreement in thought and or fact which is sought in both processes. Criteria then are the means used by which various kinds of agreement of conceptions, that is "truths," are arrived at. Typically, analysis and synthesis will use identification, categorization, and generalization as tools to group or sort similar or separate parts. The concept "Being," for example, is one kind of categorization or generalization. It is a very unique notion since it is one which, (aside from that of "God" or the Absolute) some have seen as the category of all categories.

Time and again in the writings of all philosophers we see the effort to find the particular in the general and the general in the particular. In a way, this is the method in which all philosophies, different as they might be, consist. According to Schopenhauer: "(T)he capacity for philosophy consists just in that in which Plato placed it, the knowledge of the one in the many, and the many in the one.[34] Philosophy will therefore be the sum total of general judgments, whose ground of knowledge is immediately the world itself in its entirety, without excepting anything; thus all that is to be found in human consciousness; it will be *a complete recapitulation, as it were a reflection, of the world in abstract concepts*, which is only possible by the union of the essentially identical in one concept and the relegation of the different to another. The agreement which all the sides and parts of the world have with each other, just because they belong to a whole, must also be found in this abstract copy of it. Therefore the judgments in this sum-total could to a certain extent be deduced from each other, and indeed always reciprocally so deduced."[35] Somewhat similarly and on the same point Morris Cohen observes: "Every science must *assume* some unvariant connections or categories."[36] Whether these links and unities are made possible only by the mind, and or they exist among nature and what is physical, opinions will differ as we have noted.

To what extent logic, a priori intuitions,[37] and faculties fundamental to cognition, such as our capacity for language, are necessary tools for thought-agreement, and necessary functions and criteria for belief based in thought, is in some measure debatable. Unless we are inveterate skeptics, we normally assume them valid, at the very minimum within their given self-contained context.

That the law of contradiction, for example, is a necessary truth of logic we take for granted. Likewise, the a priori notion of a purported factual proposition being, ordinarily, either true or false we take as a

---

[34] Although Plato's theory of Forms, which accompanies his understanding of the One and Many, may seem a rather static notion, in *Theaetetus* he conceptualizes forms as *fluid and moving*, and weaving into correct and incorrect places and arrangements when we think – a very important aspect of his view that tends to be forgotten.

[35] *The World As Idea*, First Book

[36] My italics. *A Preface to Logic.*

[37] Some will dispute the idea that there are set a priori intuitions, seeing such as meaningless, and would prefer rather to *start* from the immediate now of a priori consciousness, or the "instant" dialectic given in conscious understanding combined with physical experience. Even so, though significantly different in character from the idea of a priori intuitions, such counter notions nevertheless serve a similar metaphysical purpose in assuming a basis from which all our knowledge and understanding begin.

necessary given. Nevertheless, it is conceivable, at least in theory, that on some unknown higher or perhaps "divine" level such assumptions are not in part, or even at all, valid. Spinoza held a view of this kind. Unless our understanding were to become one with the Absolute, we simply wouldn't know them to be true with respect to the Absolute. If making this kind of skeptical caveat seems to cast undue suspicion on the validity of basic logic and fundamental a priori notions, one need not be too alarmed. Here the validity of such first principles will be assumed, only we provide this qualifying doubt for greater thoroughness, before making this choice.

Choice is -- certainly it can be -- crucial to our arriving at first principles. In his *Vocation of Man,* Fichte writes: "every knowledge presupposes a higher knowledge on which it is founded; and to this ascent there is no end…It is not knowledge, but a decision of the will to allow the validity of knowledge…All my conviction is but faith; and it proceeds from feelings, not from the understanding."

"Choice!" one might object. "You make it sound that first principles of logic and thought are a matter of personal preference!" Yet if we look at the history of philosophy is this not to some extent so? Witness the numerous first principles which some have introduced, noting similarities and differences (while asking whether these should be seen a mere practical concepts, or real actual things.) The basic idea here is that all knowledge, at least of which we are capable, can, in one form or another, be subsumed under these notions. Such a listing can hardly be expected to do justice to a given philosopher's point of view, but for our purposes will suffice.

Eleactic school, Parmenides, Zeno:
One and the Many

Pythagoras:
Number and harmony

Empedocles:
Love and Strife, and the four elements: fire, earth, water, and air

Platonic "categories":
The dialogue "Parmenides": The One and the Many.
The dialogue "The Sophist": Being, Motion, Rest, Same and the Other, Non-Being
The dialogue "Philebus": Infinite, finite, mixture or unity of both, cause of this unity

Aristotle's Categories:
Substance
Quantity
Quality
Relation
Where
When
Position
Possession
Action
Passion

Kanada (Hindu sage, 3rd century B.C.)
Substance (dravya)
Quality (guna)
Action (karma)
Genus (samanya)
Individuality (visesha)
Inherence, or Concretion (samavaya)
Co-inherence (sadharmya)
Non Co-inherence (vaidharmya)

Pyrrho of Ellis[38]
Ten modes or criteria of appearances and judgment (or disagreements based on):

1. Pleasure, pain
2. Idiosyncrasies of men
3. Difference in sense channels
4. Difference of condition, e.g. age-youth, sorrow-joy, health-illness
5. Customs, laws, myths
6. Mixtures and combinations
7. Distances, positions

[38] As given in Diogenes Laertius, *Lives*, Loeb. Vol. II., p. 493.

8. Quantities and qualities
9. Strangeness, rarity (e.g. an earthquake)
10. Inter-relation: light-heavy, strong-weak, great-small, up-down

Nagarjuna (early second century A.D.)[39]
Void and Appearances. Appearances are sorted into opposites. Void (contrary to how it is often conceived elsewhere) is seen as the Absolute, Ultimate reality, and all potentiality.

Cartesianism:
1. Thought and extension
2. Substance, attributes, modes

Spinoza:
Substance, attributes, extension, ideas

Leibniz:
Substance, Quantity, Quality, Action, Passion, Relation

Locke:
Substance, Identity-diversity, Modes, Relations, Co-existence, Real existence

Berkeley:
Spirit (mind), Ideas, Relations, Substance, Accident

Hume:
1. Comparing of ideas
2. Inferring of matter of fact

Both can then be divided into: resemblance, contrariety, degrees in quality, proportions in quantity and number

Kant:
a. Space-Time intuitions

b. Table of Categories

I. Quantity

Judgments	**Categories**
Universal	Unity
Particular	Plurality
Singular	Totality

II. Quality

Judgments	**Categories**
Affirmative	Reality
Negative	Negation
Infinite	Limitation

III. Of Relation

Judgments	**Categories**
Categorical	Inherence and Subsistence (Substance and accident)
Hypothetical	Causality and Dependence (Cause and Effect)
Disjunctive	Community (Reciprocity)

IV. Modality

Judgments	**Categories**
Problematical	Possibility and Impossibility
Assertoric	Existence and Non-Existence
Apodictic	Necessity and Contingency

[39] Founder of the Buddhist Madhyamika branch (one of the Mahayana schools.)

Fichte, Schelling: I exist, I think: Self as producing (subject), Self as produced (object), self-consciousness (origin of all synthesis of subject and object)

Hegel: Spirit, finite, infinite, thesis, antithesis, synthesis

Schopenhauer:
Space, time, causality, principle of sufficient reason

Trendelberg:
Motion

Herbart:
Reality lies in simple unchanging points of relation, the sum of which constitutes the absolute.

Peircean Categories:

a. Perceptual judgments (i.e. perceptions implies unconscious judgments), these demonstrate basis of triadic categories

b. Triadic relations

	Firstness	*Secondness*	*Thirdness*
original view:	subject	relation	interpretant
later view:	quality (“this-ness”)	hacceity (“suchness”)	connection-combination (“signhood,”general-ness”)
corollaries:	feeling	volition	belief

Intuitionists:
Sequence

Despite the diversity of perspective, the ideas of unity, multiplicity, transformation (of one sort or other), identity and non-identity seem to be common threads. Otherwise, such variations of viewpoint and emphasis suggest the implausibility of any fixed objective epistemology. As William James remarks: “No concrete test of what is really true has ever been agreed upon…one’s conviction that the evidence one goes by is of the real objective brand, is only one more subjective opinion added to the lot.”[40]

Perhaps one of these thinkers or schools of thought, it may be argued, has the more correct view or emphasis of first principles. Perhaps. But if they do, someone must first choose to believe that they do if such a view is to have meaning and validity. The truth cannot just sit there, it must be believed or not believed. As a practical matter, if not a logical one, until something is believed it cannot be the truth. Is this requisite of belief due to the fundamental nature of reality as we know it? Is belief a necessary aspect of Reality? Or is the necessity of belief merely a product of the nature of reality as *we* know it, as limited by language and our finite intellects, but that there is no adequate way of knowing whether our limited understanding are capable of comporting with higher or True reality?

We, of ourselves, whether as individuals or members of a group, have no way of guaranteeing our own first principles, and those first principles we do adopt are, to some degree, a matter of subjective choice arising it seems out of mystery. The rejection of such abstract first principles by some nominalists and logical positivists (or people who think of themselves as such), while not without its point, is a contradiction, cannot be considered a serious solution to the problem. A cautious and unbiased skepticism seems to be the safest and most prudent route on this. In other words, we will allow the posing of first principles with out being too adamant in insisting as to exactly what they are or must be. Though such skepticism fails to give us the full confidence of conviction we would like, it at least has the advantage of impartiality and consistency, while allowing that it is or might be in some measure possible to make our understanding of first principles more clear overtime. This at least is our hope and wish.

b. Subjective and Objective Belief

In our common experience, the mind possesses two elementary kinds of belief, subjective and objective. By subjective I mean beliefs which we hold personally, though it is certainly possible for a group of people to hold a subjective belief or beliefs in common. By objective belief, I mean subjective beliefs which can in some way be confirmed independently of our own personal opinion(s) by means of some kind of independent criteria or authority. Criteria refers to rules or voice(s) of authority which instruct us how to proceed in our judgment or decision.

Though we usually view knowledge or beliefs as subjective or objective, if all beliefs are hypothetical, we could say all our beliefs are actually subjective. We might well be inclined to think them true,

[40] See his essay “The Will to Believe.”

but cannot really prove them as being necessarily and absolutely true, without at least some qualification. Take for example the law of excluded middle we find in logic (not experience). It tell us that "not A" and "A" are by definition separate and opposite conclusions, that is there is no middle ground so to speak between them. To us, at least as far logic goes, this seems unobjectionable and as obvious as anything might be. It is well at least for us to think so. But *how* do we know this is? Malebranche puts the matter simply enough: "When I know that twice two is four, I know this very clearly, but I do not know clearly what is in me that knows it." [41]

Whether because of inborn or a priori logical intuition, and or confirmation by other's testimony, the law of contradiction[42] in logic and rules in mathematics, are *so* ultimately because we believe them. If we did not believe in them (so to speak), any mere inborn awareness, or other's authority, such laws and rules would hold no sway over out judgments. True, we would arrive at all manner of illogical conclusions ignoring the law of contradiction for example. Even so, unless believed in it as a principle its validity would never be established as objective truth.

Only then if we believe a principle or rule does it become relevant, and therefore true, in thought. This, of course, does not mean that something, including a principle, is correct or false just because we believe it correct or false, or that our belief in and of itself makes something true or false. Rather, if something is to be accepted as a fact or principle it must be believed. So in this case, our inborn intuition and or the authority of others, are not, in and of themselves, sufficient for establishing the law's validity. In addition, our belief in the principle and these criteria are also necessary for establishing the law's validity. One could after all, refuse to believe the law of contradiction, and therefore for such a person the law would become irrelevant. This would end up causing someone many problems, perhaps drive them insane. Even so, if they chose to disregard the law, it would potentially be within their power to do so – only some price would, most likely, have to be paid in the bargain.

The question might then be asked: just because a person has the power to choose to disregard such a principle or rule, does this necessarily mean that to *accept* the law also requires deliberate choice of belief? As a practical matter, we can see that a person could accept the law unthinkingly without any deliberation. Nonetheless, whether conscious or no, a choice to believe *is* made, simply because I know that I could choose to not to believe the law. Any rule potentially allows for alternative acceptance or rejection of its validity, and consequently any rule will, as a matter of course, be believed or not believed. Again, any fact or principle of thought requires or implies belief on the part of someone if it is to have value as truth.

Now it could be objected even if everyone disregarded the law of excluded middle *in logic*, it would still nevertheless be true. My response to this is that, yes it might still be true, and we could never categorically dismiss it as untrue no matter how many people agreed that it should be so dismissed. Yet despite this, it would not have meaning and therefore become true, unless, at minimum, someone believed it were true. Short as we come of the Absolute, *we* are in no position it would seem to confer apodictic necessity on a given assertion's truth or falsehood, though as a community of people we could still confer (at least) practical necessity on it.

If we start from a skeptical position, as we have here, there really is little or no ground for objective belief, other than certain rules and principles, such as those of logic, which make given beliefs more or less plausible, but never necessary in a truly absolute sense. Even the irrefutable existence of our own consciousness, for all we know, could conceivably be pulled out from under us unexpectedly at a moments notice and have no basis or meaning, the universe and ourselves disappearing like a puff of smoke as much as if we had never been or been known by anyone.

But as this does not happen, we go on then to make assumptions, and form correct beliefs which take into account all that we might possibly know, all that we might possible imagine, and which, in such forming, we endeavor to keep from conflicting with one another. Part of this process involves our forming objective beliefs. By objective beliefs, we mean beliefs consistent with logic, experience, and other peoples views which we find agree with our own preconceptions. At this juncture, to avoid confusion, I will treat objective beliefs as tentatively distinct from subjective beliefs, with the understanding that (as I contend) the truth is really a difference in degree, rather than kind, and that all *our* beliefs are really subjective, inasmuch as they are all conditional and consequently hypothetical. It must be emphasized, however, that this is not to say that subjectivity necessarily renders a belief false, or not possibly absolutely true, but only problematical if viewed from the standpoint of unconditional validity (inasmuch as we are capable of knowing such.)

What is objective thought and what makes it possible? Firstly, in addressing this question, it would seem clear that an object *in thought* proceeds from unity which subjective consciousness makes possible.[43] Without self, and (*some* kind of) awareness of self, as Jacobi, Fichte, Schelling, Hegel, Bradley and others have brought out in one form or other, there is no other.[44] Without subject, there is no object. While it is well to

---

[41] *The Search for Truth.*

[42] The law of contradiction states that (p & not p) is false. The law of excluded middle says that (p or not p) is true *only*.

[43] Note that thought does not necessarily imply reality. Or does it? Perhaps we might say it implies a basis for reality, but is insufficient of itself to be real.

[44] Hume, and later Russell, denied literal consciousness of self, but refers such consciousness to certain thoughts and feelings. But the question can then be asked what is it then that unifies these thoughts and feelings? William James likewise, challenges the idea of necessary self-conscious, saying: "thought may, but need not, in knowing discriminate between its object and itself."

speak of subject and object, self and universe, coming into being simultaneously in physical life and in thought, thinking requires the subject who thinks first. The universe, *in theory* anyway, could *possibly* exist without anyone (aside from God) knowing it. At the same time, we could not conceive of a "self" existing without a universe, or of a thought of universe without a self. Self, or the subjective viewpoint makes possible the necessary point of unity for the consideration of a not-self or object. Hence, self, the subjective viewpoint, is necessary for objective thought. As Bradley insists upon it: "in order to have an object at all, you must have a felt self before which the object comes."[45] The relation or the realization of the relation between self and not self then calls for something which will unify the two. For Fichte this was God's will accompanying our own will, the former working in us through our free will and reason. Hegel's view was similar, but he specifically called this unity Spirit, and attempted to expound on and explore it in greater and more complex depth.[46] Many 20th century philosophers, thinking particularly of the empiricist and positivists, have generally shied away from or rejected such beliefs, preferring to take the more common sense view of subject and object as matter of fact givens, which need not especially be, explained and accounted for. Yet this self, this will, is known first subjectively. Schopenhauer it seems to me is mistaken when he speaks of pure objectification being free of anyone's will, since (at least I would argue) there is no truly pure objectification to begin with. Will is necessary as basis of belief, and any objectification involves some degree of choice first, the choice that something can be believed or thought of objectively. Absolution, on the other hand as well, could seem to only follow from someone's will, presumably God. Again knowledge implies, belief, and belief implies choice. There is, for us at least, no un-chosen knowledge or criteria, for such would be meaningless.

Reverse of the objectivist view, we might in effect say, as in the film "Cabinet of Caligari," no one's reality is the real one. But if we do, we are making an assertion about reality (i. .e. that reality consists of multiple realities), which seems to imply that from multiplicity comes something that is true about all reality. In this way, logic seems to be able to turn all subjective views into one objective view.

Historically, at any rate, intellectual "truth" has been viewed as being synonymous with objectivity, objectivity in the minimum sense of something collectively agreed upon So many persons as "subjects" are somehow able to agree on the nature of an object or objects by applying certain criteria. This then becomes the means of deciding upon the truth. This view perhaps has been particularly more prevalent in more recent times where empirical science is typically seen as a litmus test for something being true.

Idealists, on the other side, have tended to be dissatisfied with such conventional standards of objectivity. For them, it doesn't really matter what people think as such: truth is the truth! These have tried to find what is most real by means of rational intuition or our immediate consciousness realized by means of transcendental or idealistic reasoning. You see the truth for what it is, or you don't, and if you don't so much the worse for you. Their opponents will have argued, rightly or wrongly, that such an approach cannot rid itself of the risk of inconclusive subjectivity.

Empirical science's objective method allows proof for its claims which all can more easily see and test if they so choose – at least in theory and so I think most of us believe. In the period of the medieval and renaissance schoolmen, certain methods of formal logic, largely drawing on the work of Aristotle served a role similar to empirical science as a litmus test of truth among the well-educated. The shortcomings of both the

---

Principles of Psychology, vol. 1, page 275. Ordinarily this would seem to be true, as obviously we can think of something without being attentively conscious or aware of our self, as such. But here, it could be argued, that a certain awareness of self is ever present in us, similar to the way that consciousness is always present, on some level, even when we are asleep, something which James himself observed. If then consciousness is always with us even though we are not necessarily giving our attention to, it is at least plausible that some minimum awareness of self is equally an integral and fundamental element of our thinking. Yet this self-awareness, or built in orientation to the world and its objects, takes place so regularly that it does not necessarily draw our over attention to itself when we are reflecting or perceiving. Alternately, as per James, self could be defined as given unity of our consciousness in given point of time. Schelliing's is yet another view of self deserving consideration. Admittedly, proof of such minimum self-awareness would be difficult to provide in a way that will satisfy everyone. Yet for the purposes intended here its plausibility is all that is required to make our point. [Supplemental Note (third edition.) Subsequent to writing the above footnote did I become more familiar with Buddhist, or Buddhist based, notions of "self" and "not self." For some Buddhist thought, it is not "self" which is capable of knowing true reality, but rather "not self," attained through following certain the Eight Stages of Perfection which is capable of this. It would be to much to take this all up here and now, offering as it does a spectacular expansion of our epistemological view. But my simple response to the Buddhist view regarding knowledge and self, is to say that, technically, the knowledge I am seeking to know and affirm here is *objective*, but not necessarily absolute knowledge. The Buddhist "knowledge" (or "enlightenment") in question, on the other hand, is really what we would call *Absolute* knowledge, and not such as I am necessarily addressing at the moment. On the other hand, I agree strongly with such Buddhists who would maintain that there is a way whereby withdrawing from self increases our ability to think objectively.]

[45]"On Our Knowledge of Immediate Experience."

[46] It is somewhat puzzling whether Spirit in Hegel is one "thing" which is real (or most real) to merely the individual thinker, or whether it is that which is real (or most real) to all thinkers, that is to say most real(or potentially most real) in collective awareness. Ostensibly, Hegel means to say it is both. But, to my knowledge, he doesn't appear to explain how and why we know this to be so. Put another way, *how* do we know that Spirit known to one individual is necessarily the same Spirit known to another? Off hand, and as best one can tell, the answer would seem to be that we must simply assume this based on the seeming similarity of logic to all. Further, there seems no reason why Spirit should be less realizable to one individual than to the greater collective whole, or why Spirit should manifest itself in a superior way collectively (or historically) among people, rather than within a given isolated thinker. *Who*, after all, decides when and with whom the Absolute is most manifest and present?

scholastic and empirical and scholastic methods have been subsequently brought out largely by subsequent Rationalists, Kantians, Idealists, and Empiricists (themselves.) Antagonism to the false assumptions, and the misuses and abuses of formal logic and dogmatic empirical science have not always been exclusively expressed by logic's adversaries. Just as frequently the criticism has arisen from those who themselves ultimately had great confidence with these methods. The desire of the latter was not so much to refute these methods, but to try to reformulate and rid them of error and inconsistency, while preserving their importance.

Perhaps the greatest failing of scholastic logic was the lack of a desire to adequately question the validity of the premises on which its arrived at its syllogistic conclusions. Indeed, it was the *realization* of this failing which arguably helped make modern empirical science as we know it possible. By taking the trouble to confirm by inductive or otherwise close observation what assumptions were entitled to be adopted, it was seen that the power of deductive logic, as a truth determining method, could be enormously enhanced. We might observe in this how closer scrutiny of premises, hence better research and evidence, became the foundation for a more convincing formulation of objective truth.

Following the various reformulations of reason as passed down by the scholastics, empirical science, the gathering and verification of evidence by induction, in turn, was subject to more careful examination. It was realized that the failures to appreciate the effects of misinterpreting data, the limits of induction, and the quasi-necessary character of empirical assertions could lead to scientific error, just as failure to properly establish premises had lead to error in scholastic logic. Ironically, however, while the scholastics had been routinely dismissed for their dogmatism, the potential blindness of the scientific method (i.e. when science is carried out more or less illogically) has received relatively little notice, with the not so surprising results that often times incompetent scientific thought will take over the mantle of spurious authority role for which the dull scholastics had been (sometimes rightly) condemned. A good example of this would be some of the extravagant claims and careless data misinterpretation in social sciences, anthropology, biology, and psychology such as we might find or have found in some of the heirs of Darwin and Freud, with as many harmful results to people's lives (indeed it could be argued far more harmful results) than anything ever arising out of the scholastics errors. Of course, the fault lay not in the scientific method itself, or logic, but their misuse and vulnerability to cultural dogmas, arbitrary prejudices, and irrational or amoral ideologies.

More usually, metaphysicians, transcendentalists, logical and mathematical theorists, semeiologists, and idealists have in more modern times been taken to task – sometimes quite rightly I think -- for abstruse and useless reasonings. Yet compare the practical results of philosophical exploration to the plethora of informational minutiae produced by research in clinical psychology. Such research costs as much time and certainly more money and resources than the supposed airy speculations of metaphysicians, and the like. Yet the practical benefits overall of such psychological research – whether to human understanding or application in medicine -- is frequently so nil as, in many instances, to make the practice ridiculous. In reading William James's *Principles*, for example, one has difficulty seeing how such of the manifold psychological research references really have all that much bearing on all he concludes, and whether he could not, after all, have persuasively expressed the same general view he offers without much or most of it. Though such technical information may, in certain circumstances, benefit medicine as it pertains to physiology, it is questionable what good such medical specificity does in telling us about the "soul," which is ostensibly psychology's purpose. But while medical knowledge can give us *physical* health it cannot in any special way bestow on people better judgment, understanding, or morals – at least no more than say auto mechanics. In the latter respect, the metaphysicians, etc., by comparison and for all their shortcomings, would seem to have done much better, and empirical science, as practiced, has not always lived up to its reputation as necessarily the more reliable and thorough method of either truth or objectivity.

By objective, we mean something ordinarily believed as true based on a criterion which requires communication and agreement among people. According to this definition, the innate or a priori rules of logic and mathematics are not strictly speaking objective unless agreed as being so by people. We are not saying that such rules are invalid unless they are confirmed by agreement between people, only that they do not have *objective* validity unless agreed upon by two or more persons. Subjectively and with respect to the Absolute, the rules of logic and mathematics might very well be taken as true or absolutely true. But they only become true objectively if there is more than one "person" to claim they are true. The Absolute itself cannot be considered such a second person since "it" is unknowable, or if knowable is only known subjectively. The bare notions of something being true versus false, of something being a fact versus error, and "if-then" inference, may be considered innately[47] objection their way, but they would be the sole exception. The application of all other criteria of objectivity, on the other hand, require some amount of agreement among people if they are to serve a truth verifying function.

Schelling wrote: "Only by the fact that there are intelligences outside me, does the world become objective to me…a rational being in isolation could not arrive at a consciousness of freedom, but would be equally unable to attain to consciousness of the objective world as such; and hence that intelligences outside the individual, and a never-ceasing interaction with them, alone makes complete the whole of consciousness with all its determinations." [48]

---

[47] Innate, if not faculties necessarily or sufficiently exercised by all, since some do little choosing for themselves.

[48] *System of Transcendental Idealism*, Part IV.

To instantiate (with a hypothetical illustration), if an abandoned foundling was raised from very early age on a deserted island all alone (and say miraculously fed by sea birds, or omnipresent easily reachable and ready-to-eat fruits), with no knowledge of their parents or background (say they suffered from complete amnesia on these points), would it be possible to say they somehow naturally possessed objective thought? Unless and until our almost entirely nature reared Robinson Crusoe (or perhaps better yet Tarzan) made contact with another person (and barring their shared mutual intelligence of animals), it would seem they would not. Rather for them, subjective and objective thought would be identical. Possibly if they were of an inherently philosophical disposition they might hypothecate another person and consequently another person's 's thought, and therefore come to infer and realize the notion of something in an objective way, that as something which another could see and think about in a way different from one's own.

Otherwise, that there was a difference between a subjective and an objective view would seem not to likely occur to the islander, and truth would consist of everything they believed to be true, and everything they believed, aside perhaps from the bare formulaic distinction between true and false, would be subjective. Objective knowledge for them, outside the bare true/false sense, would not be possible.

Now let's say, as the years passed, another like island foundling, also living entirely in this same exclusively subjective state, made it over to the other, one very surprising day, from another near by deserted island. Their possible reactions on first meeting each other leaves itself open to some interesting speculation. This said, after such meeting, would then objective thought be realized by the two? Even if they had no shared spoken language, their natural instincts, needs and emotions, basic logical inference, would no doubt find some commonality by which a mutual understanding and agreement, and hence objective view could be established. Say for example the visitor goes to a tree to grab some fruit. The other, apprehending his purpose, goes to another tree and grabs fruit himself. From this circumstance would probably arise the objective understanding to both that each requires food as sustenance, so that now if one of them brought fruit to the other it would be mutually, and hence now *objectively* understood and *objectively* verified that fruit was a food. Consequently, as a result of perception, and perhaps some amount of reflection, the notion, in this case of food being something which served both their purposes would become a *shared* notion which they could make reference to in some form of primitive communication. While the fruit already had such a meaning to each prior to this meeting, now the concept of fruit as a shared notion would have *objective* meaning, which would supplement and confirm its mere subjective, unshared meaning.

If there is no shared thought there is no objective thought, and so for objective thought there must be grounds of mutual understanding and means of communicating this understanding. The lack of such mutual understanding and communicating, I think all will agree, would else make objective thinking impossible.

To give another example, imagine an instance where one is alone and finds themselves in a sudden great earthquake. They might assume that their friend across town knows of this same event, without his communicating this to us. Based on their own experiencing of the event, he would infer his friend experienced and knows about the earthquake. In this example, objective knowledge is assumed based on inductive inference and his previous mutual understanding with the friend. If seeing the friend later, he asks "what did you think about the great earthquake that occurred earlier today, he responds "*what* earthquake?," and the friend goes on to deny knowing of any such thing taking place, he either concluded that either a) his senses were so numb the event went unnoticed by him, say, for example he was asleep, or b) he is not telling the truth, or c) else perhaps we were mistaken about an earthquake taking place. How a given individual would resolve the mystery, will vary depending on the person's capacity to obtain facts and analyze. For most people, they will assume the friend was either unconscious of the event, or else is lying -- not thinking to doubt their senses as to a great earthquake taking place. But the final decision as to whether the earthquake took place is ultimately a personal one. If the person insists there was an earthquake, and the friend insists in denying any such took place, the former will ordinarily continue believing there was the quake, and that the friend was either mistaken or lying. The friend for his part might think the same of us, so there is an impasse as far as their being an objective resolution of the problem.

Certainly, the first person will think of their knowledge, as being, "of course," true, as objective knowledge. But unless confirmed by others, it is meaningless to claim to others that it is so. This is not to say, it could not, as matter of experience, later be confirmed as being objective by the testimony of others – if the earthquake actually took place, such (in theory any way) could well happen. Yet until another confirmed our belief, or else believed it likely or plausible, the earthquake would have no meaning as an actual objective event, and consequently he could really only claim subjective knowledge of it *to others*. Property damage by the earthquake would encourage his belief that what he knew was objectively true, but his belief still could not pass as objective belief with others unless they accepted it as well. To himself, the earthquake was as real as real could be, and he would infer that it could be it objectively established. But communally speaking, if all refuse to agree with him as to the event happening or the plausibility of its happening it has no objective value as truth when he speaks of it to another. Yes, the rest may all be mistaken or lying, but until there is agreement with another, his knowledge is technically subjective, and only potentially objective, mutual agreement being a necessary criteria for objective validity. This does not at all mean that if a falsehood or fiction is agreed upon

that it necessary follows that it is true, only that if a proposed fact or reality is to be established as objective the mutual understanding of or agreement about that fact or reality between two or more persons *is* necessary. If someone wants to say that not even mutual agreement confers objective truth, and that there really is no objective truth, they are free to do so and no one can really refute them.

But if we assume some kind of objective truth as our standard of reality then we must assume some degree of communal agreement. It will be suggested that we could share our thoughts with God and hence we, or "our island foundling" could always have objective thought. While there is no reason for me to dispute this in principle, it is less confusing to view such inferred sharing one's thoughts with God as subjective, since only God could be in a position to properly validate the purported relationship in a way that we could call objective. If others agreed with one person that that person shared his thoughts with God, it would be their agreement with him that rendered the belief (in some way) objectively valid -- not the alleged divine relationship itself. As always, subjective does not necessarily mean not true or less true. A subjective belief may turn out to be absolutely true, and more correct than an objective belief of others, only unless it is agreed upon by others it is not objectively true. Objective truth, on the other hand, while it often has the practical advantage of being more convincing than subjective truth, never, of itself, implies absolute truth, nor does it necessarily imply even valid truth.

c. Language

If there is to be agreement of belief between people there are certain mediums of communication, and their rules and conventions. Such mediums are something the given persons must assent to in order for them be used, and then make possible objective understanding.

There would seem to be an innate medium and rules which experience has shown are availed of by all. For example, a sign and its reference to something other than itself, and the very act of referring would seem to be kinds of mediums and rules which are instinctive, in animals as well as humans. Leaving aside the question of God's willing this belief of signs and our using them as references, the medium of signs and the rules of their use are adopted by us without necessarily requiring our volition. Language and logic, are mediums with laws which are based on the use of signs and referencing. They would also to some extent seem to be instinctive to us on some basic level. Allowing that belief in signs, language and logic is in some way an innate or instinctive kind of belief not requiring choice, which is a very primitive kind of belief, and undeveloped or by itself, is of very limited application. To properly realize the powers of signs, language and logic beyond this most elementary level requires a belief in their usefulness and validity, and an effort on our part to develop our skill in their use.

Our belief in the use and validity of signs, language, and elementary logical and causal inferences seems a belief which is imposed on us without our consent. Yet the mind and will are such that they possesses the potential to (later) reject those beliefs and assumptions. In this way, the mind can act retroactively on all beliefs, and choose to believe or not believe the validity of signs, language and logic and causal laws. How successful one might be in this would depend on the individual. This said, so built into us is our instinct for signs and language (much less so logic), that it is questionable whether we could really rid ourselves of their habitual use. Yet in theory, there seems no reason why such a thing would be impossible. Nothing, it can be argued, necessarily compels one to require objectivity in order to make their own personal determinations of truth and falsehood. No doubt a person who rejected traditional objective mediums and laws would seem very strange and confused to us. But if a person chooses what seems to us madness, there is none that can tell them they cannot, or even that they are necessarily wrong, unless perhaps it is the Absolute.

For all their general adoption and acceptance, we cannot ignore the fact that signs, language, and the systems on which they are based quite frequently are loaded with subjective, artificial and often arbitrary meanings, which require more careful inspection and analysis in order to avoid our saying more or less than we intend. Sometimes by not saying something, we end up saying much, whether we intend this or not. As well, language is often infused with latent biases and prejudices which can also be the cause of misunderstanding, or of saying more or less than is intended. The word "animal" for instance can refer at once to an objective concept while at the same time referring to something about which people have subjective feelings, such as when the term is used in a derogatory way. In this way, signs and language are not as value neutral as they often seem, which should caution us from reading too much into their character as somehow implicitly unbiased tools of communication.

Inasmuch as agreement between two or more people implies communication between them, we assume language as the foundation of all objective belief. The search for the objective foundations of both semiosis (or semeiosis)[49] and linguistics is inherently problematical since both are already presumed valid and somehow intuitively understood prior to the inquiry. In addition, any speculations we make or conclusions we draw on the subject are accomplished by signs and words. This is a circumstance somewhat like a judge judging himself. Technically, we might see nothing wrong with this if we grant the judge is possessed of sincerity and

[49] Peirce: Semeiois is "an action, or influence which is, or involves a cooperation, of three subjects, such as a sign its object, and its interpretant, this tri-relative influence not being in any way resolvable into actions between pairs." *Pragmatism in Retrospect*.

integrity. Even so, we, indeed he himself, might understandably be skeptical at his ability to evaluate himself objectively. And if there is no other judge outside himself or the Absolute to judge him we can never be quite sure we are achieving an adequate, fair, and objective judgment. This is why discussions of semiosis, linguistics and hermeneutics are so often found to raise more smoke then real fire. While apparently making reference to the practice of law (an apt comparison to linguistics), American scientist and inventor, Edwin Howard Armstrong said: "men substitute words for realities, and then talk about the words,"[50] -- something it is very easy to do when signs, language, and their interpretation are the topic under consideration.

There have been some interesting attempts at analyzing the structure and elements of language by Russell and Wittgenstein (and others of course). But as helpful and enlightening in their way as these efforts are they seem only to be successful in their parts. There always seems to remain a great veil of mystery which ever thwarts a reasonably full grasp of the subject. Some have tried to approach language by coming at the problem through the study of bare signs and sign functions with little better success. Peirce's work in this area is very intriguing, and seemingly full of great potential, but very little that is really decisive in reformulating understandings seems to have actually arisen from it. As J. G. Hamann, Prussia's, brilliant (if not always consistent) reactionary to the Enlightenment, realized, the meaning of words is ever shifting and never fixed. Words overlap and change in meaning, value, and significance depending on who is using them and the context in which they are being used. How then by means of words can we arrive at a fixed meaning of what words (and their use) are?

The rhetorician and philosopher Gorgias of Sicily (later Athens) argued (in effect) that objects of thought are themselves not the existents, ergo the existents are something other than thought, and therefore nothing that exists can be thought of. This same argument would seem to be even more true of language than thought, and of course we take it for granted that language as a mere system of signs is not identical with the things it speaks about. In many ways it is most obviously different, especially when the signs are not pictorially literal. And much of the time what we communicate about are not existing things, but stretched or empty concepts of real, independent things, or perhaps not even that.

There is no logic without signs, and in most ordinary languages we have signs or words representing symbols, concepts, concepts of concepts, concepts of real things (and real events, real relations, etc.) and signs or words representing words (which in turn might be understood as symbols, concepts, concepts of concepts, etc.) There are ways we can know something, and our thoughts have meaning, without necessarily accompanying those thoughts with words, as when Zhuangzi (or Chuang Tzu), the 4th century B.C. philosopher and satirist says: "Words are for meaning: when you've got the meaning, you can forget the words. Where can I find someone who's forgotten words so I can have a word with him?…"[51]

It would seem intuitively to be the case that *process* (or if you prefer spirit or activity, including emotions) as well as though processes,[52] precedes *image*. Image may, to some extent, (and sometimes almost perfectly) represent process. But process is always superior to and always more real than image, because image refers to it in order to allow for the construction of meaning. It is important then in understanding signs and symbols to be aware of whatever process (or processes) precedes, leads up to, or brings about (so to speak) a given sign and symbol, though with the understanding that any sign based description of that process is limited in expressing both what the process is (in reality) and the variety of ways we might know or be familiar with processt (that is, for example, without language, as per Zhuangzi.)

Although we usually overlook the fact, in most all our communications, we more commonly speak with respect to abstract concepts than specific real things, and even when we are specific we also overlook that we are mediating our own understanding and communications with others by means of *concepts* of these real things, not the real things as such per se. Yet the very presence of a sign or signs presumes something real. In this sense all signs represent something real. Even a sign which is interpreted wrongly represents something. For example, 7 + 5 = 13 is incorrect, and in a manner of speaking not real.[53] Yet in saying it is unreal, it is an "it" and as such is something real, if something not much more than something barely real.

Various rules and criteria are applied to a sign or "statement" made up of signs to determine whether they reflect what is real. The determination of whether a sign or signs is more rather than less real depends on the interpreter and the criteria they use.

Isaiah Berlin, in his (mostly)[54] insightful treatment of Hamann, in expounding on the latter's outlook on language, states: "There is no objective 'structure' of reality of which a logically perfect language could be a correct reflection."[55] Perhaps another way of putting this is, that the world of language and the "real" world (i.e. the world as we know and believe it to be) are separate, and there is no way of exactly knowing how, if, and to what extent the two correspond, since we can never go from the one world to verify the other, but can only truly

---

[50] Address to the annual convention of the Institute of Radio Engineers, Philadelphia, May 29, 1934.
[51] *Chuang Tzu* ch. 26.
[52] Such as interpretation for example.
[53] Along the same lines, we would normally say 7 + 5 = 12 is correct, and therefore is more real than 7 + 5 = 13..
[54] His connecting Hamman's "irrationailsism" with 20th century folly and madness is not a little extravagant.
[55] *The Magus of the North*, Appendix.

know them within their separate realms. What correlations we make between the two arise from a custom which it is not possible to verify independently of the presumed (and unproven) validity of such correspondence. When we say "there is a giraffe on the plains," we understand what is said, but think of the endless number of ways this might be expressed and or wide number of things it might imply or signify (including what it is understood to assume, for example that a giraffe is an animal in Africa. Africa is a continent, etc. Giraffe is a word. Africa is a word. A word is a sign. etc.)

We might simply go ahead and conclude that language is ultimately subjective. Signs are something chosen as a designation for something else, and the correlation between a given word and its intended object is, after all, arbitrary and subjective. That we call a train a "train" might be better called a "locomotive," and the choice of using one or the other is subjective choice. Such acts of choosing and designating are based on value judgments or a word's use. Peirce says the meaning of a sign is its use, and in this sense the meaning of a word carries for us a certain value (i.e. if it is to be of use.) If value judgments then are primarily subjective in origin and character, then so must be language. Value assigned symbols, it is easy to see also, require people's subjective consent, though granted there is a sense in which afterward an objective valuation may be conferred on and added to such initial subjective valuations. We may acquire subjective sense of values from commonly accepted or objective values, but ultimately all our valuations must be considered primarily or essentially subjective.

Russell maintains that language serves the purpose of indicating fact, expressing belief, and attempting to alter the belief of others,[56] thus making clear the importance of language in forming objective or socially agreed beliefs. Signs, usually in the form of words, as the foundation of communication, are the initial and necessary starting point of all objective belief. Subjective belief, on the other hand does not always require language or words.

Hamann states: "True and falsehood first make their appearance, with the use of words," "language is the first and last organ of the criterion of reason," and "reason is language, logos."[57] Earlier we spoke of the innate or instinctive faculty of knowing true versus false. If this is true, and Hamann is correct, our capacity for signs and language is, again, innate or instinctive along with our true/false sense. At any rate, it is fairly self-evident that language is a necessary medium and criteria as means of agreement and consequently objective judgment. If reason is words then we might say reason is what is potentially most real, i.e. if we avail ourselves of it. If we say physical experience is somehow more real than words or reason, then we fail to account for what gives physical experience this designation. What is merely physical does not (it would seem) confer value on something, rather it a person that does this. If to be real is something of value, then nothing is real that is not known – or at least so might an argument around this point be framed. For this reason words, accompanied by reason, could be said to have a reality superior to that which is physical.

How can words validate physical experience as being most real, as something true versus something false, if words themselves are unreal or else less real then physical experience? Why else have ever used them? Russell sought to strike a compromise between the significance of what is physical versus the significance of words with his correspondence theory. But this sense of there being some potential pre-established commonality or equivalence between the physical and language seems only to leads us back to some form of rational (and therefore word assuming) epistemology, howsoever nicely his view is articulated. And the notion of physical experience (based on sensation, perception and memory), being real, ends up taking a back seat to the greater reality of language and reason, with experience being adjudged and given its proper voice only at the court of reason.

Yet language, like applied mathematics, only seems to approximate to physical experience, and somewhere in the accommodating of experience to language and mathematics there is understandably a certain amount of drop off and disparity. Precise as we try to be, there is inevitably going to be some amount of difference, howsoever slight, between what is expressed and what *is*.

Truth *as expressed* has other limitations we might mention before closing here. Usually, for example, the better philosophers know what it is they lack, that is (for instance) if they tend to being more dogmatical than skeptical, or vice versa. Yet for them (in their writings) to give this foible more weight than they do would undermine their credibility *as speakers*. Their thought would not be received for what it was if they tried to compensate too much for this given deficiency (e.g. by giving more recognition than they do it) and would therefore not be *their* thought, and therefore not *their* self.

A philosopher's thought then is typically, if not always, a reflection of himself as a person, to some extent, and of his subjective view of the society and world in which he lives, and the world has yet to see a philosopher, or scientist for that matter, of pure, disinterested objectivity. In addition, how those thoughts are interpreted by others brings another layer of subjectivity to what they seemingly state objectively. We not infrequently find that when views of philosophers are summarized or transmitted by others, they sometimes end up being stereotyped and distorted, and thus understood in a way possibly very different from what was originally intended.

---

[56] See Russell's *An Inquiry into Meaning and Truth*
[57] Quoted in Berlin's *The Magus of the North.*

Both logical and causal inference,[58] to some degree and in some form or other, are a necessary component of language. Like language, they are (somehow) innate and shared methods of understanding, and all but perhaps the most very primitive forms of communications require their use. Language needs logic's and causality's powers of inference, its application of symbolic reference and identity, if expressions are to have meaning. Even in the case of a bird crying alarm to his fellows of possible danger, we see a kind of sign use and logical or causal inference being made, whether or not we ascribe it to built in instinct or conscious reflection. The bird senses a possible predator, it cries alarm, the other birds interpret the cry as *meaning* danger. We do not think of the birds using logical or causal inference, yet in interpreting the phenomena this is what it would appear they (in some way) do, albeit guided more by acquired or inbred instinct to do so rather than conscious ratiocination.

To conclude this section on language, we might simply say that, howsoever reliable or trustworthy as a gauge of thought and reality language is, we cannot get around using it if we are to form objective judgments.

d. The Dialectic, Principles of Inference, and Logic

The "dialectic" (called, perhaps inappropriately, by some the dialogical faculty, or something similar), that is the switching of possible viewpoints and the positing of possible premises (whether internally or through communication with others) accompanies this innate true/false sense.[59] It is the means by which hypothesis and conclusions can be built upon another, prior to our making judgment as to whether an assertion is true or false. The presence of the dialectic is perhaps the first indication of the fact that a mind possesses free choice, or at least potential free choice, in judgment and belief. This is perhaps why philosophers like Kant, saw in logic or reason the practical basis of free will, since without the choice or possibility, which the dialectic allows, logic would be without purpose or meaning.[60]

There is something about the dialectic, in its purer sense, untainted by emotion that fosters objectivity. It makes provides the process of assessing and moving from one claim to another in a manner that is impartial, and capable of suspending judgment.

It is a second voice to our own subjective voice asking "is *this* or *that* (or some other) true?"

In at least a practical sense, it becomes possible for us by means of the dialectic to be *someone else* who considers the rightness of what we might or might not believe. It acts as a second person to our volition, yet paradoxically it is our self. As this second voice it calls for *agreement* between our thoughts and our understanding. It says that before deciding whether a belief is true or false might we not consider alternatives as conclusions by applying different criteria and or evidence? The dialectic's seeking of a commonality of understanding through evidence and criteria, that is to say a voice somehow independent of assumption, provides the initial call for that disinterested and impartial agreement of beliefs which checks our more otherwise more pronounced tendency to be subjective.

Hence, the dialectic could be said to be the real starting point of objectivity in conscious judgment. It is in some way a voice separate from, yet somehow a part of, our own which commands us "let's consider alternative sides to the question at hand." It is a command distinct from our volition, yet which tells us we have the power of choice in arriving at our conclusion, and that there is a way we can do so consistent with objective or higher rules of understanding. Judgment is suspended while we ask, "is X correct? Or is is Y Or maybe still it is P?, etc." In the dialectic we wait prior to arriving at a formal judgment. We wait until we can find the proper place to rest our thought activity, and in the process ask questions like "can we repose at this point, or will it lack the strength to properly support and uphold this (or that) conclusion?"

If, as some have maintained, the dialectic, along with logic, is a manifestation of God or the Absolute in us, this does or might imply we are both one in ourselves, and also one in Him. This would explain how two perspectives could exist in one mind: our own subjective view and an objective one which God, (as objectivity's requisite second person) bestows by way of the nature of the dialectic. The agreement required for

---

[58] Logical inference includes the inference that a causal inference or causal association based on perception can be made into a logical or inductive inference.

[59] Diogenes Laertius: "A *dialogue* is a discourse consisting of question and answer on some philosophical or political subject, with due regard to the characters of the persons introduced and the choice of diction. *Dialectic* is the art of discourse by which we refute or establish some proposition by means of question and answer on the part of the interlocuters." *Lives of The Philosophers*, I. Loeb p. 319.

[60] Must a will be logical? While I can picture a will that is logical, I have a difficult time conceiving of one that is illogical. The fact that someone acts is no clear proof that they mostly act out of their own will. Yet if someone is logical I would think they were. So at any rate it seems to me.
Must the will that prevails, between contesting wills be logical? Yes, says logic because otherwise you are saying that there is something greater than logic. And if there is something greater than logic how, and without logic, could we know what it was and that it was greater than logic?

objectivity is brought about through the possible agreement between our individual self and logic, through the medium of the dialectic. Thus it could be, and is in effect, argued that objectivity is a given or at least a potential given in a rational human mind. Speaking for myself, I have no special reason to reject this view, except to say that it is one we can choose or not choose to adopt it, and consequently there is no obvious necessity it must be accepted. If a Hegelian concludes that the voice of the Absolute, the dialectic, this second voice in us gives us objectivity, he will only be able to do so after having subjective faith that this is so. There is nothing outside God or the Absolute which compels us to agree with him, and the Absolute, if its judgments are made available to us, are known subjectively. This, at any rate, my own sense of the matter.

Otherwise then, the *dialectic*, along with our *innate true/false sense*, *language*, and *logic* are the primary medium and means for realizing objective judgments. While they can be seen as the fundamental and elementary principles and mechanisms of all rational persons, they are not necessarily accompanied by a sense or desire for higher truth, such as is found in philosophy. The perceived need for higher truth originates elsewhere than in these by themselves.

Yet while we have considered, howsoever cursorily, the true/false sense, language, and the dialectic, we need now to look at logic and the role it plays in making objective judgments possible.

A case might be made that logical consistency is only trivially connected, or else is not strictly necessary, to our understanding *reality*. Things are predetermined by unfathomable forces like chance or fate, and the power of logic to attain real or higher truth is merely an illusion. Certain Hindu and Buddhist meditationists have taken a position of this kind. Other instances of this might be someone who bases their deepest beliefs about the nature of what is real predominantly or exclusively on the grounds of some kind of inexplicable intuition, mystical revelation, or communal dogma. In addition, as well, there might be a view, which attempts to synthesize both the logical and illogical perspectives.

Viewing it from the perspective of experience, even the most irrational and extreme intellectual anarchist will resort to logic as it suits him, thus revealing that all recognize its necessary validity on some level. What priority a given thinker will place on logic's importance will, of course, vary. A good contrast would be between the idealist who believes logic to be the ultimate standard for truth discernment, versus an empiricist or pragmatist who will disdain logical precision if such precision seems to conflict with observation and common sense (or else if such precision does not bestow on observation and common sense what is deemed their due weight.) While the use of logic in judgment then does seem, to some degree to be necessary to both subjective and objective judgment, its priority and emphasis as a true and false determinant on the other hand, is, nevertheless and in the final analysis, a matter of subjective choice.

While I myself am inclined to see logic, along with form, as something independent of the brain as such, we can note that there are those who view it as something which is somehow material. While the latter view strikes one as perhaps peculiar, nevertheless the former does not allow of easy or obvious explication either. Berkeley viewed Spirit as the mind or force behind logic. Yet because spirit is something active, and ideas are passive, we can have no proper idea of spirit. This said we are capable of imagined "notions," or, if you will, working models of spirit; from which notions we are somehow able to reason about the real thing.

Peirce described logic as "a mere struggle to escape doubt," [61] and divides it into two kinds:

1. Explicative, or analytic (deductive)
2. Ampliative, or synthetic (inductive)

Later he adds that the process of cognition can be fully described by three forms of inference: induction, hypothesis, and deduction – in that order. "The validity of an inference," he states, "does not depend on any tendency of the mind to accept it." This is only true if we assume experience (which apparently what Peirce refers to) adequately validates such inferences. There is, therefore, no absolute necessity to assume experience is in a position to authorize such validation.

Do logical and causal inferences always compel belief? The answer is no, unless we already believe in their authority, which a person might after all not choose to do. The exception to this would be our innate true/false, sense. Our true false/sense is a belief which we are compelled to go along with since any belief we hold we will see as "true," or any belief we choose not to hold as "false." Again a belief such as this can be and are inculcated in our formation as persons, and thus we cannot reject them. But as we acquire the capacity to think so we can also, to some greater or lesser degree, develop the potential ability to dismiss such previously imposed beliefs.

How varied a number of views there are on the significance of logic is revealed by the following *historical* list of, what I will call, Ultimate Criteria of True Belief. By criteria I mean the medium and rules looked to for deciding a true or false question. [62]

---

[61] "On the Doctrine of Chances."

[62] It is not without some hesitation that I construct this rather simplistic catalog. In a particular instance this hierarchy of criteria might, for example, be applied to metaphysical matters, religious matters, or to natural phenomena differently. Though some might object to my rather sketchy summarization, I hope this can be excused in view of the general point I am making. If my

The criterion mentioned first, for each thinker/school, is of greater importance, and what follows it of equal *or* less importance. The term "observation" refers to physical experience based on basic intuitive concepts and principles, sensation, perception, and memory.

Plato
(1) Innate ideas and (2) logic

Aristotle
(1) Logic and (2) observation and quasi-observation

Zeno and Stoicism
(1) Logic (2) Impressions and sensations

Neo-Platonism
(1) Logic, (2) innate ideas, (3) inspiration

Philo, Church Fathers
(1) Scriptural revelation and (2) logic. There is some reference to observation but never at the expense of either the assumed form of logic or scriptural revelation.

Aquinas, Scholastics
(1) Logic and (2) scriptural revelation

William of Ockham, Duns Scotus, Roger Bacon
(1) Logic, (2) scriptural revelation, and (3) observation

Francis Bacon
(1) Logic, observation, and (2) scriptural revelation

Descartes, Spinoza, Mallebranche, Leibniz
(1) Wholistic Logic or "Reason," and (2) observation

British Empiricists
(1) Observation and (2) logic

Kant
(1) A priori intuitions, (2) logic and (3) observation

Hegel
(1) Spirit (the Absolute), (2) logic and (3) observation

Nietzche, various nihilisms
(1) Intuitive and experiential observation and (2) minimum of logic (or else logic as it suits)

Radical Empiricism
(1) Observation and (2) logic, but never at the expense of observation

Logical Positivism
(1) Observation and (2) logic, but with a minimum of non-physical concepts

Brouwer and the Intuitionists
(1) Intuition, (2) Mathematics and (3) logic (4) Observation

Every image has, and could be said to require, its geometrical equivalent, and every geometrical figure has a mathematical equivalent. But not every mathematical equivalent has or needs an image. This (I believe) proves the superiority of logic and mathematics over images, or understanding based on mere images, inasmuch as while images necessarily require logic and mathematics, the opposite does not seem much to be the case.

In conclusion here, logic, when all is said and done, will have as much significance for a given belief formulation as a thinker *chooses* to gives it. We can be as logical or illogical as we like, and only the Absolute, if anyone, could possibly insist our beliefs are necessarily true or not.

---

subjective interpretation of a given thinker or school is seen as erroneous or a distortion, at least the list will show how different standards or principles of truth *might* be arranged in order of importance.

e. Secondary Criteria

Beyond language and logic as First Criteria, that is those mediums with given rules which are fundamental to basic objective agreement, we have available to us "experience," the character of which can range from first hand witnessing of events and phenomena to commonly adopted (yet otherwise perhaps flimsily substantiated) beliefs of fact. An experience or experiences is assumed or made reference to by means of language. In this form, experience, as a "fact" or facts, is understood by means of being something agreed upon. Of course, with objective belief based predominantly on experience (or commonly held notions "brought about" by experience) there generally tends to be greater disparity of agreement than between people who place a priority in logic.

The means by which experience is interpreted and determined to be what it is (for objective purposes) are various, and we will call these means Secondary Criteria. These Secondary or experiential criteria can also affect the character of the language and logic people use, for example if they place undue emphasis on the importance of certain secondary criteria.

While language and logic can certainly affect how these experiences or their influence are themselves interpreted, it nonetheless is possible to list the bare form of certain kinds of elementary experience which make up Secondary criteria. If someone objects that this demarcation of criteria into First and Secondary is subjective and arbitrary to begin with, I will not dispute them. I merely offer this configuration for what, in my opinion, seems to me to be greater ease of understanding the matter. I place experience after language and logic only because experience cannot be known objectively without them the latter. Of course, it could be maintained that common experience is necessarily prior to any mutual understanding of language and logic, or at least is simultaneous with the latter. Again, this point itself need not be disputed. What we can at least say, however, is that objective belief formed on the grounds of experience is not possible without some minimum of language, and logical inference. Deciding whether language and logic are prior to experience, or experience is prior to language and logic is not so essential here as is realizing their separate importance, yet necessary interdependence.

The following then are possible criteria, or authorities with rules, of a more subjective nature than Primary criteria which people might choose as the basis for determining whether something is objectively true or false, or real and not real. The specific rules stemming from or being emphasized by these different criteria and authorities might differ.

What we ourselves use as our personal or subjective criteria, and what we see as agreed upon objective criteria, have both the nature of being something potentially chosen, even though they might be originally prompted, against our conscious will, by instinct, logical inference or the authority of other criteria we accept.

Secondary Criteria for Establishing Objective Belief[63]

I. *Personal basis for objective belief:*
Biological instinct
Personal experience, based on sensation, or cognitive intuitions, and these inasmuch as we are capable of understanding them.
Family, friends, close associates

II. *Contemporary basis for objective belief:*"[64]
Community/Societal authority ("conventional wisdom" or what others think within our community or society)
Academic or learned authority
Religious or inspired authority

III. *Traditional basis for objective belief:*
Communal/Societal authority
Academic or learned authority
Religious or inspired authority

IV. *Influence of Nature:*
Natural phenomena which presents an obvious such as in animals, trees, plants, geographical formations, etc, or the inferred or revealed general order of life as we see collectively see it in natural phenomena. For example we might understand the concept of maternity from seeing a squirrel mother and her children, or the concept of majesty while watching a soaring eagle or viewing a great mountain. Such spectacles become the ground for objective agreement, though their truth may be known subjectively and realized

[63] It is worth mentioning that, Francis Bacon's *Idols of the Tribe*, *Idols of the Cave*, *Idols of the Market Place*, *Idols of the Theater* (enunciated in his *Novum Organon*) are characterizations which touch on some of these same criteria, and serve as a worthwhile supplement to this list.

[64] William James, in "The Will to Believe," wrote: "Our faith is faith in someone else's faith, and in the greatest matters this is most the case. Our belief in truth itself, for instance, that there is a truth, and that our minds and it are made for each other, - what is it but a passionate affirmation of desire, in which our social system backs us up? "

independently of any other human confirmation. Some people have claimed the ability to speak to animals and plants, implying there is a mutual, and therefore objective, understanding brought about, and there would clearly seem to be some amount of truth to this claim. There can be said, therefore, to be some manner objective agreement between certain individuals and animals and plants. Of course, non-living phenomena would not apply or else be very problematical. In sum, nature has a voice, and can, to some extent, speak to certain people as if its creatures were an actually another person with whom understanding could be shared and agreed upon. But unless speaking directly, nature's truths will have to be communication and validated by some human authority, among those listed above, in order to applicable as grounds of mutual human agreement. This reminds us that our higher intellectual knowledge is usually and distinctly *human* knowledge, and which we might go further to say is knowledge that is peculiar only to humans.

When then we seek to make, what we think to be, an objective assertion, or attempt to validate what we think is an objective belief, we will invoke these First and Secondary criteria. As individuals we know and understand these objective criteria subjectively, i.e. our thoughts are our own. That others agree with us that the given standard or standards of truth are correct, itself argues to us the credibility of the standard. Yet outside the Absolute, we have no way of knowing the standard's absolute validity, and hence all objective criteria are subjective and ultimately must be seen as verified subjectively. For this reason, it again is probably more prudent to characterize objectivity as merely raised up subjectivity.

One criterion or source of authority could have common ground with another or other authorities, and of course it is more typical then not that more than one authority might be invoked as a standard or criteria. As we saw in the case of logic, language will be required; and in the case of language inference, whether logical or causal, is necessary in the interpretation of signs. Which criterion is of greater importance than another becomes somewhat a matter of people's choice. Certainly it can be made to be so. Whether, aside from the distinction of First and Secondary, some criteria have more weight as authority in determining the "real" truth of an assertion than others depends, as a practical matter, on the would-be or potential believer (or disbeliever.) of that assertion.

Further, we note that each authority requires a community of some kind which will formulate, establish and uphold the objective criteria. This is in keeping with objectivity's essential character of mutual or agreed understanding. First criteria will invariably receive some amount of interpretation by and accommodation with some number of Secondary criteria, and there is no pure science, such as formal logic, which, in its objective application, is not to some extent filtered through value judgments and Secondary criteria. Howsoever so small the effect of Secondary criteria might be on the interpretation of First criteria, no one communicates, calculates, or agrees solely by means of absolutely "pure" language or "pure" logic, though we might perhaps speak of realizing language and logic in an elemental form intuitively. Yet even if the latter is true, we could not prove such by itself, and of and by our own thoughts, to be objective knowledge. For this reason our intuitions of pure language and pure logic, in their most elemental origins in our cognition, and as *we* know them, should perhaps be thought of as kinds of faith.

If we grant that absolute certainty is impossible to us outside the Absolute, as discussed earlier, then we can, for practical purposes, arrange objective beliefs according to probability of their likelihood being true, with true and false, in and of themselves, being merely modes or receptacles of our judgment.

1. Objective practical certainty -- relative highest degree of cognitive truth
2. Objective practical likely possibility -- relative high degree of cognitive truth
3. Objective practical possibility -- relative medium degree of cognitive truth
4. Objective practical plausibility -- relative low degree of cognitive truth
5. Objective practical impossibility -- relative lowest degree of cognitive truth [65]

Schelling said there are no degrees of truth. One truth is as true as another. But that the truth of all propositions of knowledge are absolutely equal (in validity) is impossible. On the basis of this same reasoning it is probably more honest and feasible to rate the above truth probabilities in very general and contextually relative terms (such as Least, Average, Most), instead of presuming to exact degrees.

What standing we will confer on a given belief from the five choices above will be determined by the First and Secondary Criteria we apply, and what amount of importance we place on a given criterion relative to the other criteria -- hence the inclusion of the word "relative" in the above list. That a criterion must or might be chosen makes any objective criterion *ultimately* subjective.

Objects and their characteristics only have meaning and relevance to us insofar as we take an interest in them and they are believed to affect our interest. Again, we are not talking so much about what makes an objective belief true with respect to the Absolute, but rather what possible standards a belief must meet in order to be considered objectively true by a given community.

[65] For a list of subjective (intellectual) grades of criteria, one could, of course, use these same five tiers, substituting "subjective" for "objective" – that is, if one so chose, at the same time accommodating community selected objective beliefs to intermingle with these our own otherwise explicitly subjective notions. To the extent one's subjective beliefs are consistent with a given community's of which they are or might be a member, naturally, depends on the character and intellect of the individual.

f. Objective Truth versus "Real" Truth

In the division of objective from subjective one is reminded of Parmenides' Truth vs. Opinion. But *mutually* understood truth (by definition), and, to some degree our own personal notions of what is real, are formed on the grounds of collective opinion. From that point an assertion's validity as objective truth, not necessarily *real* truth, depends on the extent of collective agreement. This means that a ridiculous falsehood could pass among a community as objective truth, and that a veritable, or truly God given truth, could be equally dismissed by a community as merely subjective belief.

Can then a community never transcend mere agreement and arrive at *real* truth? By "real truth" I mean the consistent correlation of our ideas with reality that somehow transcends mere subjective and objective truth. Regarding what is real, Peirce describes it as "that whose characters are independent of what anybody may think them to be," and later "the opinion which is fated to be ultimately agreed to by all who investigate, is what we mean by the truth, and the object represented in this opinion is the real."[66] The problem with Peirce's view is that unless there is a higher authority which can confirm the beliefs of "all who investigate," we can never be sure they are not in serious error. Yes, one might reply "even so, it suits them, and they don't seem to mind." Yet then what is the difference between such a view and delusion, seeing that the deluded don't "seem to mind" being deluded? Perceived progress in knowledge, based on communal objective criteria, may in fact be in error, yet its influence on present and future thinking can be enormous. On the other hand, a continually dissatisfied skepticism doesn't seem to be the answer either. At minimum then, it seems, a great wariness and caution is often times warranted with respect to beliefs that become conventional wisdom, whether conventional wisdom in the ordinary sense, or conventional wisdom among educated and more enlightened communities, who, as much as they are more rational or intelligent than the common run of men, may yet still succumb to error or prejudice.

To answer the question, can we arrive at "real" truth that is objective, we would need to decide how real truth is to be determined, and this in turn itself becomes a choice, and so we find ourselves turning to the Secondary criteria of objective belief. If we seek Absolute or complete and total truth, and it is at all possible, in some form, for a person less than God to possess, it will require a religious faith of one kind or another, regardless of whether we find ourselves mostly of a mystical, logical or empirical disposition. Whether or not such truth for us finally becomes obtainable becomes a kind of wager we place. To those who would say that their faith connotes no wager, but is a certain, I respect their feelings on the subject. They may after all be right. But unless I myself share that same belief, for my part I can only view such faith as a wager, though at the same time expressly conceding that I might well be in error myself in doubting its potential conformability to experience.

With respect to less than total cognitive truth, which is to say partial truth, we might think ourselves on easier footing. Yet we still find ourselves requiring faith, and therefore there is a degree of risk (which faith seems to imply) to any belief. What any single individual or community really knows and understands, what this world truly is, at best it is for any of us - even the most knowledgeable, ultimately founded on one's faith and a conjecture, and we really don't know anything with unqualified certainty. It is a devastating conclusion, but one in particular we would do well to reflect on. One of the implications of this, as I will come to maintain, is that life is less a matter of what we know (as such), but more so what we love. Our capacity for love is incalculably greater in its effect on what life is to us compared to the measure of what there is to know *and* that which we are also capable of knowing.

But whether we speak of Absolute real truth, or partial real truths, these, like objective truth, require another to validate them. Who is there that can validate an objective or subjective belief and make it real truth? Outside of God there is no one, and subjective and objective belief cannot qualify as *real* truth or ultimate and irrefutable truth, except as a matter of relative degree, that is a belief can be classed as more or less likely really true or not true. Some one will ask, do we not know that five is less in quantity than six? Do we not know this as a real truth? And even if it is not true in an Absolute sense, can we not say it is a real truth within a given mathematical context? The answer is no, because in the Absolute sense it is possible that the laws of mathematics and logic might be qualified or abrogated on this point, such that within the Absolute numbers like five and six are mere illusory symbols without constant meaning. As far as five is less than six in the mathematical context, again, we cannot say *real* truth because the mathematical context itself relies on other factors and assumptions. We do not say, however, that the proposition five is less than six is therefore false. Instead we say that this is a conclusion that possesses objective practical certainty, as opposed to absolute objective certainty. Russell rejects this kind of reasoning, yet his counter argument it must be understood still comes down to being a matter of mere faith – not categorical fact. Mathematical propositions, such as five is less than six, are absolutely true, simply because he believes the Absolute is not necessary to establish their truth. That is to say, that they can be apodictically true within their isolated context. Yet, at the least, his argument in this wise seems no more compellingly obvious then its opposite.

Such skeptical carefulness as I have been arguing for will, needles to say, appear silly and unnecessary to some. Yet while it might seem overly precise, nonetheless it makes possible a greater unity and

[66] "How to Make Our Ideas Clear."

coherence to our understanding, by making our beliefs consistent with an acknowledgment of our falling short of omniscience. A preference for too easy answers over such precision opens the door, however so slightly, to sloppy or sloppier thinking. Such precision on so obvious a belief as "five is less than six," on the other hand, encourages a more stringent skeptical caution when we approach less obvious and self-evident claims, thereby enhancing the quality of our judgments in general. Nor need we in a paranoid manner worry ourselves that five might not be less than six. Rather, it simply reminds us generally of our finite nature as people, of the infinite or indeterminate nature of the universe, and that it is well for us to scrutinize our assumptions before arriving at any final conclusions concerning the nature of any single one of its citizens or components. It is by taking such intellectual humility as this that I believe objective judgments can be guided toward what is real, and thus be made more truth justified.

Tautological and pure analytical propositions are not usually thought of as statements of belief, but rather a re-defining of the same term. It might be protested, however, that if we take a statement like "this ball is spherical," is this not after all a belief, namely that the concept "ball" is by definition a spherical object? Therefore it is true that a ball is *by definition* a spherical object. How then can it be at all possible that such a proposition is wrong? To answer specifically: the use of language itself requires belief. We believe in the validity of language, because we know it to work as a means of communicating. Whether language is capable of communicating Absolute truth, we don't know, again because Absolute knowledge implies omniscience, or the exhaustion of all contingency. Therefore, such statements would still only stand as true in the sense of "objective practical necessity." In other words, by definition, yes, the statement is necessarily true in a certain confined sense. However the rules of language, from which spring the rules of definition, do not imply absolute truth, and as a result, all language statements are at best hypothetically true.

So "black is not white," and "white is not black," for example, would be contingent and hypothetical, and therefore not absolutely or necessarily true. Again, any concern that such formal preliminary skepticism would paralyze all thought and action is unfounded. That we would lose our "confident tone," with respect to our various beliefs is something not likely to happen. Whether we are superstitious and irrational, or properly scientific and right thinking, there is little or no grounds to ever fear the loss of zeal with respect to belief, least of which with respect to beliefs which are so common and taken and taken for granted as obviously being true. Again, it is our nature that we must believe *something*. Reflective doubt is something far more rare than ready belief. If we judge the matter experientially (in our own lives) or historically (as a member of the society we are in), I think it will be more than clear that, in the vast majority of cases, the greater danger lies not in lack of confidence, but in over confidence about what we think we know.

The absolute meaning of truth requires far more than human formed truth makes possible, given our finite (objective) natures. The pragmatist might argue that my distinction is an empty and meaningless one, because we always have said, and always will say that "black is not white," and that "white is not black." "Call it practical or necessary truth, it is still truth." My own answer to such an objection is that, a) by saying the belief "black is not white" and that "white is not black" is contingent, does not necessarily imply that such propositions are *untrue* in the Absolute or practical sense, and b) I would rather err on the side of conceding the inherently finite or potentially fallible nature of the human intellect, then err on the side of the need for "confidence." Once more, I do not see that such formal and preliminary skeptical reservations could ever threaten the role of psychological confidence in belief, especially when it comes to firmly held beliefs. In what way however, it might be further objected could "black be not white and white not black" ever be untrue? The answer is that it might never be the case that such is not true, or else there may be circumstances beyond logic, language, psychology, physiology and ordinary human experience, which we have not ever yet, or perhaps will never yet know which would make it possible for such propositions to be false, or otherwise meaningless and irrelevant. We are just that much short of omniscience to ever be able to know such a thing absolutely and with zero doubt. "Play with words as you like, I know black is not white, and white is not black. Whether my belief is absolute necessity or practical necessity makes no difference." Yes, it does, because, aside from the logical consistency such skepticism provides, it goes to the question of how supreme or not the human intellect ultimately is: a very crucial value judgment question which potentially affects just about everything else we might believe or conceive.

The issue of justified or unjustified pride, such as is implied in this question of our possessing cognitive absolute truth, it could be argued, is relevant with respect to our attitude about ourselves, and therefore relevant with respect to our relationship with God (if we assume his existence), and finally with respect to our moral character. In bringing up these last points, I am getting a bit ahead of myself in this discussion, but my purpose will become more plain as we proceed. I will at the moment, for those who care not for either notions of God, or even morals, that the position of formal preliminary skepticism is, if nothing else, a logically valid, if not necessarily true or desirable, epistemological argument. So once more, whether we are speaking then of "mental truths," regarding ideas, or "real truth," regarding all ideas and experience, all claims and beliefs formed by the mind cannot be absolute, and *at best* are practical truths of varying degrees of validity, including, and I fully concede to you, this very claim I am making.

From any standpoint we look at it, the claim that a belief is true requires the decision of someone declaring it to be so. Who we say possesses authority to make such a declaration is a subjective choice. Hence we see again why it was important for many philosophers to invoke God as the ultimate decider of what is true and not true. If there was not God, as *the* primary and eternal authority, to decide, then all claims of something being true (or not) would ultimately fail as being merely subjective, and not objective in the sense that objective

means real or true. It is conventional belief to think that objective means real and true, however, this is mistaken and no mere mortal or group of mortals can pronounce final truth based on their own authority. It might also on this point be observed that aside from God's authority, absolute truth does not necessarily require objectivity, and absolute truth could conceivably be known subjectively. We have already observed that anything claimed as being objectively true does not necessarily imply absolute truth, and even less so something claimed subjectively. Nevertheless, it still remains possible for something to be known as absolutely true subjectively, even if such belief is not confirmed objectively. Of course, as a practical matter, such belief will not lend itself as persuasive to those not already believers, but, in theory, at least, it could still end up proving absolutely true.

Leaving aside the notion of Absolute as the ultimate arbiter of what is purely and apodictically true, and from the natural tendency as individuals overseeing our own understanding to play that role ourselves to some degree, people tend to look to other people as authority and arbiters of what is or isn't to be believed. We typically do this by way of utilizing or applying both First and Secondary objective criteria to possible judgments. While it is of the nature of Secondary criteria to look to others for validation or invalidation of beliefs, our resorting to other people on matters of language and logic, will vary depending on the individual and their proficiency in those matters.[67]

Language (in the sense of the most elementary use of symbols) and logic offer a kind of independent viewpoint and objectivity, and therefore superiority, not found in Secondary objective criteria, which makes the need for confirmation by others *less* necessary. In this way, logic, and language (because of logic's implied use as an ultimate arbiter of objective belief), and part of our earlier Primary Criteria, are second only to or, for some, even a replacement of God's authority in cognitive belief. It is extremely rare, if not unheard of, however, to find someone who values pure logic or reason as authority, while not believing in God's (or the Absolute) authority, and seeing it as superior to and or co-existent with the authority of logic and reason. [68]

The importance placed on logic and reason over habit formed experience is, seems to this writer, fully justified. When Rationalists and Idealists were criticized for ignoring the importance of practical experience and observation, or otherwise argued to be in error on a given point, it was even so always possible to have argued against their purported mistake by their own methods. The fault then that potentially lies in any Rationalist's or Idealist's argument arises not from logic or reason as such, but in their faulty or improper use and application.

Indeed, as the definitive rules of cognitive understanding it would be well if more emphasis were placed on logic, instead of viewing it as a mere adjuncts say to "science" and "experience." Empirical and natural science are only as good as the logic they employ. And while the nature of logic makes its errors more clearly and easily to be seen, this is less true of empirical science where a more subjective interpretation and focus are required, and mistakes more easily overlooked. At the same time, as we observed earlier with respect to the scholastics, logic is only as good as its assumptions --- this is the key to making best use of logic and science together. And despite logic's superiority over empirical science for truth testing, *the desire* for coherence and comprehensiveness in judgment -- which in turn instills the desire for better established logical premises -- originates not in logic but comes from a inborn desire for higher truth as a higher good -- the same or similar desire that prompts deeper scientific inquiry. This sort of desire, as many a worthy philosopher has taught, in its sincere and purer form, comes not from the body, perceptions, sense, or physiological instinct, but from the heart, soul or spirit (call it what you will) and its longing for higher unity -- most usually meaning, explicitly or implicitly, God and or Truth.

Yet logic gives us only the conditions for truth, that is such as with the relation "If – then." It cannot supply its own premises, but must derive these from inspiration, intuition, or sensation. As well, while principles of logic are value neutral, its practical application and the interpretation of its role in establishing right belief are *not* so. What logic is, its importance, and how it should be used has, as we observed earlier, received diverse treatment over the ages, particularly in recent times when it has in large measure been agreed that induction, probability, and empirical observation and analysis are necessary to shore up logic's weakness when it comes to establishing premises.[69] It was, and is thought, that the abstractions of idealistic and pseudo-

---

[67] It seems a good idea, and I would like to do at some point, to examine some of the assumptions, premises, and principles of formal and symbolic logic in light of their possibly being more of a conventional rather than a genuinely logical origin, for example noting the difference between a class between as defined by logic, and the variety of ways in which a class is or reflects something more real than what a deduction makes intelligible.

[68] It is worth observing that but for suspension of judgment as to things unknown, more average people often tend to think of belief as being something simply true or not true, avoiding the caveats and cautions of skepticism and probability. Also, they rarely take into account the idea that it is possible for a belief, to some degree, to be both true and not true, depending on how a given proposition might be interpreted. In the case of value judgments, it is true, we generally understand that the belief as to value of somethin, might change depending on circumstances. Yet with respect to questions of factual belief, people are less generally able to think in terms that there are beliefs that can possess *both* truth and not truth. More precise thinkers, on the other hand, are more attentive to the notion of a factually asserted belief perhaps being both true or not true depending on the circumstances. For example, ordinarily a person will think of mass and energy (or if you prefer matter and energy), as two separate things. In one sense this is true, in another sense it is not true because they are really the same thing but in different form.

[69] The *probabilistic* school of thinking of Arcesilaus, Carneades, of the (Platonic) Middle Academy, Cicero which (along with Archimedes) could be said to have been the founding source of modern empirical science, arose from the rational *skepticism* of Pyrhho (later revived in somewhat systematic form about the beginning of the 2nd century A.D. by Sextus Empiricus.) A better

scientific philosophers were overly subjective, and that this only rendered logic suspect in the inquiry for true belief. What was and is needed to make applied logic valid is scientific observation, easily verified experience, careful research and comparative analysis by specialists and professionals. In this way, natural or empirical science has *to some extent* become a kind of First criteria or authority alongside logic or, for some, even superior to it. How much this is so, however, and the extent to which this is desirable will be disputed.

g. Science and Objectivity

It cannot be denied that often the assumptions of Idealists are subjectively based. Notions such as Self, Being, Substance, and Infinity, for example, it would appear have no way of being objectively established and agreed upon in the same way we can demonstrate that water boils at a certain temperature. Even so, are the conclusions of empirical science that much more objective, that is more "real," as we are commonly given to assume? Do the demands of empirical science deserve equal or greater status as logic as a first criteria, since it provides more "solid" grounds for premises than either metaphysical, epistemological, or transcendental thinking?

Of course, the great and numerous advances and ubiquitous displays of science and technology have worked like miracles on people's imaginations. "Science" in its way for some has become it's own great faith, in a way philosophy, in ordinary people's minds, could never be. Nay better than faith, a faith that was both faith and certainty, confirmed in an apparently objective way. Where the metaphysicians needed God to decide ultimate truth, modern man needs only "science." In this way, what is thought of as science has, and for practical purposes, for many superceded, not just logic, but even the Absolute in the role of ultimate arbiter between true and false belief.

We owe it to ourselves, certainly, to always bear in mind how the misuse of the achievements of science and technology have brought great sorrow and devastation. As part of this, we are not in a position to say the quality of modern life, with all its mechanical advances necessarily, and least of all in all respects, is always better than the quality of people's lives in the past. Certainly we can see in individual instances how later people, with the advantage of science, fared better than people did in earlier times. Yet we can also point to many instances in which man fares and has fared worse. Likewise, we cannot know what joys earlier people may have known to us, anymore than they could have known the new kinds of happiness we now enjoy. Modern industrial society has benefited us with more goods and produce. Yet mankind also generates more waste and at an accelerated rate than ever before, which both contaminates our environment and more seriously diminishes what we already have.

In sum, there is no obvious and indisputable way to conclusively demonstrate that the quality of people's lives are over all better or worse due to the advances in science and technology, taken by themselves. We consider this point because some exponents of science seem to suggest that one of the ways empirical science can be established as somehow one of the first criteria for higher truth and objective belief, alongside language and logic, is its amazing results in improving our quality of life. Some would as well refer to its marvels and wonders, but I don't really think this is as compelling an argument, or else these marvels and wonders should be simply included as part of its character in improving our quality of life. If empirical science can advance quality of life, they argue, then science must be one of the primary standards, if not the ultimate standard, for higher truth and understanding. If science had not improved our lives materially so much as it has done, and the only success it knew was in the way of its being a more superior and refined exposition of reality, it is very questionable whether it would hold the eminent, almost religious, status that it does.

While I think all will agree that the wise and proper use of science and technology are of inestimable benefit to people, and that we can assume, they are necessary, to some degree, for the well being and support of human life, the claim of empirical science and technology as ultimate criteria of truth because it ensures better quality of life (or because "its works") is at best a gross simplification and at worst very much mistaken. The argument fails to tell us what better quality of life is. Can science and technology make this value judgment? Are they the source for final truth? In assuming "yes" to these kinds of things, the case for science and technology as ultimate standards of truth begins to take on a self-contradicting and mystical-like character.

And in those who believe science and technology can be an ultimate basis for values (ethical and otherwise) and as necessary truth, we see an inevitable floundering: a hypocritical effort to create a metaphysical and ethical system to justify already assumed values, and these occasionally of a decidedly materialistic and unethical kind.

---

understand of nature from a probabilistic viewpoint was not developed much further however because people, including Cicero believed that knowledge of, say, the earth and planets does not improve our character. Even earlier, in 5th century China, Mozi (or Mo Tzu) advocated and used "gauges" of precedent and the more close application of evidence to support one's conclusions. In his own work such conclusions usually center around social and political concerns.

Yet before proceeding further, I want to make it quite clear that my purpose is not, by any means, to censure science and technology of themselves, far from this, but rather to warn and urge cautions towards the great dangers their irrational use and misapplication pose.

For a thinking person, scientific conclusions generally are arrived at or decided by::

1. Observation (intuitions, sensations, perceptions) and causal intuition
2. Predications formed on the bases of simples derived from observation
3. Assessing hypotheses and predications by means of deduction and induction
4. Application of testing and analysis to specific observations (to varying degrees of thoroughness depending on the investigator.)
5. Reported observations, testing and analysis of others
6. Traditional learned scientific opinion's testing and analysis
7. Contemporary scientific authorities testing and analysis

These, in turn, require:

1. Faith in uniformity, the ultimate validity of sensations, and the principle of induction
2. Inner conjecture, imagination, hypothecating, separate from sensory experience, though usually used to consider or reflect on sensory originating data
3. An orderly, intelligible, and communicable, arrangement in our thoughts of what we know

Despite its commonly accepted objective and definite character, questions have arisen about empirical science which have not completely freed it (that is, as we know it) of the suspicion of its being ultimately subjective. For example, is the scientific method valid universally to all minds? If so how do we know this? If not, why not?

The following are some claims and arguments one sometimes comes across, asserted or put forth often by people who are obviously in great awe of modern science and technology's sensational success, and who, whether rightly or wrongly, see themselves as their advocate. In response to each I will attempt what strikes me as a appropriate reply.

* *Only that which is perceived or based on perception and sensation is real. Empirical science as the master sifter of sensations and perceptions should then be seen as the final truth determining authority.*

The initial assertion fails to tell us what exactly "real" is supposed to mean, other than to perhaps say that if something is real then it is something we should believe. Sense data, as has been said many times, in and of themselves, have no truth value. The determining of whether something is true or false requires judgment, and judgment the dialectic. Otherwise how can it choose between alternative explanation? Between what is real and not real? Sensation does not of itself tell us whether something is true or false, nor does it possess judgment. Jacobi, Peirce and others believed that there is a kind of built in judgment in perception which passes so quickly that, as judgment, we are not conscious of it as such. But even here, such judgment-habit is an extension of the cognitive faculty and not actual sensation. The term "real" itself is not anything experienced. It is a concept founded in the mind's distinction that there are conclusions which are true, and there are conclusions which are false. A judgment that something is "real," is one way of saying that it is true. Again truth or falsehood is not determined by experience, rather it is something determined by the mind. Experience can provide the data which will lend credence to whether as assertion is true or false, real or unreal, but it does not of itself provide that determination. Put another way, experience, by itself, cannot *conclude*. This only the reasoning mind can do, and, we might take this opportunity to remark, only a deliberating person with some amount of choice – as far as we know – can have a mind. Instinct and unthinking habit if taken as conclusions can still be said, in theory at any rate, to derive from someone's prior reasoning.

Whether only that which is experienced in the physical is real or not, one is free to believe and one cannot prove them necessarily wrong. Yet as Russell and others have pointed out, very little of what passes for empirical science rarely derives from direct experience. At the same time, a rather considerable amount of indirect inference is involved in empirical conclusions..

Take for instance, the assertion "Zoroaster lived." Now as no one living has ever met "Zoroaster", nor experienced him (the literal physical person) directly, how do we know he lived? We believe, as an empirical judgment, that due to certain assumptions and evidences we can infer he lived. Unless we lived in the ancient Persia, we cannot say we perceived him. We assume that those who claimed he lived and knew him were not liars, b) that the records concerning such testimony have not been altered or tampered with, c) the accumulation of testimonies and evidences (induction) gives us reasonable, not experiential grounds that he lived. On what basis then does reasoning determine that conclusions, like "Zoroaster" are true, or "real?" If you answer that experience tells us that such inferences are correct, you fail to tell me what it is about cognition that empowers it to make such determinations. If you say we have faith that reasoning makes such conclusions valid, I most certainly will not disagree.

To use one of Peirce's favorite examples, let say I am holding a stone in my hand. Now if I let go, you will probably agree with me that we have the belief or faith that it will fall to the ground. Yet no matter how many times we have seen an object fall, there is nothing in experience that can tell us that it is impossible it will not fall. It is not impossible, for example, that someone might come by unawares and snatch it before I hardly have a chance to release my grasp; or that some force, hitherto unknown to us, may for the first time in all recorded history, counteract the force of gravity, etc. In other words, experience gives us only probable conclusions, not necessary or categorical ones. But for many people probable is, as a practical matter, just as good as necessary. Hence, if what we say is real can only be derived form experience then we must say that all assertions based on what is sensed are only probable.

Further if we say all claims about what is real must be founded on experience, then the assertion itself cannot be necessarily true, but only probably true. Whether a non-analytical assertions is more likely true or not depends simply on the criteria used to make such determinations, and the people choosing those criteria. Yet either way, when we come to close checking our assertions, we find sense data at best plays only a partial, though granted decisive, role in scientific conclusions arrived at.

Science commonly relies on abstractions, for example in utilizing such concepts as the universe, adaptation, habit, and environment, which are something more conceived, than actually perceived The same is true of those most elementary of scientific concepts form and extension. Again it is not that more abstract conceptions are invalid or without scientific usefulness, only they may be stretched to more or less meaning than is really warranted or justified, a regrettable habit too common to many people's way of thinking.

G.E. Moore, using the example of perceiving an envelope, asks: "What is the envelope's real size? Its real shape?" We do not know from sensation. Its numerical identity (as in size), qualitative identity can change with time-space circumstances, and who is looking at it. Shape based on sensation, for example, can change according to different angles and distances. It is cognition, through synthesis of sense-data, not mere sensation or perception that gives us what we think of as the real shape. [70]

In this way no given sense data is ever perceived the same way for any given pair or group of individuals. Space and time then, when based mostly on the senses, is emphatically subjective and personal -- that is unless we posit that one person could see, think, and feel identically with another.

As for the principle of induction itself, as Russell says, we cannot use experience to prove its validity, since such proof would be circular. Further, it is a disguised form of deduction which only gives probable conclusions. Or as Malebranche nicely put it, *complete* consent cannot be given to probability.

A belief found in our minds is something arranged with respect to various thoughts and feelings. That is beliefs are thoughts and feelings *arranged* a certain way in our understanding, and are the result of certain relations. The thing being considered, whatever it might be, may be *known* objectively, but ultimately our *understanding* of something, and its arrangement in our thoughts with other things is to no small degree actually subjective. For example, the contents of a science textbook and its conclusions may very well be accurate and objectively arrived at. However, in the arrangement of those facts, reasonings and conclusions we have greater latitude of subjective choice. The connections within a given science, and that sciences connection to other sciences take the form of an arrangement which is largely subjective, all the more so as the scientific topic takes on greater scope.

Sensations can only give us existence. Mind is needed to conceptualize and hypothecate, and which are necessary for science. Even if relations are thought of as something we can know from mere sensation, perception, and feeling, it is the mind, by means of the dialectic, and abstract theorization, that knowledge of objects and their relations is taken to its most full and widest bounds. The irreplaceable role of imagination and creative memory in scientific theory is, frankly, something too often ignored or taken for granted. As William Blake said: "What is now proved was once only imagined."

Empirical science relies on logic. Logic and its use do not really require empirical science, and therefore they can plausibly be said to precede (formal) empirical science. Moreover, it can be said that empirical science in general is not as fool proof as formal logic. In conjunction with proper use of reason, both reason and experience can, in their way, demonstrate and support, the practical validity of empirical science as a method. Yet insofar as the latter relies on experience, which derives from Secondary objective criteria, it is inferior to logic, though in some ways arguably superior to all but the most minimalist metaphysics, transcendentalisms, and pure idealisms as an objective method.

**: The only true science is empirical science or science which concerns that which is physical.*

Among its functions, science seeks to distinguish and translate the given order of things into an intellectual order which can be comprehended by reason, and, in William James' words, "to make the identifiable terms more numerous." Peirce offers this formulation: "we naturally conceive of science as having three tasks – 1. the discovery of Laws, which is accomplished by induction,; 2. the discovery of Causes, which

[70] See *Some Main Problems of Philosophy*.

is accomplished by hypothetic inference; and 3. the prediction of effects, which is accomplished by Deduction."[71]

Some consider math a science, yet math does not involve the study of sensation based physical phenomena. Since mathematical propositions are neither analytical nor derived from experiential knowledge, Kant believed they were a priori synthetic, which we might say lies between synthesis and *formal* analysis. Using this example of mathematics, it was Kant's position that we could have a transcendental science or a science of cognition based on intuitions and innate concepts. One of the problems with Kant's view is that is more difficult to identify and distinguish mental "objects" and concepts then it is physical ones. Despite this, the remarkable extent to which thinkers still return regularly to respond to Kant's arguments about reality is strong proof of their continuing relevance and significance. This would not be the case if Kant's transcendental science were only empty imaginings or an airy nothing (at least no more than any number of other sciences.) Since we cannot begin to perceive or experience all of it, *the world* as any given one of us conceives it patterned after some ideal system. *Whose* ideal system, however, becomes the question. Poincaré then was correct in asserting that science can predict ends and provide connections but not adequately describe reality. "The aim of science is not things themselves, as the dogmatists in their simplicity imagine, but the relations between things; outside those relations there is no reality knowable."[72] Whether, on the other hand, there is "no reality knowable," as he states, many will dispute.

The metaphysical, transcendental, and idealistic worlds are as real and practical in their proper places as the empirical sensory world, and we can choose between the former and latter which in our consciousness to focus and dwell on. If all people lived like rational idealists (or minimalist transcendentalists) such notions as theirs would not seem flighty and unrealistic at all as they might to ordinary people. So it is false to assume idealistic mindedness is not reality mindedness. The idealistic and empirical viewpoints are simply two aspects of reality we can choose or not choose to focus on. In truth, it is only because idealistic perspectives are in the minority that they are often viewed as without real meaning or relevance.

* *The conclusions of the scientific community necessarily reflect our greatest understanding of the world and reality.*

Well, yes and no. After all it is possible for one or a few individuals to have a more correct understanding of a given topic than the current scientific community – as history has so many times demonstrated.

Another difficulty is, who decides who and what the scientific community is? In Stalinist Russia there was an established scientific community whose conclusions needed to conform with the dictates of the political will. Economic and financial interests can have the same effect on science in the United States. Can scientific communities answerable to political sentiments or economic dictates be considered highest scientific authority? Clearly no, and it is fair to say that a given scientific community is only as credible as it is fair, rational, impartial, and honest in its thinking and outlook.

Jacobi's remark on this point is worth quoting: "(W)e must accept that at any given time the composition of human reason is determined by the way of the world, and never by reason *on its own*. In every epoch and in every place, therefore, men have precisely as much insight as God allows them to have at that time and place, even though in their opinion they are always and everywhere capable of as much rationality as they like." [73]

Another question we need to address in answering this point is, where does science end and begin? As practical matter we can put only so much time, energy and resources into a given branch of science or school of study. Next, the founder or founders of such a school decide what is their subject, how it is classed, and what are its parameters. In classing through analysis their subject in-itself into fixed categories, and the subject as it relates to other subjects, there is a certain amount of value judgment based on intuition, imagination, and logical inference (including possibly empirical experiment as well) taking place Here the usually used criteria for doing this would seem to depend on the goal of the school, but also the goals of the larger communities of which the school is a part to some extent. For example, some scientists are interested in getting at truth, while others are possibly more interested in how scientific findings can be applied to life activities. These kinds of value judgments, are going to some significant degree to be subjective. This should be a caution in too casually viewing any given science as strictly objective. There are degrees to which a given school can be made objective, but complete objectivity is impossible. We see this very much in studies of logic, and even to some extent in mathematics, which one would think would be the most objective of sciences. Yet the truth is value judgments are made as to what is significant and not significant, what should be emphasized and what not, and science as practiced is for this reason more subjective and agenda oriented than we customarily think.

---

[71] "The General Theory of Probable Inference."
[72] *Science and Hypothesis*, preface.
[73] *David Hume on Faith*.

On the surface it would appear that increasing the scope of one's study would more helpfully increase our understanding of it. To an extent this would seem to be true. A student of American literature who also knows US history, English literature, English history, will more likely have a clearer view than the student that focuses solely on the main subject. But in knowing these other areas will he not risk also knowing less about the main subject (i.e. by spending that much less time on it)? This will depend on the finite time, energy, resources and ability of our student. Even so, I think it clear that no matter how wide he broadens base and scope of his study, and no matter how much time, energy, ability, he has, there is always theoretically more he could do better. Consequently, there is an inherent fallibility in all schools of learning which the responsible thinker, scientist, scholar and teacher will always bear in mind, ever being on the look out for blind spots to help remedy this unavoidable limitation.

** Science is unprejudiced and value free*

As already mentioned, there is a certain amount of value choice involved in what "science" chooses to examine and emphasize. In addition, we all have seen science, or some version thereof, used as a cloak for the wildest fanaticism and demagoguery. Such remind us how politics, ideology and superstition can hijack science for untruthful purposes, and how the necessary value choices in scientific examination and emphasis can be so abused as lead to science's debasement.

** There is theoretically no limit to what science can possibly know.*

Empirical science is limited by:

a. The fact that all scientific propositions are appearance, because they refer to limited aspects of reality (like a painting does.) Expressed another way, science takes or digests reality in fragments.

b. Subjective value choices in examination and emphasis.

c. "No perfect system can possibly be finite because any limitation from the outside infects the inner content with dependence on what is alien." [74]

d. Worlds of physics, astronomy, biology, etc. have no complete reality taken in and of themselves. In this sense, scientific categories are somewhat arbitrary looked at from the perspective of the vast scheme of things.

e. In science no thing is known or understood outside the minds own classification of it. A fact is a kind of abstraction taken from the world as whole, formed by the mind, and subject to the mind's own rules, regardless of the what the world's or nature's "rules" are supposed to be.

We are often at a loss in science, as in daily life, to identify what exactly it is that causes something else. Not so rarely what we come to view as the cause of something is not a real cause but an apparent cause. Until the mere appearance is unmasked, we will think A is the cause of B, even though until such unmasking we might be entirely mistaken. Of course, it is to the honor and credit of true scientific inquiry to question and examine all possible assumptions, alternatives and explanations as to actual cause. Yet how often very lamentable it is in practice that these powers are less realized and fully availed of than they might be.

h. Honesty and Reality

A fact too frequently, sometimes blatantly, disregarded is that the moral character of the scientific community defines its credibility. Whether the persons in that community are honest and or courageous makes all the difference in the world. For example, honesty could be said to be required for truth-reliability, and courage is necessary to permit the widest scope of inquiry and exploration. How much in the way of morals science may require might be opened to debate. But that it needs some amount of morals is undeniable. It is curious to think how often academic credentials, such as University degrees, seem to imply character and a certain amount of moral integrity. Experience, in most instances, would seem to justify this implication. Yet, of course, it does not *necessarily* follow that a person with high academic credentials is a moral person. No doubt, most academic communities are usually bound together by a sincere desire for truth and higher learning. But how much, as well as why, this is so is open to question.

Morals, thinking most especially (but not exclusively) of honesty, should be considered a First Criteria of objectivity. It goes without saying, dishonesty pollutes the waters of truth, and hence impairs our beliefs. The more we allow ourselves to lie to others and ourselves the greater risk we run of cutting ourselves off from better reason and ultimately losing sight of reality. Honesty in science is even more important than in philosophy, since in philosophy a more careful logic allows us to see error. This is not always the case in empirical science, where we sometimes have to take someone simply at their word, say with respect to data.

There are lies as to fact and lies as to value. Often the excuse for lying in everyday life is that we fear offending someone if we do not do so. Yet even allowing this, it must be understood that, as a practical matter, such situations invariably involve dishonesty as to value, less so as to fact.

[74] Bradley, *Metaphysics*, I.9.

If we lie to ourselves, or someone else with whom we seek agreement lies to us, (and such lying concerns a point of no insignificance), the truth-value of our subjective and objective determinations, respectively, are negated. Illustrations of this might be cases where there is a use of words to deceive and throw off meaning, pretended assumptions of logical validity, and distortions or willful fabrications of fact. If then the meaning of a belief is deliberately misrepresented, or the logical error it contains deliberately overlooked, or the fact (or facts) on which it is premised is known as false and pretended otherwise, the belief could potentially be considered void, depending on how serious the "lie" is. The reason for this is that lying violates the rules of language, logic, and presentations of alleged fact. Of course, not all lies or misrepresentations are equally serious, and a belief might still hold essentially good if the lie or lies are sufficiently minor in nature. Otherwise, there seems to be no persuasive reason why it should be disputed that dishonesty has the potential effect of rendering both subjective and objective beliefs void. Those inclined to dismiss the importance of more stringent logical and factual consistency (in a person's account of something), or else think little of common sense experience, might reject such a view. But it is difficult to see what argument could be brought against it if we assume that coherence and sincerity of truthfulness are something desirable.

While due recognition has historically been given logic and language (and some of the other possible starting points mentioned), it is puzzling that relatively little consideration has been given to honesty (and hence morals) as a first criteria and basis of all sound knowledge and understanding. After all does not any given serious thinker imply that he is being honest with others and himself? Does not any legitimate effort at arriving at truth necessarily imply that we are honest with ourselves and others in what we are about? If one considers the matter, the answer we find is yes. For if a thinker lies to themselves and or to others, this would seem to critically undermine the credibility of their arguments. To be deceived or mistaken is one obvious flaw which philosophers and scientists readily assume as a possibility. Yet not as often is willful deceit and error openly taken into account. Rather, it is unthinkingly assumed that among serious thinkers that honesty is necessary, and where honesty is significantly lacking there is no serious thinker. Though this should not surprise us, it raises the somewhat odd question as to whether there is such a thing as instinctive or a priori honesty, at least among academics and intellectuals, and if so, are morals instinctive or a priori as well? Does a given thinker's seriousness and sincerity necessarily imply he is honest (hence moral), and if so how and why? Or do we assume a certain kind of culture or scholarly environment produces honest people?

If the ascertaining of truth requires (at least) basic honesty, it probably is helpful then to ask what honesty is. Perhaps the best way to understand the notion of honesty, is to start by attempting to explain what its opposite, dishonesty, is. After all, if there was never dishonesty, would we have ever have had need of the principle of honesty in the first place? *In theory* a person in the primordial past, in which there was neither honesty nor dishonesty, might have imagined and hypothecated the notion of dishonesty, and otherwise there had not yet been any practiced dishonesty as such. But be this as it may, it would seem fairly evident that the concept of honesty would not be required unless there was a conscious need to avoid dishonesty. Curiously then, we might be justified in saying that if dishonesty had never been conceived, than neither would have honesty arisen as a notion. Said Heraclitus: "They would not have known the name of justice had not these [unjust actions] occurred."[75] Perhaps he might have added, as some in effect would, that "justice" was God's response to and medicine for the ill.

In what then does dishonesty consist? Dishonesty, or lying, is the deliberate communication of a falsehood, untruth, prevarication to another, or else the communication of a truth which is so distorted or truncated as to constitute a falsehood. Normally speaking, it is a conscious act. A person cannot lie unconsciously or by mistake. It is the willful choice on the part of one to deceive or mislead another or others into believing something that is untrue. It is not strictly speaking necessary for a liar to deceive a person into a falsehood. They conceivably might deceive a person into the truth. For example, if Frank tells John that so-and-so will be at the airport -- Frank having heard earlier that so-and-so is bed-ridden and cannot possibly leave their home – Frank will have lied to John, even if, as it later turns out, that so-and-so does manage somehow, against all odds and expectation, to leave their bed and arrive at the airport.

What matters then is not so much whether what a liar tells another is true or not as such, but rather a conscious and willful intention on their part to deceive another. A mistake made is not a lie, yet even so (given the above example), a person can still lie even though, through a mistake, end up telling the truth.

A lie, as Russell puts it, "presupposes truth speaking as the usual rule."[76] It takes place when there is a conscious discrepancy between a person's knowledge and their expression of that knowledge. By knowledge here, I mean knowledge occupying immediate and attentive consciousness. Is it possible then to have knowledge without attentive consciousness? Yes, one can have knowledge in memory un-recollected, or have perceptions they are not immediately attentive to. The knowledge involved in lying, however, does not include un-recollected memory or perceptions we are not consciously attentive to or in our intellect aware of. It must be facts or knowledge (whether accurate or mistaken) which the liar is conscious of or has ready means of being familiar with. Only when my consciousness is attentive to a given perception or a recollected memory can I be said to possess conscious knowledge. We cannot then lie about un-recollected memories or perceptions which

[75] Fragment 60.
[76] *An Inquiry into Meaning and Truth.*

our consciousness is not attentive to or which it does not focus on. A person may attempt to justify their lying by rationalizing it to themselves. Yet no one can lie without knowing it.

The kinds of dishonesty or lying we might normally encounter are: Out-right falsehoods, Dissembling, Equivocation, Half-truths, Deliberate omission of pertinent facts, Willful Distortion. These in turn might be known or expressed in degrees. Any of these in some dishonest communication with another might involve a combination with one, any, or all of the others. The circumstances in which dishonesty arise will vary and might be prompted by motives such as fear, an unenlightened selfishness, fanaticism, or laziness. Some lies are told casually and frivolous, while others will lie only when there is strong pressure to do so. Deliberately ignoring an opponent's or rival's persuasive argument might also be considered a kind of dishonesty. Of course there are sometimes silly arguments which as a practical matter we do not have all the time available to consider. Yet what, on the other hand, is too often the case is that legitimate argument or theory is deliberately ignored, not because it is false, but rather precisely because it is true (and possibly perceived as threatening certain deeply cherished beliefs.)

From whence morals, such as honesty arise, what further relation they have to First criteria, and the role the critical function they serve in belief formulation will be considered more closely further on.

III. Beliefs of the Heart

"The mind should be kept in the heart as long as it has not reached the Highest End. This is wisdom, and this is liberation. Everything else is only words."

~~~~~~~*Maitri Upanishad*

For the Egyptians, the Jews, the Chinese and other ancient or else more primitive cultures, the heart[77] was the seen as the seat of the understanding. Hunzi (or Hun Tzu), a Chinese sage from the 3rd century B.C., for example said: "The heart is the ruler of the body and the master of one's spirit and intelligence. It issues orders, but it takes orders from nothing: *it* restrains itself, *it* employs itself; *it* lets itself go; *it* takes itself in hand; *it* makes itself proceed; *it* makes itself stop."[78]

Inasmuch as thought was seen as proceeding from the heart perhaps certain ancients saw themselves as thinking more from their whole person than through their head as we might, and where we ordinarily understand thought to take place. Chrysippus, the Stoic, living at a far distance, yet a contemporary of Hunzi, also saw the heart as the ruling function of the soul. Yet, perhaps somewhat strangely, he was a confirmed and strict rationalist, who saw emotions as being something defective in us, and a result of errors we make in judgment.

The attitude of the ancients generally toward emotions varied. Plato and Aristotle saw them as positive goods, while Zeno, Stoicism's founder, saw them as bad and something to be suppressed or otherwise got rid of – at least as a general and perhaps really a didactic rule. All of them, and many others elsewhere including both the Near and Far East, preached temperance and to that extent control of one's emotions and desires. The Buddhist faith in a sense is built very much on an idea of this sort.

At the same time as they often, if not always, sought to minimize the value placed on emotions, they, have argued for the intellect and ideas as the source of truth or true belief. Others were less stringent and saw true belief as derived from *both* mind[79] and senses, with the imagination serving as a drawing board of sorts for hypotheses. In both cases (and there are other variations as well), true belief was to be found essentially in the mind, or else the mind in conjoined relation to perception and sensation. God, as a concept, might be introduced as a necessary part of the truth realization process. But otherwise the mind was seen as the source and focus of true beliefs.

While the notion that valid belief, both subjective and even objective, can be derived from bare feeling is widely accepted among people generally, it has not always been well received by philosophers. One notable exception was Pascal who wrote: "We know the truth not only through reason but also through our heart…Principles are felt, propositions proved, and both with certainty though by different means. It is just as pointless and absurd for reason to demand proof of the first principles of the heart before agreeing to accept them as it would be absurd for the heart to demand an intuition of all the propositions demonstrated by reason before agreeing to accept them." [80]

Beliefs based on feelings and sentiments do not always lend them themselves to easy identification or verification (as to their worthiness and truth value.) And certainly, it can be conceded, that for beliefs based in feeling and sentiment to be believed as true, cognitive discernment, on some level, must be included as part

[77] "Maimonides: "The Hebrew *leb* (heart) is a homonymous noun, signifying that organ which is the source of life to all beings possessing a heart…It further denotes thought...counsel…will…understanding…" *Guide*. I. 39.
[78] *Hunzi*, ch. 21
[79] Bearing in mind that "mind" might mean or be one's heart
[80] *Pensees*, I.VI.
~~~~~~~

of that identification and verification process. But leaving aside the question of how much the mind supervises or works in tandem with feeling, does it make any sense to speak of discerning what is true and false belief by means of feeling?

Activity of mind has some feelings of its own, howsoever faint, such as rest and agitation, which no thinker can avoid. Imperceptible as they might be sensations and intuitions are accompanied by feelings. Even a priori principles, such as those of deduction, may on a rarefied level be conceived as being accompanied by feeling of a kind. But feeling in the grander sense, of deep emotions, or feelings that might reach the height of passion, can these be a basis for either belief, be it subjective or objective? And if so, do such beliefs have a truth value? Obviously there have been many who have thought so. If they did not invoke conventional philosophy to express this notion, as did say Rousseau and Hamann, still their conviction of its truth was so strong that they explicitly formed the course of their lives and careers on it, of which many poets, painters and musicians come to mind.

To distinguish relatively faint or low level feelings (such as the rest and slight agitation of involved in ordinary reasoning), from our innermost stirrings, I will, generally speaking, use the term "heart" to denote the latter. In a way it could be said to be the ultimate repository of all emotion and feeling, and, as the ultimate source of value judgments, forms the basis for our views about the world and our purpose in it. The least strong states of feeling I will, usually, refer to as "feeling," while states stronger than "feeling" but less than "heart," we will call "emotion." This, needless to say is generalizing, but even so useful, while reminding ourselves of Augustine's remark: "[Man's] hairs are more easily counted than his feelings and emotions of his heart."[81]

The fact that the term "heart" is not ordinarily a proper philosophic term, and to that extent perhaps grates the sensibilities of some I think mind only serves to make my the point better concerning the heart's semi-independent function as a basis for beliefs which possess a legitimate truth value. [82]

In the gospels, we find: "where your treasure is, there your heart is." In this statement, heart is probably best understood as synonymous with deepest longing, desire, or what we care about most (if we really thought about it.) It isn't mere emotion, it is something deeper from which emotion originates, and in which emotion receives its utmost realization. In the sense in which I use it used here, "feelings" (by contrast) refers both to ordinary pains and pleasures, and psychological compulsions, such as acquisitiveness, fear, envy, addiction, as well as heart. Yet by heart we mean the deeper emotions, longings and desires lesser emotions, such as from out which the psychological compulsions (at least in part) might originate. Emotion means merely the heart acting on a relatively lesser or surface level of intensity. Feelings, emotions, and heart are interconnected and the manifestation of one may well be in some way be the result of another. There is not always a clear distinct line to be drawn by which to distinguish the emotions of ordinary pains and pleasures, and psychological compulsion, and those of the heart. They over-lap to some extent.

William James speaks of love, sympathy, sociability, jealousy, modesty, acquisitiveness, play, cleanliness, parental love, curiosity as "instincts." Yet, except for love itself, these are surface manifestations of deepest volition and desire, so that their actual origin remains to be found. Some theorists have attributed emotions in general to a kind of conditioning of human psychology, in conjunction with something like inborn instincts for survival, that occurs over the course of generations and in the life of an individual. While I think there is something to this view, I do not believe it can be firmly established since we have no actual physical records as to man's origin, and thus can only speculate on the subject. I am inclined to think that the kind of evidence on which to establish that man's emotions are simply a product of his physiology and his reaction to his physical environment are at best inconclusive, and that the argument saying that basic emotions and longings are innate to the soul has a better grounded claim. Yet presumably there is at least some truth to both views.

While we will want to acknowledge that there may be legitimate dispute as to whether the distinction between physiological compulsion and deeper emotions is really necessary, here we will adopt the following view: 1) That while there does seem a plausible grounds to believe that there are psychological compulsions, and 2) these compulsions are often the result of environmental conditions and biological inheritance, they are and should essentially be treated as distinct from our much more deep longings and desires, that is that "heart" as we know it from poetry, art, music, religion and sincerely motivated charitable enterprises (as much as anywhere else.)

Compulsions and the heart do indeed overlap. Psychological and neurological compulsions and reactions are, in many instances, traceable and identifiable, and it would not be difficult to see these as, in some

---

[81] *Confessions*. IV.14.

[82] Is the notion of "Heart," referring to deeper feeling and emotion, the same thing as a physiological heart? More usually, it has been assumed that there is a definite connection. Physical hearts have been known to palpitate in great throes of emotion. On the other hand, are we to think that those with heart transplants, i.e. hearts not their own, or those with artificial hearts are without the deeper emotions? We might conclude that those with physical hearts not their own are perhaps at a disadvantage when it comes to deeper feeling. But certainly we would not conclude that they are incapable of great emotion, or core desire In any case, it is not strictly necessary to resolve the issue here, and those who prefer to view the physical heart, in itself, a) as the main seat of emotions, or b) see it, as perhaps the means of physical realization of what actually is the soul's emotion, or c) as simply a useful abstraction signifying deep emotion in general, may, in what follows, interpret the notion as they see fit.

measure the heart's greatest desire or desires. A neurological or otherwise physiological cause can, under certain circumstances, possibly trigger and bring to the surface a deep emotion, and a deep emotion can sometimes take on the character of a physiological compulsion. Though we are too much influenced by our heart and emotions (or feelings) to distinguish them exactly, yet we must think there is a point at which they are ultimately different. This, at any rate, is the view we will adopt here.

It would seem to make more sense to make our deepest emotions the source, or at least part of the base, of our desire.

What it is that brings about the heart's deepest yearnings, some have tried to account for by the doctrine of grace as mentioned. Here I take the view that we do not objectively know from what our heart's deepest desires spring, only that it is from the heart, *as best we can otherwise tell*, that deepest desires and our volition originate. If nothing else, since we do not really know what is the actual source of our deepest desires, it will not hurt to simply designate this mystery as our "heart." Those who prefer "soul" or "spirit" are well within their rights to adopt those designations, with the heart perhaps being seeing as the palpable manifestation of soul or spirit. I would point out that while others conception of soul will include volition and deepest desire along with other aspects (of the soul), heart refers merely to deepest volition and desire and in that sense might be thought as being a part of the soul, and if you like as well, the heart of the soul. Alternatively we could say the spirit is the soul of the heart. Either or any way, taking anyone of these perspectives, will not interfere with our inquiry, as long as we can identify some basis for our deepest desire or deepest sense of what is good, but which is not cognitive mind as such.

While the mind guides, instructs, cautions, and admonishes the heart, it is the heart which is the basis of our deepest desire, and as such it plays a necessary part of all value judgments we make. And when we are reminded that *all* judgments imply some amount of value judgment to them, we see how the heart can not only be a part of any judgments and beliefs we hold, but may in a sense, be considered more important than cognitive mind as such.

The heart knows love "in-itself," not the mind. The mind can know that the heart knows love in itself. The heart, like the mind, has the potential to see past representations. Representations are exactly that, representations. That is they are not a something they are a sign of something. Signs can serve as a guide to love, but real love, like the mind desires the real. True, the heart might love a mere representation, but then this is what idolatry is. The goal of great and true hearts, it could be argued, is to seek past the representation to the real. For a selfless heart the real might be love or God seen as love. This in turn might mean imply love of others, our neighbor, as well. Since the heart knows love as real, it desires the real it already knows, seeking it via faith, morals, and aesthetics which are the avenues it goes to find itself in another. Certainly, symbols and signs are very likely to be to found along the way of its path. However, it is possible for love to know Love as real, and love "Love" as something independently real, at least this is what some religious mystics believe and have claimed.

Given the heart's often distinct and separate sense of what is real, it is often seems at great odds with the (cognitive) mind, and does not quite allow of the comprehension allowable to *mere* feeling (or even emotion), such as neurology or medical psychology make possible. This is simply to say while the heart can be described usefully in general terms, such descriptions cannot expect to be very scientific. In this way, the heart, as I speak of it here, is perhaps can be likened to Bergson's "inner real" in its indivisibility, ever fluid nature, and transcendence of time-space formulations. Perhaps we could say heart (and mind also) is separated from form and quality because it discovers, creates, and arranges form and quality. When heart (and mind) are put into form and quality in a manner limited to words or some other physical medium, and although what is expressed may very much stir or inspire hearts (or minds), the expression cannot actually exceed heart, for heart is that process (so to speak) which is ever more real than any image.

This, in addition, to its role as the essence or centrality of volition and desire (as I maintain) does not lend the notion to much in the way of objective analysis. To find out how problematical interpreting and defining our deepest desire can be, one need only go through the debate between St. Augustine and the Pelagians respecting grace. The heart, by itself at any rate, knows no clear and objective determination unless we judge (or were to judge) emotions to be such. Emotions, it would seem, are known relative to one another. For example, greater love or greater hate, we measure only by comparison with the love or hate between people. In this sense the values we assign to the strength or weakness of desires and emotions is relative and comparative. Pure love, or pure joy, or pure hate, or pure sorrow, as far as we know and objectively speaking don't exist, or if they do, defy ordinary mortal comprehension (intellectual comprehension certainly.)

If there are absolute standards of love and hate we know them subjectively. That there are certain kinds of sophisticated order possible to emotions is seen in the complex effects nature, poetry, works of art, and music can have on them. Along this same line, to the extent emotions can be broken down in their aspects and causes, or different emotions can be added to another, emotions follow patterns that (in some way) mirror and or can be understood (to some degree at any rate) within the framework of analysis and synthesis, and the "parts" of the heart could be said to be (essentially) events. How far and how accurately the mind can identify

arrange and such states of heart or else emotion is open to question. Yet that such can be done to some degree, and in a way useful to us, is not. [83]

A heart can love universals (as in "I love sculpture") as well as particulars, but ordinarily is more partial to specific someone's or somethings, rather than general someone's or something's. One might love one's country, but only because we first love someone or something more particular and specific. Deepest emotions, feelings are typically latent in us, and, depending on the person, might come overtly to the surface on only certain occasions, or be seen in a person's actions and comportment regularly more their heart is sincere in its focus.

When we tire of something we tire of it usually because of the effect it has on our emotions. So that when something wearies us it usually reflects how that something affects us emotionally. Put differently, how something affects us emotionally may be said to be what tires or wearies us about it. In this way, rest is an unavoidable and regular part of experiencing emotion, rest both to avoid bad emotions, and to save up (and refresh ourselves) for good ones.

Other than perhaps descriptions of this kind, to get analytically at how deeper emotions or the modes of heart are to be demarcated and defined is not really possible because the more we delve into precise definition the more we lose sight of nature of emotion itself – namely that it is something quite distinct and separate from reason as we know it. At least, there would seem to be a profound divide between the two. We will want to then avoid expecting too great an objective specificity when trying to arrive at what the heart is, how it is composed, and precisely how it functions. This understood, a certain more or less accurate and qualified generalizing about it, not inconsistent with reason and experience is, even so, still possible. Further what we will have to do is see heart indirectly, through emotions and feeling, with the understanding that we are seeing something through its shadows.

Similar to the way the clinical dissection of a body causes the researcher while engaged in that activity to lose view of the incomprehensible vibrancy of life itself, in the too eager effort to clinically classify emotions we lose sight of their ultra-objective nature. The realm of the heart is in a sense a country of its own laws, which while it can be made to cooperate with (cognitive) reason, cannot truly be what it is if it lived solely by reason's dictates. It will suffer reason's assessments, and to some extent (depending on the person) acquiesce to it demands, but the heart can never be what it is if it allowed reason to supplant its own being (assuming such were even possible in the first place). It is well to bear this in mind, lest we transgress or in some way insult the heart's natural privilege and position of independent authority with respect to judgments, perhaps similar to how different main branches of government must respect each other's separate decisions, while possibly attempting to persuade the other.

Yet many have contended that sensations, including emotions, have no truth relevance, or indeed (for some) even existence, outside of ideas. Even radical empiricist William James states that mere feeling unformed by thought has no reality.[84] The sharpest pang of pain, such as James might argue, will have no true reality unless the intellect in some way cognizes it. But perhaps the question is not one of whether a feeling is real or not real, but rather one of *degree* of real, and that cognitive reality is simply a higher form of reality that we can know, and not the sole one. To illustrate, a cell would seem to have a kind-of notion or awareness of existence. If it is prodded under a microscope it will retract. By a sort of instinctive intuition it senses by feeling that something "exists" and so reacts to it. Now of course, we would not normally think of a cell forming the idea of existence. Nonetheless, we can reasonably interpret it as possessing this awareness or "awareness of existence" without possessing a mind, as we know mind, as such. Perhaps the way to interpret such a phenomena is that the cell has a capacity of mind on a very primitive level. Yet what is interesting in all this is that someone can possess, on some albeit tenuous level, the notion of existence without possessing formal, rational cognition, at least such cognition as we normally think of it, and that knowledge, of a kind, is (at least to some extent) possible outside of noetic consciousness. This suggests that cognitive knowledge is perhaps merely a highly sophisticated form of feeling. But if we do take this view, we need not interpret it as a vindication of modern materialism. Instead we might just as well say that feeling is mind in a primitive state, perhaps invoking Leibniz's monads, as we are justified in saying the reverse. A Stoic like Chrysippus, on the other hand, could have it both ways and see mind as being a rarefied sort of matter, yet matter all the same. This suggestion of non or else ultra cognitive awareness opens up the interesting possibility that heart and mind have similar and joint origins which developed into two quite different modes of consciousness and belief. Perhaps in lower animals the two are in some way merged into one as heart/mind, in contrast to humans where heart/mind has developed into heart *and* mind.

---

[83] For every and all feeling and emotion (it *could* be said) there is a rational thought which expresses or potentially expresses its grounds, origin, purpose and justification (or lack of.) Put differently, regardless of whether or not we are actually aware of it, there is a thought or explanation we adopt which accompanies any feeling, emotion, or disposition we have -- no matter how heated or how crazy the feeling, etc. The question then becomes what is that thought (or thoughts), and does it really make sense? What such thoughts are (if we are not already more or less clearly aware of them) we can realize by means of rational introspection. The clarity of that realization is a result of the quality of our reasoned analysis of it, and the criteria we apply (or use) in establishing the thought's truthfulness or validity.

[84] *Principles of Psychology*, vol. 2, page 11.

If the heart can be the basis of belief, it seems fairly evident that the formal and necessary affirmation of such a belief must take place in the mind. In other words, any beliefs originating from heart requires the mind's validation. While emotions can be the origin of belief, the crystallization, as it were of those feelings into belief proper must take place in the mind. This would appear to be confirmed in the argument that inasmuch as beliefs are a basis for actions, and the decision to act takes place in the mind, all belief must take place in the mind. As well, we can point out that belief being an intellectual choice, requires intellectual consciousness, hence mind. The heart does appear to have a kind of consciousness and choice of belief independent of mind. Even so, in us, for us it appears it must cooperate with the mind on some minimal level. This all having been said, if the heart is the seat of our desires and volition, and hence value judgments, then the heart would appear to be the final determiner of our beliefs, not the mind.

There are ways in which the thoughts in mind can trigger or prompt emotion but these are merely signals for us to react emotionally. Thoughts, in and of themselves, are without emotion, though naturally they are and can be accompanied by both feelings and emotions. The heart can be said to have a certain kind of self-consciousness and memory inasmuch as it can identify and recollect its various feelings and emotions, albeit usually in conjunction with the mind.

What I mean by heart as the source of belief then is that our heart's stirrings move our thinking in such a pronounced and significant way as to act in conjunction with, perhaps over ride the rational mind, although, as we said, those feelings have little power as belief unless our mind, whether consciously or sub-consciously, validates them. What hold a person's emotions will have over their reason, what hold a persons reason will have over their emotion, or what extent the two cooperate, differs from person to person. Because objective beliefs, as we defined them earlier, can really only take place in the mind, belief for which emotions are the primary source or impulse should generally be viewed as subjective. Despite this, we must recall that while emotions are less credible as objective belief, there is nothing about subjective belief in and of itself to say that it is false. Beliefs sprung from emotion (say the high estimation of someone or something) can sometimes be confirmed by the mind's objective criteria. "Jupiter is the largest planet, and therefore the greatest (in value and importance.)" But such objective confirmation can only take place in the mind separately. Our feelings as such remain subjectively with us, and even if others share those same feelings, which lead us to the belief of a high estimation of someone, those feelings of others remain subjective to them as well.[85] We may, however, legitimately claim or speculate that God or the Absolute could or would objectively validate our heart based beliefs, which, of course, is customarily the claim of religion.

The nature of heart based belief is invariably a belief as to value or worth, not fact. Yet if in our thoughts we believe certain facts relating to value or worth which spring from emotion, this is a mental act. For example, one of Roland's knights might reason: "I admire Charlemagne as a great leader. This admiration I have for him comes from the love I have of him in my heart. Therefore, I believe that since he is a noble king, he will not be remiss in coming to our rescue."

Granted this person's confidence in the king's arrival could just as well have arisen from rational considerations. Yet they might have originated from emotions they felt for him with little intellectual or practical reason required to justify their belief. In such an instance, the heart moved the mind's thinking in a certain way. A mother's urgent need to protect her loved child's interest can be seen as based both in genuine feeling and at the same time rational grounds, even if those rational grounds make little impression on her consciousness. In the instance of anger or resentment towards someone we might expect that as a matter of fact some ill will likely befall them. Yet the belief as to a possible future event adversely affecting this person does not arise from the emotion of anger, but rather a belief about the person's worth. It is from this belief about worth that *then* we suspect some potential mishap to befall them. Again, the role emotions can have in forming belief, normally speaking, is that of conferring subjective value or worth on someone or something, but not in forming beliefs of fact as such. However, the less careful a mind is in examining its beliefs and their validity, the more easily will emotions supercede the mind's determining power and authority.

Because feelings, emotions, and heart are experienced within ourselves as individuals only, it is a curious question as to how it might be possible for us to know the feelings, emotions, or heart of others. We can to some extent feel and react to the emotions of others in a manner that is emotional to us, for example in cases of intense intimacy. Nonetheless, the emotional experience for anyone of us seems ultimately to remain personal to ourselves as an individual, and hence subjective. If we believe others feel like ourselves, it is based on inference with respect to emotions we know or have known.

---

[85] While it is debatable in itself whether beliefs as to value can properly be made objective, it would be safe to assume that normally they can't, unless perhaps we take great care in qualifying our assertion. If I like and value this automobile over another because it drives faster and handles more smoothly, the belief as to its speed and handling can be established objectively. However, my preference to it based on these qualities would ultimately be subjective, even if it were agreed by *everyone* that speed and handling were the most desirable characteristics of an automobile. Now it is true, we might be able to establish objectively that *everyone* prefers a fast smooth handling car. But outside the direct reference as to who the judge in question is (in this case "everyone"), assertions as to value cannot be established objectively in the way we can establish facts objectively. If we say we prefer the faster smother handling car because it makes commuting easier and will win the approval of our fellows, the belief that easier commuting and approval of fellows is desirable leads us to the same point. We can objectively demonstrate that the car makes commuting more easy and that it will win the approval of our fellows, but whether or not these are something we should value is subjective. And so on and so on…

And while we can perceive the emotions of others, and in particular instances be moved by them, the only feelings and emotions we truly know, or experience, are arguably our own. It might then be said that emotion is inherently subjective. When everyone laughs or weeps together in a theater, we see agreement, and the commonality of the experience will render the emotions objective. But since emotion is not so much based on logic as it is on individual instinct, education and experience, there will tend, by comparison, to be a much wider latitude of disagreement between objective belief (e.g. the actor on stage is amusing) emotionally founded, than objective belief intellectually founded. Objectivity in emotional belief is simply a matter of two or more people feeling the same thing, or somehow believing they feel the same thing. The mind on the other hand, unlike the heart, can more easily refer to logic, more specifically objects and sequences, or other First and Secondary criteria, to establish objectivity. If the heart by resorting to mind, say by using clinical psychology to attempt to know itself, it (in am manner of speaking) starts becoming mind, and the more it does so, and if too much, it risks betraying its own nature, and by doing so surrender its importance or authority to mind (the mind presumably acting in error also.)

Belief founded in the emotions relies on thought, perception and memory, in the sense that emotions are, to some extent, reactions to these. Perception is our senses plus apperception, or what I prefer to call apprehension.[86] Apprehension is the beliefs, thoughts, feelings which we, consciously or unconsciously, associate with a given person, object, or event we perceive. It arises from past sensory experiences, reflections, habits, unthinking beliefs we develop ourselves, or which we acquire from others. In this way, all our thoughts and perceptions, both internal and external, are to some degree, colored by *subjective* feeling and emotion. That is, we don't merely sense or perceive on object, as in merely receiving data. Rather we receive the data and it is, to some varying extent, colored or modified by our feelings and emotion. This is all one way, though not the only one certainly, of describing how judgments of fact entail value judgments.

So while emotions react to thought and senses, to some degree thought and sense, as we experience them, are followed about by our feelings. While in theory we can abstract thought from physical experience, and not without some success, nevertheless there is no experience such as mortals are capable of in which thought, emotions, perception and sense are entirely separated. Things are seen and thought in the very personal way we as individuals experience them. In this we see the extent to which pure objectivity in belief is not really possible. We can speak of a more objective rather than less objective belief, but never are we completely free of a certain amount of subjectivity in any given judgment.

Reason, self-discipline, morals and certain kinds spirituality do make it possible to purify our thoughts from the too heavy and uncontrolled influence of emotion. Such as Plotinus (not to mention many Buddhist thinkers somewhat similarly) went so far as to believe that complete transcendence of thought from bodily emotion could be brought about through reason and contemplation. Yet the idea we could separate mind from heart and body thoroughly and completely would appear, in this life at least, to be impossible.

Fichte, made the distinction between God as known by the philosophers and God as known by the theologians, in effect saying that God is known to the philosopher through reason, and to the theologian or common man by what is in the heart (or revelation, which apparently for Fichte was something identical or similar.) What perhaps he might have said instead was that with respect to God the philosopher thinks more but feels less, while the theologian, *by comparison*, feels more and thinks less. In this we can easily see how by choice the emotions or mind can have dominance in a person's thinking.

If we fall prey to our emotions, some philosophers, like the Stoics and Kant, of many we might name, have said, this (presumably at the expense of reason) can only lead us into error. While there is certainly a valuable and undeniable truth to this, and absconding from emotion to a significant degree can make possible greater clarity of thought, rational thought does not and cannot comprehend the full range of beliefs of which we are always capable, nor is it, of course, (short of the Absolute as it is) fool proof. Even if our logical judgments are technically consistent, such judgments do not always imply good or wise judgment.

Sometimes our emotions can succeed where our reasoning fails us, say in emphasizing the importance or value of something which routine, albeit otherwise correct, analysis might over look. For instance, the love and admiration followers may have for their leader, may stir them to great deeds they otherwise might not be capable of. The fortress cannot be taken, says the military expert, and in a sober, rational way he speaks correctly. But if Alexander or Caesar comes to lead the troops, suddenly, what was otherwise impossible becomes possible. Similarly, the doctor tells his patent that on the basis of all previously recorded cases of their illness, no one has recovered, and he speaks truly. Yet against all odds, the patient with a great religious faith and resolve manages to get well, and defy all medical expectation. Granted, that the factor of belief based on emotion could have been taken into account by the doctor and thus he could have modified his assessment, and rendered their previously flawed reasoning both more relevant and correct. The flaw, in such instance, would not have been with reason, but how they used and applied reason. Though, true, the highly rational mind's estimation of the value of emotion, as an everyday matter, can certainly be as much lacking as an emotional person's appreciation of reason -- the latter is more common than the former.

[86] James denoted this phenomena "apperception."

Yet for a person to be more than occasionally rational, their heart must wish them to be so. Feeling, originating in the heart, is, ultimately certainly, the presupposed basis of all beliefs, including belief in the need to think rationally. The heart esteems truth, for the sake of truth itself or some other motive such as love for example, and thus comes to esteem reason. St. Irenaeus wrote: "The will and the energy of God is the effective and foreseeing cause of every time and place and age, and of every nature. The will is the reason (logos) of the intellectual soul, which (logos) is within us, inasmuch as it is the faculty belonging to it which is endowed with freedom of action. The will is the mind desiring [some object], and an appetite possessed of intelligence, yearning after that thing which is desired." [87] For Irenaues then reason and desire, for an intelligent person of faith, are one, and on a certain very deep level he may be right. Even so, such unification of reason with desire would outside of a blind faith seem quite inexplicable. And the idea that the disposition to be rational arises from our hearts desire that we be rational would seem, at least for practical truth purposes, to make more sense, since one is hard put to conceive of the mind, as we know it, *desiring*. It is the heart which on an ongoing basis desires truth, and the mind which acts in the capacity to help the given person fulfill this desire, oftentimes by comparing our own desire with what and how others desire. The mind essentially acts to provide and validate our beliefs as to fact and greater reality, while the heart's essential role is to provide the basis of our beliefs as to value and worth.

Does the nature and strength of our desire to reason allow us to reason? Some are gifted in logic and mathematics. Some are gifted with a healthy curiosity and desire for learning. Some are gifted with a more moral and considerate nature. Some are so gifted even to have an aesthetic sense and desire for higher truth. All these can, to some extent, be produced by family, cultural background, upbringing and education. But as can be seen, a person, in addition, can have a natural" or inspired desire to be rational, and that desire can lead them to practice reasoning, and or studying and observing how others reason. By these means following upon the desire, desire can make a person more rational, though granted other factors might be present to inhibit or foster their ability to reason. Can a person be more rational than average without especially desiring to be so? If such is possible, it would seem to be an extremely rare sort of person.

Ideally, the beliefs of both mind and heart should be consistent with each other and the truth. But how is this to be achieved? In answering these questions we will want to observe that the intellect has the advantage over feeling in that its scope of comprehension is much more vast (with respect to particulars), and is capable of controlling feeling in a manner that promotes feeling's best interest. On the other hand, deeper emotions provide a necessary energy and enthusiasm to action which the intellect of itself is incapable of providing. Henry More, the 17th century theologian, poet, and moralist, thought so of emotions, saying that passions "excite vigor in the execution of our purposes," and "if we can but skill out Passions aright, they are Lamps or Beacons to conduct and excite us to our Journey's end."[88] Hope itself, so valuable to both inquiry and discovery, is, after all, much more so an emotion, than a thought.

The respective powers of intellect and emotion powers are most pointedly evinced in the performance of a master violinist. Here we find years of hard study and analysis of violin technique combined with emotion of great breadth, depth, and height. It gives what seems a good illustration of how the beliefs of mind and heart are and should be synthesized, harmonized, and united. The intellect lays the placement and sets the stage as it were for the emotions to be realized. It is a usually poor musician who tries to play on the basis of raw, unprepared spontaneity. Instead the musician must, by means of his intellect, and later by acquired instinct, know in advance what the given music is about, and how his instrument works, before setting his emotions free through the medium of music, though naturally desiring to retain as much spontaneity as they can.

Yet in music, it is the emotions that really shine, rather than the intellect, when it comes to the performance. Such is the nature of music, and so, as well, it is with life. The intellect must ultimately oversee our beliefs, but less so for the sake of intellect in and of itself, than of properly realizing our heart's longings. The mind must lead the dance, but in such a way that its partner, the heart, may all the more radiate.

In the symbiosis of mind and heart in musical performance, the reverse, that is the heart leading mind, is also to some extent true. But it is by comparison, less true. Formed instinct which will often fill the role of intellect in actual musical performance, and this instinct, in most cases, is formed over time on the basis of intellect and experience, that is to say study, practice, and creative reflection. The mind otherwise has little real say in telling our soul to feel in actual performance however. This is left to the heart to do, by realizations and understandings that do not necessarily make reference or acknowledgement to reason or reasoning, while at the same time overtly ignoring the importance of careful intellectual deliberation altogether – this despite the importance of the mind in the preparation! Yet most aesthetics tell us this is only right and appropriate. This does not mean the mind need disappear, rather it only means it takes a second place.

In terms of more day to day experience, there are, of course, many situations where we will want the mind to be in full control of the emotions to the extent that emotions are suppressed. Yet even the desire to have such control *ultimately* springs from an emotion, a value judgment, rather than a thought as such.

---

[87] *Fragments.* Interpreted according to my own view, according to what Irenaeus says, heart (volition) and mind, though distinct and separate, do have a common unity and origin. If this is correct, that unity is logos, or at least such is an interpretation worth exploring.

[88] *Enchiridion Ethicum.*

If reason and emotions conflict it is because one or the other (or both of them) errs in their belief: reason in not taking into proper consideration the value and importance of emotion, and emotion in over-esteeming its own powers.[89] While reason is necessary to correct the errors of either, nevertheless in practical experience a given person's capacity for reasoning is not always up to that task. And while the emphasis on being logical and rational cannot be made too great, even so, it will not, in itself, guarantee a proper estimation of the value of emotional beliefs. Even in science, how common it is to overlook the heart felt values, such as our admiration for progress, enlightenment, and wonders, which are associated with science, without recognizing or else fully understanding what these emotions are, and what their origin and justification is.

Form in a sense is everything. It is in what is material and is itself immaterial (i.e.non-tangible.) Matter without form or less of form than something else, has generally less value. And even a misshapen rock has value only when seen as part of a greater whole, or else take the example of a simple cylinder or block in an engine, because of it the engine runs, comes to life in a manner of speaking. Heart and Mind are known by form, but also can be seen as the source of what gives form value and meaning. Heart, like mind pursues, reacts to or otherwise deal with form. In poetry for example a "new" emotional experience can be created when two or more forms, which are analogous (i.e. one form is represented by another), are simultaneously thought of or felt.

It is worth observing that mechanistic description, thinking particularly of mechanistic description, cannot fully or adequately describe emotional experiences except insofar as they are emotional experiences themselves. In poetry, for example, the experiences brought about by the poem cannot be created by mechanistic description. Words, as an after effect, can describe the poetic experience, but unless they are the poem itself (or one similar) cannot recreate it. This shows that experience itself cannot be adequately described except by means of the poem itself. Ergo, there are phenomena which mechanistic description cannot describe without losing key aspects of the practical and actual experience. If this is true, it goes much to discredit what have been some of the pretensions of much of clinical psychology.

The heart is no more true or false, as such, than is the mind. Both need to live and operate in a manner consistent with the truth, and both are capable of being deceived and lapsing into falsehood. Just as the mind can err, among even the best thinkers, so certainly can our heart err in loving wrongly, or more specifically, valuing what is less important versus what is more important. Neither do minds always think wisely, nor do heart always love wisely. How does a heart, in being more consistent with mind, tell what is more and what less worthy of its love? The answer, (or so at least I would maintain), is that which is most consistent with 1) the moral law and 2) aesthetics (in this order of importance.)

Both mind and heart[90] seek unity of a kind, and the most powerful common ground of mind and heart are moral and aesthetic desire and fulfillment. There may be thought other kinds of unity possible, some no doubt, given the seemingly depthless nature of our souls, we are not perhaps even capable of being aware of. Humor is a good example, partaking as it usually does of both the moral and the aesthetic in some manner. Yet morals and aesthetics (that is the love or desire of what is morally and aesthetically good) are common ground in which both mind and heart can participate in forming beliefs agreeable to the other, and in them do mind and heart find their tightest bond, linkage, and integration.

"The soul is constantly driven toward the good in general," says Malebranche. And for those who question whether a concept such as "the good" is valid, we need only define it as that for which is the aim of our greatest desire or desires, which is to say *our desires of most and the accumulated aggregate of the time*. Alternatively, we could speak of it as that which all our other various desires logically tend to.

Of course, how people will conceive of what "good" is will differ from person to person. Yet we can see that if the heart desires something, and our reason forms our beliefs as to its attainment, then it is possible for the mind and emotions to be agreement. Morals and aesthetics are especially suited to this kind of joint working relationship. The principles and beliefs a person decides upon which will make possible, at least in their own mind, the obtaining of what they believe "the good" constitutes that person's idea of the moral law. Aesthetics, using the term in its broadest sense, addresses how "good" will manifest itself, that is how good will *appear* and or feel to someone. As matter of experience, the notions different people have of what the moral law is and how it should be followed, and what is beautiful are as diverse are their ideas and sentiments as to what "the good" is. This said, though people may share similar or identical ideas and feelings about what the good is, the priority they give one aspect or sentiment of that "good" over other aspects or sentiments can still differ. These differences, as they serve to form our beliefs in order of importance, can make for radically divergent viewpoints and perspectives between people who otherwise share otherwise like ideas of what the "good" is.

---

[89] In this way the mind can be said capable of forming value judgments, but only by going by and in the shadow of the heart's judgment.

[90] Sexuality comes to mind, which it could be argued – at least with certain people – has a commonality with aesthetics and the moral law like heart and mind. Here we will not want to push the comparison of heart and mind with sexual activity except to say that the latter is not comparable to the first two in over all importance since it is more dependant by far on them, than they on it. Expressed another way, sexual activity , as highly as desirable as it is for many, possesses not the *necessary* function and lasting significance to a person as do heart and mind; and what significance it does possesses is largely derived from and secondary to the heart and mind.

A person's focus on what is good may vary, but over the course of their lives it is possible to see pronounced foci and trends that stand out, that indicate what matters most to them. This overall pattern may be said to be united in the persons spirit, perhaps accompanied by some idea of a higher or divine ideal, and is the consummate joining and harmonization of the mind and hearts belief over time (short of complete oneness with God as such.)

A good example of one person's ideas and feelings about "the good" and how they see it in relation to their beliefs about moral law and aesthetics is William Wordsworth. In him we find a lyrical reconciliation between intellectual beliefs about the good, the beautiful, the moral law, and his heart-felt sentiments toward them. For Wordsworth, the mind's understanding of the good, beauty and the moral law as a way to realize the good, can fit perfectly with the heart's emoting. Indeed, in the consummation of the mind and heart, we have a greatest kind of life experience, a highest realization of truth. It is God, as ultimate unity, moving and speaking through nature, and the mind's and heart's belief in Him known through this experience, that makes possible this sublime harmony our soul can both vividly know and feel.

"I was only then contented, when with bliss ineffable
I felt the sentiment of Being spread
O'er all that moves and all that seemeth still;
O'er all that, lost beyond the reach of thought
And human knowledge, to the human eye
Invisible, yet liveth to the heart;
O'er all that leaps and runs and shouts and sings,
Or beats the gladsome aire; o'er all that glides
Beneath the wave, yea, in the wave itself
And mighty depth of waters. Wonder not
If high transport, great the joy I felt
Communing in this sort through earth and heaven
With every form of creature, as it looked
Towards the Uncreated with a countenance
Of adoration, with an eye of love." [91]

Although we see a great emphasis placed on feeling here, it is expressed with clear powers of thought, both in the sophistication of the composition, and its ideas about God and Nature. In "Tintern Abbey," he says he saw in nature:

"…and the language of the sense
The anchor of my purest thoughts, the nurse,
The guide, the guardian of my heart, and soul,
Of all my moral being."

While an unsentimental skeptic might question the objective (or subjective) "truthfulness" of Wordsworth feelings, yet whatever their origin such emotions obviously helped instill in him a sincere and thoughtful moral and aesthetic disposition. From this sprang deeper beliefs about the importance of gratitude, love, piety, and duty, which in his poetry he expresses by means of describing his perceptions and real and imaginative experiences.

There was, as reflected in his poetry, a desire to participate with that spirit and harmony of God as he saw him in nature. This desire became most realized by means of a moral and aesthetic devotion, in turn overseen by a thoughtful and sensitive intellect. It is beyond our purpose here to attempt to assess how successful these feelings were in making Wordsworth himself a more moral and beautiful person. However, I think it is fair to assume that such sentiments as he expressed, if felt sincerely, will and can enhance one's moral and aesthetic strengths and sensibilities. In the *Critique of Practical Reason*, Kant seems to say that true moral character lies full, unwavering obedience to duty without any concern for personal motive beyond morally justified well-being. Wordsworth believes the same thing but from a poetical perspective. For him, morals and aesthetics, as the way to God, are both the means and the end, since we know God best in moral good and beauty. One's desire for moral good and beauty are then, in this sense, a form of God in us.

Because emotions play such a great part in such poetical belief, the more Wordsworth's view will tend to be seen as subjective. This is not a problem for a poet as it is for the philosopher because the poet does not want so much to argue the truth of his belief, but to merely express it, and let him or her who will listen if they care to.

Some would object that not everyone experiences such feelings as Wordsworth's and that subjective feelings could just as well lead them away from, as to, a moral or aesthetic disposition. Therefore, feeling is no reliable bases for morals and aesthetics. The Stoic's and Kant's approach to morals at least has the benefit of highly cogent reasoning. In response, one could say at least however, that feelings are valid as a basis for morals

[91] *Prelude*, Book II

and aesthetics, when they do not seriously conflict with sound moral and aesthetic reasoning and practice, such as that which Kant advocates. But even more, such feeling and inspiration as Wordsworth experienced, far from running counter to reason and a moral and aesthetic disposition, indeed promotes them. Since better knowledge and understanding presuppose the moral law, certainly with respect to honesty, as we saw, such feeling should be encouraged. How lifeless and flat would the moral sense be in people, without such feelings and spirit as Wordsworth describes. At the same time, categorical antagonism and cynicism toward these feelings, honest observers will agree, tends only to undermine morals, and hence honesty, thus *undermining* true reason and science, rather than *promote* more rational and scientific thinking as such criticism pretends. Yes, feeling and emotions can potentially be a great hindrance to clear thought -- but only if they are accompanied by a rash disregard of reason. The problem can be easily corrected when the heart, in its love of morals and beauty, loves reason as well, thereby encouraging reason to better determine whether it, the heart, is desiring correctly.

As we attempted to demonstrate earlier, the mind needs the moral law, at least in the form of honesty to achieve best reason, hence best objectivity, hence, as some would agree, best grasp of reality. Is this true of the heart? Do the heart's beliefs attain greater validation by the person's being more "moral?" The problem in addressing this question is that the heart's view of what is valid belief, that is, its view of what is good, tends, by its nature, to be subjective. Again, it assigns beliefs as to value and worth. Whether its beliefs in this respect are correct cannot be so easily established the way an objective factual belief (in the mind) might be. This said we observe from experience that the emotional beliefs of a hypocrite or insincere person, i.e. this someone who logically contradicts themselves, normally carry much less weight in persuasion (ultimately with themselves as well as others) than the beliefs of someone consistent. For example, we might agree with the hypocrite about a certain higher good or benevolent end they claim to seek. Yet when they say or do something otherwise to seriously undermine that higher good, it becomes plain they do not hold their belief very strongly. They do not esteem that higher good all that as greatly as they would have us think they did. Consequently, sincerity and consistency, if not strictly necessary in all instances, play a very crucial part in establishing the validity of heart based belief. We will less likely believe our hearts are moral if we or others are insincere and inconsistent. For this reason, the mind has the power to guide and instruct the heart in this direction. But it is the heart that must desire to be more consistent and sincere. Only then can the mind realistically assist in fulfilling this desire.

Sincerity and consistency, however, do not necessarily imply a person is more rather than less moral. It is rather unusual to find an immorally disposed person to be sincere and consistent, but at least in theory there is nothing to entirely forbid it. Yet it would seem from experience, and as a practical matter, that sincerity and consistency generally reflect a more morally disposed person, than a person disposed to be immoral, using moral in the conventional meaning of less selfish, loving God, loving our fellow man, loving a higher good which will benefit all, etc. In this sense then, we can say a disposition to be moral, in a sincere and consistent way, does tend to strengthen the credibility of heart sprung belief, both with ourselves and with others. Sincerity and consistency cannot confer objectivity on heart sprung belief. But, based on experience, we observe how they do bolster the strength of subjective belief in a way that bolsters morals, and to that extent honesty also, and hence better objectivity. Further, the *feeling* of sincerity has a certain quality that can *help* to confer truth on a given belief. It cannot be decisive in rendering a belief truthful. Yet when a belief is true on other grounds, it can lend considerable force to the persuasiveness of that belief.

If a subjective belief originating in feeling did turn out to be objectively correct we would naturally expect a person's sincerity and consistency to be fully compatible with having that belief. The test, however, of the truth of the belief would not lie in the sincerity and consistency but elsewhere. Since ordinary subjective belief, by definition, does not give us truth in the objective sense, we cannot say sincerity and consistency confer objective truth on a subjective belief. We can say that if it were possible to demonstrate that a heart based belief were objectively true (say, for example, somehow it were known the Absolute pronounced it as such), the person's sincerity and consistency in holding that belief would not, in and of themselves, be what caused that belief to be objectively true. Despite this, sincerity and consistency do, as an everyday life matter, tend to make a person's subjective belief more believable to us. It is very unlikely that these will decide the matter as to whether what the person believes is objectively true or not. Yet they do make us think that there may well be "something," i.e. some truth at least, to what they believe. For instance, benevolence which seems to spring more so from sincere emotion, rather than rational calculation, is arguably a greater benevolence perhaps because benevolence springing from emotion normally implies a more pure kind of motivation. But again, such emotive power can be no substitute for rationally consistent judgment, and a benevolently disposed person naturally will not recklessly disregard the cautions and counsel of just reason.

Moral conviction without a sincere and earnest heart to support it lacks an obvious strength, vibrancy, so necessary to the proper realization of moral character and actions. True, the heart needs the mind's guidance to help makes sense of, make consistent, the heart's understanding and realization of its aims. Yet it is the heart which is the true source and the life, of that longing for the good, for which morals serve as a means, even if our "good" is the moral law itself. Sentiment alone will usually fail to give us the discipline and perseverance, which we require for ongoing observance of moral principles. It is the mind which mostly provides this, as it seeks to further the heart's interests. The mind usually will provide the judgment with respect to actions to be done, and standards to be met, and how the ends of the heart are to be best achieved. Yet there are and can be those glorious occasions when the heart takes charge, and goads us to nobler moral action than the mind by itself would normally have contemplated. It is in such instances that mere belief can become faith. How much more do we honor what we see as "the good" when we most deeply love it! Nor is it necessarily the

case that such emotional zeal seriously conflict with sound thought and reasoning, as might seem to be the case, if the individual in question attends to matters of discipline, temperance, and planning.

Naturally, the question of whether "nobler moral action," or "faith" are desirable is a subjective choice. But for those who do believe in the truth and usefulness of such notions I offer the foregoing remarks.

If we consider the matter from common sense experience, the heart can be separated into a selfish nature versus a selfless one. Where a "selfish" oriented heart is, generally speaking, greedy, vain, envious, and fearful, a more "selflessly" oriented heart has its counterpart in giving, hope, courage and love of others. Both the selfish and selfless disposition are capable of faith and sorrow, but the reasons these emotions are prompted and the form they will take in one of these two dispositions versus the other will be quite opposed. Though I do not at present presume to claim there are in all instances exact opposite correspondence, these characterizations of the two dispositions appear more or less accurate. It is extraordinarily rare, if not impossible, to find someone who is purely one-way or the other. Rather we speak of selfish or selfless rather as predominating tendencies of a heart, and no doubt there are cases where the two dispositions in a given person are fairly balanced. Some, like Hobbes, would argue that "selfless" is merely a form of selfish, and that there is only one predominating tendency, and that is to be selfish. Aristotle and Spinoza believed that selfishness in accordance with right reason was to be preferred over selflessness. Their respective reasonings on this point, with which on a few points I personally disagree for being more ethical and aristocratic than moral and democratic, can, of course, be found in their respective Ethics.

Hobbes, in his *Human Nature*, Book IX, explains all the sensations of pity by *our* fear of the like evils when by imagination we place ourselves in the case of the sufferer. Spinoza sees pity as merely the opposite of envy.[92] Yet even assuming these negative ideas of about pity, they do not detract from the argument that such sentiments as pity and sympathy foster moral feeling, which feelings in turn can only be of benefit to honesty and courage -- two moral traits that are necessary irreplaceable in the search for higher truth. Put another way, emotional indifference to the suffering of others, as a matter of experience, will more likely characterize a dishonest and cowardly person, than one who is honest and truthful.

There would seem some amount of choice in whether a person is more self or selfless oriented. Dickens' "Christmas Carol" tells the story of how a series of events on Christmas Eve serve to transform a selfish person into a selfless one over-night. Interestingly, however, as obviously as the effects of the ghosts visits bring this about, it is, even so, implied that the transformation must ultimately comes through Scrooge's choice (i.e. to be self-less.) Herein lies one of the great mysteries of the heart. While it provides our deepest motives, those motives can be changed though external influence. At the same time, the influence will only have effect if, in the final analysis we agree to it. In Scrooge's case then we might say his was fundamentally a selfless heart which had been led astray. Only through the intervention of the spirits did it rediscover itself. Alternatively, as a Hobbesian, we might say Scrooge was fundamentally a selfish person, and that the spirits merely educated him as to his greater selfish interest. If we accept the first interpretation, however, then selfish versus selfless disposition of heart is a matter of free will. But if this is so, we are then left with the puzzle of what then prompts the original choice? For this, aside perhaps from the Christian notion of grace, we have no clue. If, by contrast, we are always selfish, we apparently have no choice in the matter. In Hobbes' view, Scrooge ends the story as selfish as ever only more enlightened, which many no doubt will think is being unduly cynical. Yet which ever view we take, I think it could be agreed that whatever its origin, the more selfless disposition in a heart will reflect a greater concern for morals. As well, we might observe in experience that selfless love is more of a choice than self-love, generally speaking, and therefore reflects a greater power of free will in a person.

Sometimes worthwhile, deeply held, positive emotions can conflict. While the search for truth is praiseworthy, the disposition of a scientists to view others, people and animals, as mere things to be analyzed into their components, is – certainly, if allowed to dominate a scientist's life -- can be quite contrary to warm affection and sympathy. If left unchecked such desire to dissect, to analyze, and categorize, can be harmful to that loving and affectionate nature which is has great truth benefits in their way as well. This scientific disposition, psychological in origin, is itself a kind of emotion, and keeping control, of and in some way restraining it in no way need adversely affect the scientist in his desire for more knowledge. All the scientist need do, in order to retain both his "dispassionate" clinical frame of mind and his affectionate nature is "compartmentalize," without denying, the two. We compartmentalize feelings all the time, such as when attending a formal gathering, we suppress certain casual behaviors and emotions we might otherwise indulge in at home. However, this, depending on an individual compartmentalizing can only be done up to a point. There should be an underlying logical and moral unity joining such compartmentalized selves, otherwise one risks double-mindedness.

It can be argued that certain scientific inquiry (for example, cruel and bizarre experimentation on people and animals) can be unduly deleterious to affection and sympathy, and other emotions which foster moral character in the individual and their society. Similarly, the intensive clinical study and medical practice of psychology (or almost any physical science), especially if not balanced with proper heart based values, can

[92] Pity and envy Spinoza implies arise from the same source. If we do not pity then, it could be argued, we will envy. If Spinoza is correct, instead of envying someone we should pity another, though not necessarily, of course, the person we otherwise me might envy. Pity in this way could rid us of envy.

cause neuroses; impairment of wholeness to a person's psyche and overall sense of well being, in its unnaturally highlighting of intellect and the belief in the supremacy of crude physical force at the expense of due appreciation of morals and healthy, affectionate, sympathetic, and empathetic emotion. Further, such excessive emphasis on the physical, at the expense of morals and the affections can potentially have deleterious consequences for a researcher's or doctor's character, and hence impair their integrity both as a scientist and a human being.

In such situations, we must decide whether the good of inquiry outweighs the detriment to affection and sympathy, or whether a too great concern for sympathy unnecessarily holds back inquiry. But in doing so, if we are to be fair, we must know through actual feeling the benefits of affection and sympathy, and not merely know them, and their benefits, solely by means of abstract intellectual concepts. A sensible approach would be not to view scientific inquiry as ultimate good without qualification, but rather a good which needs to be rationally and morally reconciled with other highly placed values. If we don't do this, we risk conferring on the pursuit of truth in scientific inquiry the status of religion with the potential of becoming in turn the worst of monsters.

What is often a negative reaction to sentiment, particularly affectionate religious and moral feeling, is really a negative reaction to hypocritical sentiment which poses as these. This is to say, when affectionate or sympathetic feeling offend our sense of truth, or when they seem out of place, it is usually when they are feigned or false. Yet unfortunately the distinction is missed and some people will be lead to think sentiment itself, not hypocritical sentiment, is false and some how wrong and an obstacle to the pursuit of truth. This said, we should naturally be careful in jumping to a conclusion that someone is a hypocrite when their expression doesn't quite suit us on a given occasion. Emotional expressions can understandably offend when insincere, or out of place. Yet if out of place, *yet sincere* (and the emotion positive) it only makes sense to indulge the person, and give them the benefit of the doubt.

IV. Beliefs of the Spirit

"It is because of the Spirit that the human mind can see, and can think, and can enjoy the world."

~~~~~ *Candogya Upanishad*

There is no more ambivalent and abstract a word, and one for which so many various meanings and interpretations are given than that of "spirit." For some, the idea is too conjectural to have any real objective or empirical validity to begin with. This, at the outset, we acknowledge, and offer much of what follows, and in respect of such skeptical caution, more in the way of speculative reflection rather than insisting on any[93] hard and fast definitions. Personally speaking, I very much do believe in spirit and certain conceptions of it, but am inclined to see it, as something physically intangible, non measurable, and that we are decidedly circumscribed in both our understanding and expression of it objectively. It is a subjective concept or theory which hitherto has eluded empirical identification and verification. Like the wind, we arguably see its effects. But spirit, as such, we never see. Someone will have naturally contended, that the reason this is so is because spirit *is* itself the power to see.

Despite legitimate reservations we might have about spirit looked at from a scientific standpoint, it would be a careless mistake to dismiss the notion of spirit as too conjectural to be worth serious attention. After all, it has been a major and significant part of different religions, and a notion whole-heartedly embraced, indeed assumed, by some of history's most praiseworthy and most careful thinkers. If it is a valid and useful concept, it radically affects any number of beliefs on a wide variety of subjects, both scientific and philosophical. That it is too complex for our understanding to grasp adequately, or that firm proof of it escapes objective verification should not be reason to toss it aside as nugatory. It stands as a reasonable, if a highly unique and (empirically speaking) unusual, hypothesis which would truly be foolish to ignore. At the same time, it is no less dogmatic and arbitrary to assume brush aside its reality as it is to assume it as a adequate objective notion, particularly given its very long and international history. Much of the ideas about what is morally ennobling and aesthetically uplifting, and its usefulness in these regards, make it all the more desirable to assert its viability as a truth.

Of course, establishing the nature and reality of "spirit" depends a great deal on how one defines it.

The term has many different meanings, some of them over-lapping or conflicting.

To give some idea of this lets attempt to list some possible definitions or descriptions. For starters, we can note that the notion possesses one clear and distinct characteristic, namely that it is either an invisible being, force, principle, some combination of these, or all three. Etymologically (in English), it refers to "gas in motion," but derives from the Latin *spirare* which means "to breathe, or to blow."

---

[93] The Holy Spirit in Christianity is often spoken of as a person, but personhood seems limited compared to and derived from spirit, so perhaps such personification is perhaps not logically apt. Here, at least for convenience, we speak of Spirit as a something rather than a someone.
~~~~~

Spirit is an invisible "power" or "entity" which is (in no particular order):

1. That which emanates from God, or the Absolute, and which animates and unifies thought, feeling, and existence, and ourselves with the Absolute
2. Life itself
3. Form itself
4. Mind
5. Love (and Love and Truth)
6. Pure activity, the only *true* cause of anything
7. The process and realization involved in logic and logical understanding
8. Intuition, or else spirit is somehow known through intuition.
9. Volition
10. Truth, or what is most real
11. Totality
12. Meaning and purpose as distinguished from mere existence and relation
13. Something which if not necessarily infinite and eternal, at least is not restricted by spatio-temporal limitations
14. Something experienced only in the individual
15. Something experienced both in the individual and collectively
16. The real as "immediate" (note has no existence in time other than "now")
17. Enthusiasm, or something which has a positive connotation
18. The soul,[94] that which unites mind and heart, which (as made reference to earlier) might be interpreted also as *logos*.
19. That which unites mind and heart and soul, also might possibly seen as logos.

In any of the above instances, it could, if you are so inclined, be thought of as being either corporeal or incorporeal. Also, there may be a sense in which "spirit" might not only be one of the above, but a combination of any and perhaps all of them.

If spirit is the uniting of heart and mind, then art, music, and humor might be seen as palpable manifestations of spirit.

Normally spirit is something which affects us, or which perhaps we can actively or symbiotically participate with. Very rarely, if ever, is spirit spoken of as something we can by ourselves move or affect as such.

Even if we grant that most people, if asked, will intuitively know what you mean by spirit, for example when we hear phrases like "team spirit" or "spirit of 76," it is something that still eludes specificity and agreed meaning. Some will recognize it as a valid concept, yet fairly argue that it is merely a useful abstraction or practical fiction (similar to words like "nature" or "chance"), or else a synonym for an emotion, such as enthusiasm (as in the above examples.)

Spirit is often perhaps confused with soul in that soul itself is typically viewed as spirit, or at least "a" spirit. However, the distinction perhaps to be made is that while "soul" consists of our individual life in all its aspects, intellectual, emotional and sensual, brought together in our person internally, and as well perhaps, including its affect on others, the "spirit" is that which gives or is the soul's truth and life. So that, according to this interpretation soul has no being without spirit. Yet spirit is not the possession of one life or one truth, but life and truth themselves in which all souls partake. It makes no sense to speak of soul without an animating force (such as "spirit"), and a soul without life is no soul at all.

Both soul and spirit are similar in that both are most usually spoken of as not being limited by spatio-temporal considerations, (though certainly there have been those like Descartes and Samuel Clarke who saw the soul as being circumscribed by space.) Possibly the further defining difference to be realized lies in the belief that while an individual soul necessarily requires spirit, spirit is by comparison a much greater force that, as far as we know does not necessarily require a given soul. Of course, it is in part from this belief of something greater than soul that we obtain the notion of God. Or perhaps its from God that we get spirit. God is, or else the ultimate source of, that spirit which makes, soul, thought, emotions, sensations all possible. According to this view, to call this power merely "life" fails to bring out its all transcendent and unifying nature which surmounts what is merely mind, emotion or what is physical, since life might be easily categorized as merely a form of one of these. Yet such, we should emphasize, is only one of the many possible views about spirit.

The various efforts to define spirit, as listed above, each reflect a belief (inasmuch as it is possible to characterize them) in what life's essence consists, with a given emphasis on our rational intellect, volition, consciousness, or soul, with possibly some conceptual overlapping of any one of these into one, some or all of the others. If, as is in Hegel, spirit is viewed as reflecting the infinite or the Absolute, that leaves us with the difficult problem of how to know or describe it within the context of the finite. For Hegel, while we don't know spirit in its true being and meaning, our finite minds and natures nevertheless potentially allow us some valuable

[94] Soul itself might be thought of either as spirit. Or else soul might be perhaps a substance and or harmony (form) complementary and synchronized (if we like Leibniz's idea of spiritual mechanism) with spirit (higher form.)

inkling of its reality. For Bradley, logic and thought necessary to understanding arise from spirit, and outside spirit there is no reality. The more something is of the spirit, the more real it is, and vice versa. Similarly, but from a quite different orientation, William Blake saw what was most real in the spirit, but that the spiritual was best realized in the artistic imagination. Plato's notion of idea, is similar, in that what was "ideal" was what was most (or more) real, and vice versa.

What then makes the term "spirit" so difficult to get at is that it conceivably takes on many roles, functions, and purposes simultaneously, indeed probably unlike anything else we can possibly think of. There is really nothing akin to it in experience that we can liken it to. Again, the wind is sometimes used as a metaphor for spirit. Like the wind, it is commonly thought of as an invisible force that comes to us unexpectedly and stirs our feeling and imagination, the way the Aeolian harp is stirred in Coleridge. But unlike an ordinary wind, it is a wind we can seek after. It is that for which we long, and yet which we share a part with and which causes this longing in us. For some kinds of idealists or else rationalists, it is the life of being, thought and reason without any or little reference to sentiment. For others, sentiment is very much an essential aspect of spirit.

For our purposes, it would perhaps help if we spoke of spirit as being one "thing," yet with two separate manifestations: mind-spirit and heart-spirit, with the understanding at some point they needs must join and connect. The mind-spirit view tends to see spirit as ultimate reality, ideality, law or principle, and less so as a *physical* force. The heart-spirit view tends to see spirit as a quasi-physical force or energy which acts according to mysterious laws or principles. In a sense, spirit in its most practical sense signifies the existence and or state of the mind and heart's most full and consummate unification and harmonization. For some, God is necessary to bring this unification and harmonization about.

Spirit in the heart-spirit sense is seen as affecting both mind and heart together. In the mind-spirit view, spirit is experienced exclusively in the mind. Now I use mind-spirit and heart-spirit here not as hard and fast concepts, but rather as working ones to help get at better idea of what spirit is or might be. It should be pointed out that by "heart-spirit" I really mean heart-mind-spirit, and that it is wrong to think of the heart forming beliefs without direct cooperation with mind. Heart-mind, therefore, means heart and mind working together seeking the greater good. What the greater or greatest good is will depend upon the individual. In some traditions, the greater good will be thought of in heart-mind terms as say in the notions of love, truth, and beauty. In its use, heart-mind might emphasize the importance of heart over mind, with the two yet working together or it might refer to the equality of heart and mind in forming values and beliefs. Further, we could arrange these notions in various ways, for example, mind-heart-spirit, heart-mind-spirit, with greater emphasis given to heart or mind, depending on the person. Even further, we might suggest that a person can experience variations of heart-mind-spirit emphases, within a given person, and differently in the same person on different occasions. However, for simple convenience sake, I will forbear such nice possible distinctions and instead retain the more simple "mind-spirit" and "heart-spirit."

Beliefs of the spirit are different beliefs of either the mind or heart for a number of reasons. One is that spirit, as ordinarily conceived, is a force, power, or principle that works within or between the mind, the heart, the body, or all three, and its presence is made manifest in one, some, or all of these "locations." Spirit itself has no "location," the way we ordinarily think of mind and heart as located in certain areas in our body. It is something separate, yet a necessary part of us, which can come to us or we go to it.

When I speak then of "belief based in spirit," what I really mean is a kind of belief arising in mind and or heart, so that what one person might see as a belief of mind (or say heart), another might say is spirit, or yet another might say it is both mind and spirit.

It would no doubt be quite exhausting to attempt to enumerate, let alone examine with care, the many different kind of mind-spirit, heart-spirit, other views about "spirit," and how any one or all of these relates to a given thinker's notion of soul. We ought, however, again mention that frequently in religion, (thinking particularly, but not exclusively, of Christianity), God, as spirit himself, serves as the synthesis and unity of mind-spirit and heart-spirit, since otherwise mind and heart would seem to be at odds struggling for dominance and authority in a person's soul. *He* is the being of both heart and mind. This is to say, heart and mind would conflict inasmuch as one or the other might (or would) ignore or trivialize the other's importance. For this reason, God, as one spirit in both acts to reconcile them under his supreme authority. The idea of there being a mind-heart-spirit in Christianity is one in which the spirit of truth, or the Holy Spirit, is known and experienced in mind and heart together. Some poets, including Wordsworth whom we quoted, tend toward a similar view, but without necessarily stressing orthodox theology.

For Christian mystics like St. John of the Cross and Teresa of Avila, the soul comes to itself which is God present within (the "kingdom of God".) The heart, or spirit acting through love, plays as important or greater a role as intellect in this communion.

For some the intellectual mind is the seat of the soul, and, again, for a neo-Platonist the role of spirit might be thought of as taken up by Ideas and reasoning. In Plotinus, the world or universe itself has a soul, which an individual soul is derived from and which an individual soul can know and relate to like any another soul. The spirit, so to speak, is what gives life to both the All-Soul and individual soul. It is the all-unifying and absolute One ("God"), followed by the Intellectual-Principle (translator Stephen McKenna's term) or Divine Ideas and Reason. An individual soul has three parts: 1. the appetitive, 2. that which is capable of thought, ideas

and reason, and 3. "Thumos" or that aspect of the soul capable of curbing appetite, and taking orders from reason. Some lexicons define "Thumos" as "heart's wishes or spirit." This definition would be like our use of heart-spirit here, or belief based in heart. Emotions, and for that matter what we are calling here heart, for a Platonist, then are merely an aspect of body or the physical, and are inferior to ideas, thought and reason, though, this said, still possessing value.

With Chrysippus, a materialist, when a soul is affected by an external object it endures modification, and, by changing its (what we think of) as form, becomes something else. The ruling function that has control over the soul formation is reason, which distinguishes between true and false presentations, and which can modify us internally (by means of our own reasoning) or externally (the force of reason moving in the world.) In this sense reason might be thought of as acting as spirit which the soul possesses and or be a part of.

So much for what might be said here about soul and spirit.

What I would like then to do is present *one* theory of spirit which perhaps some will find more consistent with objective standards (though far be it from me to try and raise it out of its subjective status by any demonstration), and on this basis further endeavor to ascertain how spirit related beliefs *might* be objectively viewed and conceptualized. Perhaps to try to do so, is futile, as active spirit cannot be adequately translated into passive ideas, as per Berkeley (and, albeit in a somewhat in a different context, Bergson as well.) Nevertheless, we will try to say something that will permit a better objective sense of the concept, and possibly from this, spirit itself.

If mind-spirit and heart-spirit are valid notions, how might they be related? Are they really two separate entities? Or are they are aspects of one entity, spirit, which manifests itself differently to heart and mind respectively? Significantly mind-spirit and heart-spirit, are similar in that they both bespeak a harmony and unity. The one is the unity of thought (restricted to thought though with perhaps acknowledgment of very minimal feeling). The other is the unity of emotion and imagination. Both partake of the infinite or the indeterminate, as this could logically be said to be the necessary grounds or assumption for what is finite. Hence the word "spirit" is invoked on behalf of mind and heart to express (for objective purposes) hypothecated realities which defy more ordinary knowledge, definition, and spatio-temporal description, which relies on more explicit identification and classification.

In mind-spirit view, unity of thought prefers to keep feeling at a distance, or at least feeling should not play any decisive role in that process called idealism which is governed by logic or reason. Ultimate unity takes place in thought, and while our emotions can delight in that unity, they are to "look, but not touch," so to speak.

With heart-spirit, heart and mind act as one. It is not strictly necessary that the mind be "turned off." Indeed the mind is the heart's necessary assistant in helping the heart to realize unity and spirit moving in it. On the other hand, as a practical matter too much analysis, deduction, cogitation and general can spoil the effect of emotion. There are ways in which the two must harmonize. For example, if the teacher imparts to the student great truth, but that truth the student cannot comprehend, then the truth, in that circumstance gets lost. So it is with feeling. If the mind cannot express itself in a way that feeling can comprehend, and which respects feeling role as the center for heart spirit, than the sophisticated mind becomes useless to the heart. Yet if the mind is attuned to the heart's proper needs and aspirations it can raise the heart–spirit up to heights of feeling, of unity and harmony, which the heart by itself might never know as possible. Again, here we can point to great music and poetry as instances of heart-spirit in its higher realizations. It is heart which seems to prompt the mind. Yet it is mind that keeps the energy of heart's emotions energy from spilling over into chaos. The heart is the spirited horse, full of energy and life, while the mind is the rider guiding the reins, yet a rider who lets the horse experience its fullest freedom, and unity of being within that experience of freedom.

What seems to truly join both mind and heart is pursuit of the higher good, which is not something selfish, or self-absorbed, but a (mostly) selfless good which commands a higher unity and harmony, for example "God," in turn seen by means of truth, moral virtue, and beauty These greater unities are something which both mind and heart can on their respective levels understand and experience in isolation (to *some* extent anyway.) Yet much loftier are their experiences when they act together to seek and realize the higher good. This acting together, or sublime experience of mind and heart acting together in this fashion, is (what I would call) heart-spirit.

Both mind-spirit and heart-spirit beliefs are relatively rare among ordinary people. But mind-spirit experience is even less commonly encountered than heart-spirit experience. Art, music and poetry, we usually find, are more readier understood than philosophy or science. They are both a kind of idealism, in that both heart and mind are absorbed or taken up in "spirit." Theirs' is a manifestation of seeking a greater whole to life and being than that which more common thinking is either aware of, or concerns itself with.

The conventional view of mind-sprit idealism is that of viewing people or things in a manner that they transcends ordinary understanding, experience and materialistic interests. We see this kind of idealism particularly in the Rationalists, like Spinoza and Leibniz, and in the formal Idealistic schools of, such as that Schelling and Hegel. But it can justifiably be said to be characteristic of most of philosophy in general.

Heart-spirit idealism, by comparison, we encounter much more frequently and see expressed in religion, poetry, music, the arts, history and patriotism, and lesser kinds of idealism as in entertainment and sports.

Such sentimental or emotional idealisms, since they are so pronouncedly subjective, are disparaged by some as myth. Idealists tend to believe that what is most ideal represents what is most good, since it is most good it is therefore most real. The various mind-spirit and heart spirit idealists will approach the matter differently. But generally speaking these are a plausible characterization of both. More sophisticated idealists will see a person or thing highly admired and adored not as *the* good itself, but as rather a manifestation or embodiment of the true good which is invisible, e.g. God, Ideals, Beauty, Nature, Spirit, the Absolute, etc. The practical materialist and dogmatic skeptic, on the other hand will often sees such notions as myth. These "myths," they might contend, may serve a useful function. But even if ideals are granted to be a valid reality, for practical reasons, they are hardly superior, *objectively speaking*, to the reality of the everyday world as understood in the physical sciences.

Is idealism, and the various mind-spirit and heart-spirit, views, only myths and wishful thinking? Or do they possibly express objective truth? And even if idealism is only wishful thinking is it possible it serves a legitimate function of inspiring and promoting morals, that is the very morals, which in turn foster the honesty, integrity, and courage necessary for proper scientific progress and inquiry?[95]

Let's, for instance, examine the idealism which emanates from a historical figure like Daniel Boone. There is Daniel Boone the real person, Daniel Boone, the person popularly idealized in people's imagination, and the Daniel Boone who is seen as consistent with both. Our view, knowledge, or understanding of Daniel Boone can never be purely one or all of these, since part of what makes the real Daniel Boone who he is is the idealization (and or myth making) that accompanies him.

We do not know the "real" Daniel Boone in either the down to earth or the absolute sense. And even if we had met him, this goes far short of what it would mean to know who he was in "reality." Did Daniel Boone himself, let alone those close to him, know who he *really was*? Can anyone, even the most perceptive Boswell, know who anyone *really* is? Yet there is a degree to which we can know *some* things about the real Daniel Boone, if not the complete and purely real Daniel Boone in himself entire or mostly.

As a mythical and idealized figure we do not really know who Daniel Boone was, since as a purely idealized figure he was, by definition, not the "real" Daniel Boone. If we want to speak of the ideal Daniel Boone in some Platonic sense, this is well, but even so, unless we were divine we could not know the ideal as real either. Yet there is a degree to which the ideal Daniel Boone, who embodies heart stirring qualities and certain admirable virtues is real, and who can be objectively known. There is a Daniel Boone who is known from physical evidence and real experience. Yet from these same sources we can also know that his life reflected and manifested certain high ideals and morals realized and made palpable. If Daniel Boone lived his life in such a way that was consistent with high ideals or morals, and to the degree he did, then it is possible to speak of an *ideal* Daniel Boone being *real*. Even if he back-slid, or erred, and thus fell short of a certain greater ideal, still it is possible to distill what is positive from his life story, and on this basis, say what was real also reflected or manifested what was ideal. In this way, and as long as the discrepancy between what is good from what was less than good about him is not too great, then is not the idealism emanating from Boone's life not part of his reality, as much as the clothes he wore, food he ate, or idiosyncrasies he possessed? If such idealization has a certain legitimate and rationally consistent basis in fact it offers a reasonable way by which to encourage ideals and morals in others, without having to resort to absurd myths or fictions for this purpose.

The real person, as best we might know them is inevitably going to have flaws. The ideal, (as in "perfect") person, for us at least, does not exist. Yet the real person in their most ideal light is best of any person, and it is this real person justified both in reality and ideals that one, arguably, should most aspire desire to emulate or, look to as an example. To same approach can be applied to Nature also with respect to both morals aesthetics.

From a theistic view, one might say that God sees more the idea of us than the moment to moment real we usually see ourselves as living our lives in. But God must be known in conformity with reason, morals, and aesthetics, and the more moral and aesthetic minded we are the more we can increase our power of belief. If we ourselves can know what God knows in this way, perhaps spirit is the necessary medium or "way" for doing so.

In the long run then, it may be that the idea of someone or something is more real that the physical person or thing it represents. Works of art, music, literature, expressions of wisdom, heroic deeds are normally seen as dated in sequential time. Yet in terms of higher truth they might be seen as manifestations, morally and aesthetically, of the eternal which emanates through and is the source of sequential time. In this way a certain magnificent or especially moving work of art, for example, is never really dated to those who choose to view

[95] Perhaps it can be said an ideal is the unknown, yet real, source of something of highest value, and that, like or identical to spirit, we know the ideal by its effects, though never it.

things from the perspective of eternity.[96] This eternal, perhaps thought of as emanating from God for some, could be seen as a divine light thing which renders all these persons, works and deeds as so many stars shining in a celestial firmament of ideal truth, goodness and beauty. Rather than viewing ourselves in isolation from the past we can be part of it: in thought, values, loves, emotions, or physical ties (as in a culture or nation, for example.) As Royce says: "A very definite event must be viewed by each believer as part of the history of his own personal salvation. Otherwise, the community would lose its coherence."[97] The persons, the works, the activities of a community become the collective consciousness of that community. In this way, the collective consciousness, based on moral and aesthetic beliefs, is not an empty abstraction, but a real moving force.

If there are dangers to idealism, they lie in the dangers posed by gross hypocrisy, irrationality and insincerity. Deifying the finite (i.e. idolatry) and oversimplification pose dangers as well, as in E. T. A. Hoffman's story "The Jesuit Chapel in G," where the possession of what is ideal leads to its destruction. If we presume to think we intellectually can fully comprehend and cage what is ideal we murder it. We do this by not appreciating that the ideal is not of ourselves as such, but of heaven, i.e. it is far behind a veil which is ultimately beyond our fallen natures, and which given the fallen nature of the world mostly eludes us. Yet though an ideal may be ruined in our presumption toward it. Yet, interestingly, we can sometimes return to it, if our attitude and disposition be right and humble, and see it again in, or some semblance of, in its once glowing and ethereal colors. A good song, drama, or work of art is timeless. But it's not always timely. So that:

He who binds to himself a joy
Does the winged life destroy;
But he who kisses the joy as it flies,
Lives in eternity's sunrise.

The poet's truth may, arguably, be superior to the mind's objective rational truth. Yet for the practical world, its application is ostensibly limited, all the more so as a given community lacks adequate morals and aesthetics. It will not do to dismiss all subjectivity as nonsense, though much subjectivity, of course, is. The quality of a belief as subjective does not in itself render it false. This having been said, subjective beliefs communicated must be identified and qualified for what they are, and the more a belief is divorced from objective criteria and evidence, certainly it should all the more be viewed with skepticism as *objective* belief.

Spiritual and idealistic beliefs are, as a practical matter subjective, and people's views of and about spirit are so various that only with some difficulty can we objectively agree on whether spirit exists, and if it does exist exactly what it is. It is conceivable certainly that this need not be the case. Yet, as of this date in time at least, this is how it is. Agreement among well-meaning people as to spirit's existence will still not, in my opinion, make it objective due to the large variety of ways it can be interpreted: rationally and emotionally --- both of which have valid claims to its realization and its interpretation. We see and feel the affects of spirit, and in so many ways, that we are at a loss to know exactly what it is and where it truly ends. In addition, and more significantly, its potentially infinite character, and its being a non-object, makes adequate proof and description of it, exceptionally challenging, if not unattainable.

Objective thought presupposes morals, as per honesty, and no one need be thought rash by embracing the concept of spirit (in whatever form) as a basis and incentive to morals (or for that matters aesthetics.) If we at least accept it as plausible hypothesis, until proven false, its usefulness in this way justifies itself. For those who really do believe in the notion, spirit will mean much more than this. One cannot debate another by empirical proof or syllogism into faith, spiritual or otherwise, especially of that which comprehends the nature of ourselves, the universe, and all that lies between and beyond it. Yet for those who don't believe in "spirit," it should not be so objectionable a hypothesis, given its utility in potentially nurturing honesty and courage in the search for truth.

[96] Though grated its enjoyment may not necessarily be suitable for all occasions as such.
[97] *The Problem of Christianity.*

V. Belief, Action, and Purpose

To return some points raised earlier, if all that we think of as knowledge, whether intellectual, emotional, or spiritual (if we allow the concept) is simply a useful label for what would more accurately be called "confirmed" belief, what then is belief?

If what we think of as "knowledge" is actually belief, I think it can be readily conceded that while a proposition or alleged fact can be true or false without someone believing it so, no person who does speak of something as true or false can do so without engaging in belief. In this sense, then belief is something required of true or false claims, and statements of fact, that a person might make. Or to put it another way, to speak of truth, or of something being true, requires or commands belief, and it makes no sense to speak of this or that knowledge being correct or not correct, true or not true, unless someone believes it to be so.

For William James, belief outside its applicability to action has no meaning. According to James, if we believe something and that belief does not affect our present or future behavior or actions, that belief has no real significance or purpose. This is the basis of his pragmatism. If what James claims is so, we could as well add that there is no action on our part without some amount of belief. At least it is very difficult to conceive of conscious action without belief on the part of someone. This would include one's action when we are "forced" by another. Examples of the latter would be instances where we are physically forced to do something, say as when a physician moves your finger in examination, or else test your reflexes. Somewhere in the chain of events, and though granted we may have been deceived along he way, we have consciously agreed and in some measure, however so small, allowed whatever happens to take place.

To speak of blind force, acting without belief, completely moving our actions while plausible in theory has little to convincingly affirm it in experience. If the heat of the (ostensibly) unconscious, non-believing sun causes me discomfort and compels me to take shade, it is my belief that the discomfort will adversely affect my well-being that prompts my action. There is, of course, an extent to which instinct will cause one to react this way unthinkingly. But in that case instinct perhaps can be characterized as a unique kind of belief innate to me, namely, that is the belief that my well-being matters. Likewise, if our limb moves without our conscious willing that it does so, such an action is ultimately connected with this same belief about our well-being. We can say that God or Nature instilled in me this belief about the importance of my well-being. Or we could otherwise ascribe this belief to blind physical forces. Yet in either case the fact remains. I possess this inherent *belief* that my well-being matters, and without this belief I would have no basis from which to act out of instinct. What's more, even beliefs which are inherent to us, we can, at least to some extent depending on our powers of thought and will, be later reversed. Faith is first forced upon us, as it were, but as we learn, we discover we have some amount of choice, and while we must believe something. There is nothing potentially we can choose not to believe, though, naturally, some things are harder for us to be skeptical about than others.

As well as belief being the necessary grounds of all knowledge and conscious action, both religious and non-religious would seem to be agreed that belief is what gives something value. That is, to think someone or something is good, bad, indifferent, etc., is to think that someone (perhaps ourselves) believes they are so. This does not mean that value itself necessarily cannot exist outside and independent of human belief, only that inasmuch as humans can and do confer value, as well as make choices as to what is good or desirable, these are ultimately only possible as a result of belief. So as well as being the basis for knowledge and conscious action, beliefs, such as that one's well-being matters, makes possible motives for unconscious or unthinking action.

If the above be admitted, then belief is not only necessary for notions of true and false, but also whether some or something is good or bad. From this we can see how spectacularly our world and our lives in it are shaped by belief, and that belief is as necessary to life as breath. We have seen that that mind and heart (and arguably spirit as well) are the locations, mediums, or jurisdictions where or in which our soul's beliefs have their source and determination, and it is crucial to reflect that as different as thought and emotions are they both have their being in belief. Both seek unity and harmony in their experience, together and or (more or less) separately. Both seek after "the good," in the form of morals and aesthetics, though our ideas on what constitute the moral and the beautiful may differ. The origins of our hearts (i.e. our desiring) and volitions (i.e. our ability to choose) which underlie our belief choices, are (empirically speaking) simply a mystery. In looking towards the genesis of belief, do we believe *then* desire? Or do we desire *then* believe? Such uestions about the primal origins of desire and belief we simply do not know the answer to. Yet we can note that the question may well turn around whether we see Value as (somehow) prior to Existence, or whether we see Existence as prior to Value in importance in our basic view of the world and our lives, since factually there seems no clear way of determining Value or Existence precedes the other whether chronologically, in sequence, precedence, or value. Some might dispute the necessity of making the choice either for one or the other, but its potentially phenomenal implications are nevertheless more than remarkable.

We might, plausibly, say an innate belief precedes desire. On the, the other hand, it might be as well be argued that we start from unconscious desire on the foundation of which then beliefs are formed. But which ever is the better explanation, one would have great difficulty explaining and proving how and why it is so. The religious doctrine of grace, in its various forms, is as good an effort as any as had been made to address the issue.

1) What one believes; 2) what constitutes credible belief; 3) what kind of thoughts and feelings bring one most in unity and harmony with their self, others and experience in general 4) what is it that ultimately brings together thoughts and feelings; 5) what one desires as good, will differ from person to person. Yet that we do believe, that we do adjust to others and ourselves on the basis of mental or emotional belief, that we endeavor, in some measure, to harmonize or unify our thoughts and feelings; that we seek after "good," cannot be denied. It is in this way, through mind, heart and spirit, in some combination working together, forming and seeking to strengthen our beliefs that our lives are lived and realized.

Leaving aside spirit, which here may perhaps be simply characterized as the mind's and heart's intangible and objectively inexpressible synthesis, both mind and heart are necessary for ourselves as individuals, and society as well, to function. However, both mind's and heart's functions overlap to some extent, and hence need be duly respectful of the other's reality. Neither the manager or worker, husband and wife, can serve their function if they wholly usurp the understanding of the other. Each have their separate and necessary role. The captain of a ship should be familiar with sailor's tasks and duties, and similarly the sailor should be acquainted with captain's tasks and duties of the ship. By working together in this way, will the ship sail properly. So it is the intellect must try to understand and respect the heart, and the heart understand and respect the mind. The mind should ultimately rule the heart, that is have *a* final say. Yet the mind lives its life not for itself, but so that the heart can realize its true being. So it is that while the intellect governs, it is the heart, its longing and realization of such longing, for which the life is lived.

We should desire the formal supremacy of intellect over emotion in forming beliefs and making decisions because it is less likely to be deceived than the heart. We all know cases where a person means well. But because they are acting irrationally, in their in ignorance they are really doing more harm than good. Even as much as being cold and lacking in feeling is something to be deplored, still more often it is that gratuitous stupidity and illogic cause injustice and gratuitous hardship and cruelty, even death. Many a horrible crime has been committed by someone who feels they are doing the right thing, yet who, in truth, doesn't begin to know what they are actually doing or talking about.

The more a claim can be made objective the better we are in a position to know whether a given belief is sound. And objectivity is the communal jurisdiction of the intellect. In people's ordinary experience often times what passes for objectivity is observation with little regard for logic. Collective observation is frequently, and quite mistakenly, made the primary criteria for objectivity. There will be those who brush aside logical cross-examination, and say in effect, "we see, therefore we know." The failure of collective observations to hold itself to logical consistency and scrutiny is the source of many errors, often with very serious, in fact tragic, consequences and ramifications. Yet *why* collective observation cannot be held to a more stringent standard of consistency with logic is more usually the fault of the heart not desiring truth sincerely, than it is the mind's fault.

This acknowledged, higher truths, it would seem, can be known emotionally and spiritually which our intellect cannot always readily justify. Such truths, are, however, subjective truths, and as such, should not be objectively asserted (unless within an already understood poetical or preaching context.) Nor should they be physically imposed upon another, but should be seen as something one voluntarily chooses or not chooses to follow or adhere to. Subjective beliefs may or may not contradict proper objective beliefs. But if they do, all that is necessary to prevent dire conflict is to see that subjective beliefs are not forced upon another, or at least such forcing be kept to an absolute minimum.

Of course, dispute will invariably arise as to whether a belief is subjective or objective, and deciding which is not always an easy matter. I am not suggesting that because a belief is objective that it is appropriate to force it upon another. Yet where force is deemed necessary to be used upon another, it should be based substantially on objective belief. One thing is certain, and that is that such determinations (if they are to be justified), whether as subjective or objective belief, will be decisively facilitated with an equal and impartial attentiveness to honesty, logic and observation.

The soul, or our life, as it comes together in mind, heart and spirit, is constantly driven toward the good in general. But our individual and collective notions of the good are subjective. Most conflict arises in our not knowing objectively what the good truly is or if we do agree as to what the good is, how it is to be attained. We are, in this way, prompted largely by beliefs that are subjective, and even our objective beliefs (if we are honest about it) have subjective beliefs as their basis when it comes right down to it. We can only live our own life, not someone else's, and in this way life (in this world) is subjective. Granted, it may be possible to speak of our lives being lived, say in communion with God as some religious mystics have it. Yet, if so, such is either something in our ordinary state we can only appreciate subjectively, or else a kind of knowing for which neither subjectivity or objectivity apply, and hence not something that cannot adequately be described or referred to in ordinary human discourse, as mystics themselves will have conceded.

It will perhaps be again objected that if our experience, outside possible and literal communion with God, is fundamentally subjective, is there no *real* objective truth? Is objective truth, as we know it, merely something we agree upon without being truly certain that it corresponds with reality? The fact is that there is (for us) no real objective truth, in the sense that it is unqualified truth. What we think of as real objective truth, even including principles of logic and mathematics, are ultimately provisional truths, working truths, guesses, beliefs, and wagers. Yet this faced up to, we can, nevertheless, reasonably speak of degrees of truth, based on

First and Secondary objective criteria enunciated earlier. That logic, reason, language, experience, community give us means to absolute truth, we really don't know. They may indeed do or have that potential to do so. But as a *practical* matter we have no better methods or alternatives of arriving at what is or isn't objectively true, so it is well and mete that we go by these.

Yet more important than even the ability to arrive at objective truth (that is the ability of a community of people to decide upon what is real or isn't real, true or isn't true) is the need for morals. Without an assurance of honesty, as we pointedly emphasize, there is no objective truth, and without fundamental morals, of some kind, there is no assured honesty. Honesty, of course as we have and will continue to emphasize, plays a key part in subjective belief as well, since if we are not honest with ourselves we can also be given to error in our judgments. Morals, certainly with respect to honesty, then are the necessary basis for all correct belief, subjective or objective. They are, as well, arguably a necessary foundation for making our heart consistent with mind, and vice versa (as will be considered). It will then be reasonably objected that if our knowledge of morals precedes all other principles of mind and heart, how do mind and heart discern and decide to believe what morals are, or what the moral law is and in what it consists?

Desire for good, of one kind or another is the driving force in our lives. Experience shows, that there are essentially two kinds of desires for "good:" desire for our well being, and desire for the well being of others (in which we can include love of God, Duty, as well as love of neighbor.) Knowledge only has relevance and meaning if it has purpose. Purpose is only possible if "good," "a good, or "goods," are assumed. Consequently. It can be argued that knowledge, and hence belief, is meaningless without an assumption of a desired "good." In our experience, it is impossible that a person's desires can truly be all one way or the other. We all seek our well-being and that of others in some way, but of course the difference in a person lies in degree of emphasis. Generally speaking, some tend to be more selfish in seeking what is good, some tend to be more selfless. It can be argued that those who are selfless in seeking the good of others, are really only engaged in a kind of enlightened self-interest. This possible objection aside, it seems reasonable to adopt the division, love of self and love of others, as the basis of possible "good." On the granting of this, we can begin to understand what the moral law is. This and our definition earlier of morals, that is, as the principles or rules we follow in order to better obtain the good, will serve as useful starting points. [98]

Is the concept and desire of highest good a free choice? Love is a term often used to denote desire for a highest good, and if we say love is not a choice then the word has no real meaning. The idea of mechanically forced desire is alien to the proper conception of love. Either we must make reference to forced desire, or dismiss the notion of love entirely as either very trivial or meaningless. Again while there are excellent arguments to be made on behalf of free will, I don't believe it is something that can be proven objectively. It is something we will or will not be persuaded to regardless of what arguments are put before us. And as well, of course, as Kant has ably demonstrated, it is one of those metaphysical topics whose solution defies both pure reason and experience. At best we can invoke practical reason to affirm believability in free will. But practical reason, in effect, tells us that we believe in free will only because we believe our idea and desire for what we see as our highest good necessitates it. Otherwise the pursuit of the object of our highest desire is something that takes place without our consent, or is forced on us by someone else. So, in a way, we believe in free will in order that we can say we love. Similarly, as has been long known, if a person is not responsible for his actions, he cannot be credited for his virtues or blamed for his guilt. Admittedly, we can say that we have no free will, and that what we know as love really involves no choice, and this we can do. There is no categorical refuting the determinist here on this point and we must allow and respect his belief. Yet if we examine our hearts and minds we can nevertheless see also that there are many, probably more, sound arguments in support of free will, and that the determinist is equally at a loss to decisively refute us as well. Our consciences speak to the existence of free will. At the same time it should be noted, that in life experience we often see that for those who don't believe in free will, such belief becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy.

There would seem to be three kinds of free will: elemental, practical, and ultimate.

Elemental Free Will is the will to say that an assertion or belief is true or false, or to say that someone or something is good or bad.

Practical free will refers to the more common every day choices we can make with respect to belief and action, which to a large extent will depend on things like our physical ability, powers of reasoning, imagination, and environmental circumstances. These choices usually reflect our seeking of means to achieve some higher end or ends. Compared to ultimate free will, practical free will allows a much wider range of choice. Yet this wider range of choice is of less serious importance compared to the implications of our choice or choices with regard to ultimate free will. Interestingly, objective beliefs, which form the basis of practical free will choices, can in a sense be forced on us from without – to some degree. If we consider the matter, so many of our practical beliefs we simply adopted from someone else. The corollary to this, is that the less we choose to be restricted by any objective criteria we will in a sense be more free in our choice of belief. This potential additional freedom in choice of beliefs, however, does not necessarily imply that our judgments will

[98] It is true that mind and heart (leaving aside spirit) will apparently function without conscious morals, yet every person goes, in one way or other, by rules which they use to obtain what they see as "the good."

be less liable to error. Generally speaing, Secondary objective criteria are easier to avoid and deny than First criteria. Yet even First criteria a given person may have some not inconsiderable power of denying and rejecting.

Ultimate free will is that which allows us to choose to have faith, be moral (using the ordinary meaning of the word), and be rational, or to reject these in favor of external forces or impulses. Ultimate free will is in this sense highly limited because it is as if our only choice is between white and black. True there might be claimed to be degrees to which we move in one direction or the other. But this allowed, there are still only two directions. Advocates of moral law and selfless love will contend that the more we follow the moral law and higher love the freer we are in our choices. Otherwise, ultimate free will is a very restricted kind of free will because the choice between following the (selfless) moral law and higher love versus not following these is, at least on the surface, a very limited selection of alternatives.

Desire for "good" itself is not a choice. Even Buddhists and other religious ascetics who attempt to renounce desire, still it would seem desire, only what they desire is something divine or transcendental rather than material or worldly. Even so, in what we desire we do have some range of choice given the aforementioned kinds of free will.

Can a person reject their own life? Can one say the pains of life make not worth living? Yes, one can, but one cannot, of themselves claim they are being RIGHT or JUST about the matter, because right and just assume an independent standard and authority, such as God to validate their claim. And even if one rejects God's authority in the matter as being biased, we need the authority *of others* to claim something is right or justified. For a single person, in and of themselves, to decide something as right or wrong is meaningless.

Existential questioning about the meaning of life has no meaning while we are asleep. It only has meaning when we are *conscious*. Hence before attempting to determine what the meaning of life is one owes it to themselves to explain what consciousness is, and how is it possible to raise such questioning in the first place.

Is there no answer to the meaning of life question because the question is a vain and false one? In asking for an answer are we not trying to impossibly condense all thought and experience? If we are to speak about a meaning of life it can only be realized in all thought and all experience, our falling short of which we must, if we are honest with ourselves, be humble about, as Job finally was.

VI. The Good[99]

There is a real or at least potential goodness (or if you prefer excellence) to all we see, which goodness could be considered *to some extent* objective. For example, we would say a machine that works, an animal or plant that is healthy, dress that is orderly, figure that is symmetrical – these possess a kind of agreed on goodness or excellence, which is admired, respected, or deserving of sympathy by what we would expect to be most people. Experience tells us that people from entirely different cultures, backgrounds and locations often seem to have an inborn aesthetic and moral sense which defies arbitrary convention or mere collective choice. Despite this, it is unusual for people to insist that our sense of morals and, even less so, beauty are objective. What we more regularly find, including even among intelligent and sensitive people, is the implicit assumption that what we see as good or beautiful is based on a subjective value choice we make, and we respect others their own free choice to decide what they think is good or beautiful. It is a widely held notion of civility and fairness to grant others their right to disagree with us about what is good or beautiful. This acceptance or indulgence of other's freedom of preference appears itself to be morally based principle arrived at by common consent.

Let's say, for instance, that someone sees a healthy flower as being something "bad." Most people will not be offended by a flower's healthiness. And though we might be puzzled by the person's distaste for the sight of a healthy flower, we respect his right of preference when it comes to what does and doesn't please him. In this way we cannot prove that a healthy flower is a good thing, even though experience will tell us that most people will prefer the sight of it to a sickly and deformed one. Of course, there will be those who insist that that such aesthetic standards of value are, based on experience, and hence are true objective belief. Yet the fact that we can choose the one view or the other (while still desirous of what is thought of as moral) suggests that aesthetic choice is ultimately subjective, and not objectively necessary in the way a logical or mathematical conclusion is necessary. We have strong ideas about what is beautiful, even collectively, but we cannot insist on such beliefs as objective the same way we can insist in 2 + 2 =4. The exception to this, however, when, if we hold certain assumptions, for example, "we prefer healthy-looking plants (to sickly)," then certainly we could say a healthy flower is a good thing, and say such was an objective belief. Yet as a practical matter such objective valuation is allowable if everyone or most of the given community to be considered, already share the assumption – but not beyond that community, unless with respect to another community which maintains the same or similar assumption. On this basis, yes, we could speak of there being objective aesthetic judgments. Yet I would only caution that consensus of this kind is generally rare and harder to achieve than objective consensus regarding a fact, though granted there may be circumstances where establishing a fact objectively is more difficult than establishing a aesthetic judgment that will be accepted as objective. Perhaps the reason objective value judgments are more difficult to establish than objective factual judgments, is that objective value judgments seem to require an unanimity factual judgments don't, this again possibly having to do with people's more or less taking for granted others right to like or not like something aesthetically.

Moral beliefs, by contrast to aestehtic, seem to lend themselves to greater objective understanding among people, but only because the need for objective moral standards is seen as much more imperative than the need for aesthetic standards. This is particularly so since civil laws are so important to our immediate survival, and civil laws rely on morals as their foundation and for their enforcement. Other than for this reason, our moral sense, it could be argued, is no less, or not much less, subjective than our aesthetic sense.

The idea that there are *necessary* objective standards of both what is beautiful or moral may after all be a correct notion. Yet value judgments, unlike factual judgments, are subjective. Intuitionists, by contrast, will contend that we intuitively know basic morals principles the same way we know math or logic. This view may be true, but it is not a belief as commonly held as the belief that mathematical and logical conclusions are some how inherently true or objectively verifiable. Perhaps the reason for the discrepancy is that morals tend to be seen as a product of subjective desire and evaluation, while math and logic are seen as value neutral. Nevertheless, there is no reason to think it would be impossible for people to choose to make purported moral intuitions a First objective criteria like (or not much less than) math and logic, since after all the status of math and logic as First objective criteria are themselves ultimately a matter of choice. This is particularly so given the need to be logical and honest in objective truth determination. Having said this, it would seem to be the case that as cognitive morals presuppose logic that they would follow after or be placed simultaneously with logic in importance, but not prior to it. On the other hand, it could be argued that the moral desire is, in a manner of speaking, a First standard of truth arising from the heart. For this reason, morals might be argued as preceding logic, that is if we see heart-"value" belief as preceding or equal to mind-"fact" belief in importance.

Accurate objective truth determination, as normally understood, require some substantial degree of logicality and honesty. The desire to be logical and honest is a value judgment originating in the heart. Such desires, i.e. beliefs that something is "good," are value judgments. It therefore follows (one might argue) that there are objective value judgments, since all true objective judgments presume and require such desire. Yet even if a credible case can be made for the objectivity of value judgments with respect to logicality and honesty as necessary conditions of objective truth, how far other value judgments can be made objective beyond the point of subjectivity is otherwise not so obvious. The desire for truth itself comes to mind as a similar kind of value judgment which might be thought an objective value judgment. But the desire for truth does not

[99] In using the term good in what follows, I do not necessarily mean a particular "*the* good" which I myself have in mind. Rather a "good" is first a someone or something which people desire, and "the good" the sum of a person's desires.

necessarily imply the need to be logical or consistent. We may desire "truth," but the notion by itself, may be seen as something illogical and inconsistent. The idea of truth being something illogical or inconsistent (as say in "chaos" theories of truth or cosmology) would only be objective in a very tenuous sense, perhaps based on Secondary criteria. The desire for logicality and honesty in truth determination, on the other hand, does, by definition, imply our invoking logicality and consistency. And thus, in its relation to First criteria, the desire for logicality and honesty arguably comes more near to an objective value judgment, than the mere desire for "truth" of and by itself. So curiously though we *might* be able to posit the desire for logicality and honesty as being a kind of objective value judgment, the desire for truth, *by itself*, and without such conditions, could not be an objective value judgment.[100]

Previously we spoke of two basic kinds of "good," good that looks primarily to self interest and good that seeks primarily the well being of others, including in "others" idealistic or spiritual notions such as God and Duty.[101] These we might think of as primary or real goods, while goods that further these interests or that derive from these are secondary or practical goods. We might also add enlightened self-interest as a kind of third category, which sees the sincere promoting of other's good as a means to promote one's own good. It is not clear, if we had to decide, whether enlightened self interest should or could fall on the side of self-interest or selfless interest. The point is debatable, and one would have to judge on the basis of individual cases and the given person's depth of sincerity in their concern for others.

Again, I believe, and if we are to judge from experience, there is no pure selfishness or pure selflessness. That Kant believes we can follow duty exclusively for its own sake, without regard to interest, one has a difficult time believing as plausible theory let alone convincing fact.

For one thing the idea seems self-contradictory, for in following moral duty for its own sake is not duty simply made our interest? Or are we not saying our interest lies in practical reason? Even so, the kind of view Kant proposes does have a utility in that it goads us to a purity of intention which, while it may not be realizable, is still worth striving toward -- which perhaps is his point. While we look to duty, there is nothing so terrible about our having a self-interest separate from our seeking personal higher moral development. It might not be so easy to harmonize the two, yet they need not be irreconcilable. In this way, the left hand need not know what the right hand is doing, that is if in our hearts deep down we are sincere. For example, a person might work a job to support others, and while on the job see it as his first priority. Yet really it is for others and himself he works the job, so that in that sense it really is they, not the job, which is the priority. Yet when at work, the others are for the most part forgotten and the job focused on instead.

When then we speak of a selfish or selfish oriented person, or a selfless or selfless oriented person, we are speaking essentially of types, for which there are shades and variations between these two extremes.

With a predominantly selfish oriented person, good generally means that which makes the universe most harmonious *with their self*, in the case of the selfish oriented person (who in terms of importance, in effect, becomes God). In the case of the selfless oriented person, the good is that which that makes them most in harmony *with the universe*, which conception of the universe, depending upon the individual, may or may not include God, or sublime ideals such as Love or Duty.

The purely selfish oriented person believes that the greatest good is that which serves their own well being, regardless of how others are affected. The completely selfish person does not really exist because any given person relies on the well being of others for their own well being to some extent. What makes the more selfish oriented person "what they are" is that (in terms of priority) their-well being is deemed more important than that of others.

Speaking in the abstract, moral laws for a selfish oriented person consists of rules as they suit them. In the notions of supreme selfish interest and that of rule, or law, we have a patent contradiction. In practice, the purpose of a rule or law is to serve a greater or common good than that of any single individual. If the selfish person is to realize his well being as he conceives of his well being to be, he will answer to law or not answer to it as it suits him. Otherwise in respecting the law more than this, by definition, he will be placing the law in equal or greater importance to his own importance, which he cannot do because that would be recognizing a good equal to or greater than himself. And while he may respect the law as it suits him, it becomes unselfish of him to respect it for any other reason. If, out of fear, he obeys the law others impose, this does not mean he values or respects the law, only that he perceives disobedience to it will bring undesirable consequences to his well-being. Rules he might create for himself he will adhere to if he thinks they serve his own well-being. Such rules may, in their conceived purpose, taking into account the interests of others. However, if the rule does not in its application promote his interest equal or more so than that of others, he will have no reason to adhere to it,

---

[100] All this, of course, assumes the superiority of First criteria over Secondary criteria in the determination of objective judgments.

[101] This notion of selfish and selfless interest as polar opposites, I became particularly acquainted with from reading Swedenborg, and leaving aside his speculations regarding spirits in which this view arose, it struck me as a very much pragmatically and experientially founded dichotomy, which accurately characterizes the most basic possible interests. [Supplemental note. In the same vein, Scotus speaks of the will's two-fold inclination: *Affectio commodi*: what is to our advantage, and *Affectio justitae*: inclination or affection for justice. Of course, the Bible, implicitly, and the Jains and Buddhists explicitly were far ahead of all of us in recognizing this moral and psychological truth.]

and the rule will therefore (at least for the time being) cease to be law. He may for example regularly observe rules which tell him to be polite to others. However, if being polite to others is not seen as ultimately serving his interest, there is no need for him to be polite. Consequently, he can choose to disregard the rule about politeness if it is seen as failing to further his interest.

For the more selfish minded person, law if it is to be respected, is to serve his interests first and foremost. To the extent it does not, as he sees it, there is that much less reason for him to have regard for the law. Consequently, the more selfish a person is the less likely he will feel it necessary to adhere to his own or anybody else's law, other than that supreme rule of his own making which places his own well being above that of all others. As a practical matter, respect and adherence to the law for a selfish person is a matter of convenience or forced circumstance. Law or moral principles will deserve no honor or respect except as they serves that person's selfish interest. Hence, in any conflict between their perceived self interest and law, law loses its importance for them. In sum, the more selfish a person is the less important is law. So it is with very selfish individuals or communities one is more likely to find lawlessness, and decisions made more out of caprice rather than rule or principle, other then their supreme principle of (perceived) self-interest. A person's making their self-interest enlightened could and does mitigate the problem of selfishness somewhat, Nonetheless enlightened self-interest is a demanding calling, since if our first love is with self then it would seem all kinds of unforeseen complications might arise despite our sincere and fairness minded intentions. This is not to insist that it is impossible or unfeasible to live a just and moral life as a person of enlightened self-interest, only for the vast majority of the people I think it would be highly difficult and impractical (assuming, as part of their enlightened outlook, they are being honest with themselves.).

By contrast a selfless oriented person, that is someone who puts other people, God, or the simple and the innocent above his own worldly interest. This kind of person will more likely be consistent in following moral rules than the selfish person, as he has less reason or justification to disobey them as the selfish one does. It could be claimed that the so-called selfless person observes the rule, at the expense of his worldly self-interest perhaps, but that he still acts selfishly with a mind to "other-worldly" self-interest, that is the self-interest of a future life. Yet (even if viewed this way) such "other-worldly" self-interest the more genuinely selfish person is not going to possess, since he sees himself as the higher good, not God, justice, the moral law. At the same time, it makes little sense, even if we see the selfless person acting selfishly (i.e. with a mind toward other-worldly rewards for example), for him to disobey a moral rule, since what we might call eligibility toward such rewards (ordinarily interpreted) depends on his sincere attitude toward such rules, which are typically against selfishness.

Unlike the selfish oriented person, the selfless person is less likely to say "this rule interferes with my feelings of well-being, therefore I do not feel it necessary to obey it." In this (I believe at any rate) we see that the selfless oriented person, even if we consider him as acting on the basis of enlightened self-interest, is more prone to observe moral rules of conduct than the selfish oriented person will observe rules. Moral rules, or any rules for that matter, then have greater power and sway with a selfless oriented person then with a selfish one. It is true that we know selfish people who will stubbornly adhere to certain rules and regular kinds of conduct. Nevertheless, if they chanced for very long to view those rules (or a given rule) as contrary to their worldly self-interest there would be no reason for them to follow or respect those rules. The more selfless a person is, on the other hand, the more there is a tendency to respect and follow rules whose purpose is to serve others or a higher interest. As Bergson says: "obedience to duty means resistance to self."[102] For "duty" here, we might substitute "rules" or "laws." If this is so, some amount of undue emphasis on self leads to lawlessness. Conceivably an "undue" about of selfless might seem also to create lawlessness, for the simple reason of excess. But even if allowed, this seems less likely as we would expect such excess to be counterbalanced by a greater respect for rules, and hence presumably temperance – though granted there may be highly unusual cases to defy this reasoning. Yet even if so, cases where a person's selflessness and altruism are so out of control as to be lawless and harmful to others would have to be extremely rare, John Brown's abolition resistance being perhaps a good example of such to consider for this purpose.

Not only morals, but truth and reality themselves can be pursued in either selfish or selfless ways. Russell makes the following interesting remark in this regard: "The true philosophic contemplation, on the contrary, finds its satisfaction in every enlargement of the not-Self, in every thing that magnifies the objects contemplated, and thereby the subject contemplating. Everything in contemplation, that is personal or private, everything that depends on habit, self interest or desire, distorts the objects and hence impairs the union which the intellect seeks. By thus making a barrier between subject and object, such personal and private things become a prison to the intellect."[103] If this is true, than not only will selflessness enhance our capacity to be moral, but it will also help to enhance our capacity for higher truth. It would be wrong to say that selflessness necessarily implies a capacity for higher truth. Yet what we can say is that a person with the capacity for higher truth more likely than not possesses a greater than usual sense of selflessness. Selflessness, in this way, can recognize a greater and more powerful unity outside the self in the form of logic, reason, balance, harmony, God, and therefore is more open to embrace these as both the bases and goals of their desires and beliefs. A

[102] *The Two Sources of Morality and Religion*.

[103] *The Problems of Philosophy*, XV. The *Maitri Upanishad* offers the interesting comparison: "Whenever the soul has thoughts of 'I' and 'mine' it binds itself with its lower self, as a bird with the net of a snare." Yet the question arises, can we be too much concerned for others, whether in theory or in practice?

person who literally sees highest unity in themselves before all others and all else one would think would be a very confused person.

There seems to me no reason to believe that selflessness and sympathy are less inborn in us as selfishness, though certainly some individuals will be more endowed or given to one than the other. We might say we naturally have both dispositions, but that one is nurtured or encouraged at the expense of the other. If selfishness seems more common, it may not so much be the result of our inherent natures as of conditioning over time. Personally, I don't see any reason for not thinking so. True, selflessness ordinarily requires more conscious effort and choice than being selfish, and perhaps it is the additional effort and necessary power of resolution which makes the selflessness less common than selfishness. Observing people very generally, they don't seem pronouncedly selfish or selfless. Yet in given circumstances one or the other disposition can or will clearly manifest itself in a person.

In response to Hobbes' and other's argument that self-love is the primary drive or motive operating in people Frances Hutcheson offered this response:

"Another author thinks all this (parental love of children) is easily deducible from self-love. 'Children are not only made of our bodies, but resemble us in body and mind; they are rational agents as we are, and we only love our likeness in them.' Very good all this. What is *likeness*? It is not *individual sameness*; it is only being included under one general or specifical idea. Thus there is likeness between us and other men's children, thus any man is like any other, in some respects….Is there then a natural disposition in every man to *love his like*, to wish well not only to his individual self, but to any other like rational or sensitive being?…If all this is called by the name *self-love*; be it so: the highest mystic needs no more disinterested principle; it is not confined to the individual but terminates ultimately on the good of others, and may extend to all; since each one some way resembles each other. Nothing can be better than this self-love, nothing more generous." [104]

Concern for the good of others, possibly including in this God and higher ideals, is the foundation of more consistent adherence to and force of moral rules. Love of others and, as well (at least for many people), a devotion to God (or other non-selfish ideal principle) as the ultimate higher goodness and authority gives people a stronger more easily enforceable system of rules or law. By contrast, selfishness tends to weaken and debilitate the force of rules, whether it is selfishness on the part of those who administer the rules, those who are governed by them, or both.

Kinds of "good" which could be selflessly desired, or else desired as a matter of enlightened self-interest, (and without insisting on the particular order or demarcation given here) are:

a. God, the Creator, the Absolute, or ultimate essence or embodiment of goodness, Unity, Being, and authority, etc.
b. Highest Principles or Ideals: for example, Wisdom, Reason, Beauty, Virtue, the Moral law itself. For example, Aristotle states: "The good for man is an activity of the soul in accordance with virtue, or if there are more kinds of virtue than one, in accordance with the best and most perfect kind."[105]
c. The well-being or happiness of other persons or people in general, and not restricted to one's community.
d. The well-being or happiness of other persons and people in general, and including animals (as "secondary" persons)
e. The well-being or happiness of other persons or people but restricted to community, i.e. family, town, nation, faith, etc.

For a given individual the "good" might consists of one, some or all of these, or possibly some or all could be seen as aspects of one unified good: "God," typically being that unified good. How such concepts as contained, for example, in the Highest Principles or Ideals, or "well-being" are interpreted can vary from person to person, as can the degree of emphasis or importance which one might place on one or some of these "goods."[106]

The moral law itself as "good" is an interesting notion because with it is both *the object* of our desire, or purpose of our conduct, and as well, *the rules* by which we achieve that purpose. The Jewish people who are the most famous for devotion to the law have normally seen its observance as a means of serving God; and it is God's great goodness, both in his person and towards benefiting themselves, which is their reason for following His law. See, for example, how the law is viewed in Psalms. It can be argued that such unqualified devotion to the moral law, that is the moral law for its own sake, is the only proper way of fulfilling God's purpose. Yet this still leaves us with God's purpose as "the good," not the moral law itself. While the moral law can for us be the highest embodiment or manifestation of God, it cannot be God himself since rules must come from someone or something else, and laws by their nature serve someone or something else.

---

[104] *An Inquiry Concerning the Original of Our Ideas of Virtue or Moral Good.*
[105] *Nich. Ethics*, 1098a16-18.
[106] In a given moment or on a given occasion our greatest good might be ignored or even rejected. This is not unusual. Yet by its nature we invariably return to whatever we desire as our greatest good despite such moments or occasions.

Lastly here, to give us some additional perspective, we ought to quote a fragment of Epicurus which states: "That which creates unsurpassable joy is the removal of a great evil. And this is the nature of good if one grasps it correctly and then holds steadily to it, without walking about uttering vain rubbish about the good."

There are less traditional and more modern views of the highest good which have humanity and or the human intellect as the highest good without especial reference to God or ideals as such. Yet I think it fairly obvious that such views themselves are a kind of idealism which *assumes* humanity's well-being, or, similarly, assumes the greatness of the human intellect (say with respect to science and technology, for example) *a priori*. One of the main problems with such views is that they fail to adequately explain in what well-being for humanity consists, or in the case of the greatness of the *human* intellect, on what validates its supreme importance – seeing that it has no competition outside of animals. Such views will sometimes suffer from the same ambivalence of motive and arbitrariness for which traditional religious and idealists will have been dismissed or disregarded.

Some have clamed that one can discern "ought," or the good, by simply looking at past experience to derive it. Because people have desired such and such good in the past, and it has satisfied them, that is what we ought to desire. There is truth to this argument, because what ever the good is it is likely that people have desired it before and that it has (in some way) satisfied them. Yet this fails to tell us how to tell real good from false good, or greater good from lesser. The goal of ought is that which is better, perfect, or some approach to perfection. We can draw from experience to assist and make practical our visualization of perfection. Yet it cannot be experience alone which provides the notion of it or the "better" which we pursue, any more than experience alone can show us the origin of desire, and which perfection would seem to imply.

Experience can give us examples of perfection but not perfection *itself*. The notion of perfection, like harmony, and balance exists outside any particular experience, even though experience gives us examples of where it seems to be manifest. We can see instances of persons or objects possessing a quality derived from or like perfection. But it would be incorrect to (literally) call that person or objection "perfection." We can say, however, that such persons or objects are manifestations of perfection, which is otherwise an intangible kind of form or entity. It can be argued that without experience perfection would have no existence. Assuming this to be true, no single given experience or experiences can account for notions such as perfection, harmony, or balance. Experience reveals these notion to us, but they, in themselves, are something somehow separate from those specific manifestations of which experience is made up.

Gassendi and others have argued or suggested that perfections, such as those attributed to God, are those which exist or existed in humans, collected in thought, and then amplified in the imagination. While this might help to explain why we have the idea of their being greater excellence or perfection, it doesn't explain why we have the ideas of excellence or perfection to begin with. We might know there is such a thing as "color" by having seen a number of colors, but this still leaves us to explain from whence and how these colors arose, whether chronologically in terms of our experience (knowing them), or in terms of the explanation of them with respect to the concept of color.

Boethius states: "Since all things are desired for the sake of the good in them, no one desires them as much as the good itself."

Later adding: "The various things that the majority of men pursue are not perfect and good, for the reason that they differ from one another, and because they are lacking to one another and cannot confer full and perfect good. On the other hand, true good does come about when they are brought together in one form and efficient power, as it were, so that sufficiency becomes identical with power, reverence, glory, and pleasure."[107]

For Boethius perfection or the good is not seen in the senses. The senses can pick up one or many forms of the good, the good can be manifested in persons and physical objects. Yet the good itself surmounts sensation, just as notions of unity and being precede (or would seem to precede) sensation.

In response, it might be posed that perfection and harmony are simply more abstract conceptions of "balance." Whereas the latter has a quasi-objective quality, we can, for example, see two weights "balanced" on a scale, perfection and harmony tend to be more subjective assessments. This is due to the fact that perfection and harmony invoke a greater order of things than simple "balance," and the more of the totality of experience we attempt to base our beliefs on (including beliefs as to balance), the more subjective are those beliefs. Aside from logic and mathematics, objective experience tends to be more simple and specific than abstract notions such as perfection allow. The more isolated objective experiences we attempt to synthesize via thoughts and concepts of the mind the more such syntheses tends to be subjective. This is one reason why people's ideas of perfection, harmony and in what the good consists can be so divergent, because such ideas are based on such complicated *combinations* of personal life experiences, not *single* isolated experiences, of which objectivity in experience essentially consists. With notions like perfection, harmony and what is good we might well disagree as to what they are, but *that* they are, in some way shape or form, ought not to be. However, their existence as

[107] *Consolations of Philosophy, Book III.*

viable and useful concepts is all we can speak objectively about, while their more specific their nature and character is something we comprehend better subjectively.

It is far more difficult to objectively argue that such and such is "the good" for which we *should* seek, than it is to argue that such or such a given method is or isn't effective as means of obtaining a particular good (assuming we have more or less specifically defined what that good is.) In the philosophical sense, the means are more easily justified than the ends, and in this we see how mind is means (or presumably the heart and spirit.) We can physically prevent certain negative actions and encourage certain positive action in a person. Yet very deepest belief and desire (outside of hypothetical intervention of the Almighty) are not something that can be reasonably or violently compelled. What for any of us becomes or is our highest good is a very personal and subjective choice we make originating from an objectively untraceable innate desire. Deepest beliefs and desires as to what is or are the greatest good one should seek are the very heart of the person. While certainly the issue of the extent to which one's idea and desire of the highest good can be manipulated by others can be disputed, it cannot be denied that each of us has his or her own personal idea and desire of the highest good which they can claim as their own and no one else's. It is part of what gives us our uniqueness as individuals. Indeed, it is the very nature of life that we each have our own personal idea or concept of a greatest good (or goods) which we seek which good surpasses all others and is the one or several on which all others have their beginning. As Morris Cohen reminds us: "It is ancient wisdom that while the values of many things result from their consequences certain things have a value regardless of consequences. Otherwise the pursuit of values would be an infinite regress." [108]

This concept and desire, our Form of all forms, our highest good, can be modified, involuntarily and voluntarily, by ourselves and others. Naturally for many, this is God, including Augustine who says: "There is no other good which can make any rational or intellectual creature happy except God."[109] To which someone might respond, whatever our highest good to us is, that is God for us, in any case.

[108] *A Preface to Logic*, Ch. VIII.
[109] *City of God*, XII.1.

VII. Morals

Though we apparently cannot determine what "the good" is objectively by First criteria, and based on what I have said above, I take it to be the case that only the selfless notion of the good can be grounds for an adequate and more enduring system of morals. Though this might be further somewhat qualified, again, I believe the statement is otherwise essentially correct. If enlightened self interest makes sense, it is as an aspect of a higher sense of what is greater than self, which I think a proper interpretation of Aristotle would concede. As indicated earlier a selfish oriented person will have less scruple in obeying a rule when the rule is seen as conflicting with their self-interest. Therefore moral rules will have less hold on him, even such "moral" rules which he formulates for himself. It is in the interpretation of what selfless good is and should be that we will find most conflict as to what constitutes that which is "moral." In this disagreement as well lies a corresponding divergence as to what *the* system of morals is and should be. Different ideas of in what selfless good should consist will not necessarily differ in principle as much as in emphasis and priorities. To illustrate, one selfless view will think that supplying people with material goods will best serve the well being of everyone, while another will feel that people's adhering to just and fair conduct should outweigh satisfying their need for material things – assuming, that is, that there is any conflict between the two perspectives.

If the subjective notion of what the good is and should can be agreed upon, the method and means for attaining that good can much more easily be determined objectively. So while the decision as to what constitutes the selfless good is essentially a subjective matter, determining the rules (that is the method or means for arriving at it) is, by contrast, an objective one. The exception to this might be instances where the nature of the highest good selected frowns on or forbids outright objective or rational analysis, such as might be the case with a superstitious sort of religion. Yet this possible exception aside, the reason determination of means for realizing good are more objective than deciding upon ultimate good itself is that once we have decided what the good is we can then apply objective criteria based on logic and experience, including causal notions, as to how persons and objects can be guided and arranged so as to best to achieve the desired end. Though, of course, we will want to keep in mind, that objectivity gives us, at best, only practical kinds of certainty not absolute certainties. Previously, we addressed how the proper logic and science require honesty. If obtaining the truth (or the idea of what is most real) is a main purpose of applied logic and science than it will seem clear that these rules or practical means necessarily assume the prior rule and desire of being (basically) honest. Here from the subjective desire for truth can we objectively arrive at the moral rule, in this case, honesty.

Our lives are centered in our morals, which are the means for realizing our highest values, and hence they are the ultimate basis for all our actions. What we see as the good, the rules we adopt for achieving it, and how well we adhere to these rules make up the major part of who and what we are.

Morals as a system of rules to realize higher good (or aim) can be known or formulated objectively, inasmuch and to the extent we can determine cause and effect. That kindness and temperance are themselves, as *ends*, objectively verifiable forms of higher "good" is open to question. But that these can, respectively, promote good will and health, as *means*, is much less so. Valuing life, truth, peace, science are value *choices*: not something we can objectively prove we should believe. Yet if we assume their value, it is possible to objectively determine what are better means for their more successful realization. If we brush aside life, truth, peace, science and understanding as not of value, we can dismiss the moral law if we like. Yet if we assume these as highest goods, the moral law (as ordinarily thought of) becomes necessary, and can in this way, to a not insignificant extent, be objectively determined.

Ends and means, like "love" or the moral law for instance, can overlap, Is love an end or a means? Arguably both. For one person love might be a means of serving God. To another love, in its pure sense, *is* God himself. Whether love is more an end or more a means, or both, will depend on how a person defines it. But the main point here is that it is possible, in certain special circumstances, to view ends and means as the same thing.

As somewhat explored earlier, mind and heart, together or separately, are capable of forming beliefs about what is good, moral, and beautiful that are agreeable to both. Piety, for instance, is one moral principle that can serve the needs of both the intellect and emotion's yearning for God, in someone who sees God as the highest good. Also love, often seen as the highest moral principle is one which also satisfies both mind and heart. It is in such agreement in our mind and hearts , which for some is spirit, that we find our highest being.

There is a sense in which we seem to know fact less than we know love and morals, insofar as most particular facts are, at least in the long-term sense, replaceable or dispensable, while the desire for love, morals, and the beautiful can never be – though granted people's ideas about love, morals and the beautiful will differ.

Looking at morals, in the commonly understood sense, that is from an experiential perspective, we find they:

1. Enhance orderliness in a community and individual
2. Provide meaning and purpose(s) for living and realizing other potential actions
3. Provide context and principles for achievement of ultimate purpose
4. Give us freedom. In their prohibiting certain actions and promoting others, morals are calculated to give us most choice in thought and action which are not inconsistent with the good we desire. In addition to moral laws of our own formulation (insofar as we choose them), there are "natural" laws,

such as the laws of physics or "law of the jungle," for example, which by our awareness and respecting of them prevents our freedom being hampered by our otherwise neglecting or overlooking them.

5. Moral laws are at the basis of our rational knowledge, and our emotional well-being, i.e. with respect to love.

Note that each of the above in some way relates to fostering quality of life, which in some ways suggest that for most people communal quality of life and well-being is inseparable from the highest good. This is not a necessary assumption, only a practical one. Quality of life and well-being can be seen as applying to this life, and or a potential after life. The focus a person will have on either well-being in this life, or alternatively well-being in a next life undoubtedly colors their idea of both what the good and morals are. Are people who focus on well-being in this life less or more selfless than persons who focus well-being in an after life? Not necessarily. A person's preference for well-being in this life, versus well-being in a next life, does not, in and of itself, indicate a more or less selfless disposition.

This practical view of morals reminds us that they act as a framework on which are overlaid laws, codes of conduct, and lesser duties. Systems of rules such as civic laws and rules of civility, it is well to be reminded, are that much less observed and or their enforcement that much more difficult in a person or community in which morals are lacking. It is highly questionable whether a system of laws could even be upheld on the basis of sheer brute force and fear alone. Without *some* trust and *some* amount of honesty, one is at a loss to figure how even those policing such a state could act in cooperation. Clearly in a civil community there must be a perceived common good, and a system of morals of some kind must exist prior to any legal system. In this and other ways, morals are the foundation and essential infrastructure of all other laws, and communal rules of conduct.

The moral law is often expressed as restoration of harmony: For instance Lex talionis, or the law of retaliation, "An eye for and eye, a tooth for a tooth," is a doctrine of fostering or insuring equilibrium. It suggests to us that part of what justifies or else makes the moral law work is the restoration of balance and harmony in an order that has, because of wrong doing, been flung into disarray. From this we see how morals serve the purpose of promoting orderliness and regularity in a system or community, while simultaneously warding off chaos and anarchy. Simple and easy to accept enough, but this leaves us with the question exactly in what lies the determination of order and what of anarchy. The answer to this depends on whom or what we see as the source of highest goodness and unity for which the moral law exists and is derived. Observe also that the desire for balance and harmony in morals may be said to have the same origin as that same desire in aesthetics.

Traditionally, there are three kinds of moral law givers, which are deemed ultimate authority, unity, and grounds for the moral law. They are God (including notions of the moral law as being founded in reason), the collective society, and ourselves individually. By "collective society," I mean potentially any social group past or present which we look with deference to, it may be religious, academic, civic, familial. In addition, collective may be defined in terms of time frame, such as "era." From these "law givers," the moral law is communicated by means of: revelation, reason, and emotion, if we speak about collective morals they will inevitably arise from one of these. By revelation we mean such as we find in scriptures, saints and sages. As far as reason, we might turn to any number of philosophers, some of them overtly religious some subtly religious, some un-statedly, yet implicitly, religious. There are, as well, yet others who attempt to see morals from a fundamentally secular view. As far as emotions, we might think of such feelings as we see in motherliness, courage, compassion, friendship, which we instinctively recognize as aspects of being moral, as expounded in Rousseau. If we ask, as a practical matter, on what are our own morals based, collectively or individually, I think it will be agreed that these spring from something like one, some or all of these three, in various combinations depending on the individual or collective deciding the matter. Each "law giver" has its strong credibility. What is peculiar to observe is the importance or emphasis one person will place on one "law giver" over another, and what relation exists between such emphases and how God is conceived by that individual or group, and what role they see him as playing as the primal promulgator of morals.

As far as those who say they don't believe in God, and speaking personally, I don't believe pure atheism or agnosticism is really possible. Rather what happens is the person has some idea of who or what they believe God to be, for example their self, a noble cause, higher truth (as they see it), conventional wisdom, worldly power, well-known persons or celebrities they are fond of or want to emulate. They substitute these for the theologian's, the rationalist's, or the idealist's God, and form their morals accordingly. Such people will not unusually believe natural forces act upon man to nurture him, encourage him to certain acts and to avoid others. Yet if this is all there were to morals formulation it still remains to be explained what Nature is, and how "it" should produce purposes and rules that would mould people morally.

Does the moral law need someone to enforce it? Strangely enough, for some this question hardly occurs to them. To them the *moral* law is obeyed its own sake or because it is the system of the rules by which happiness achieved. Ordinarily, no one will actually punish you if you violate the rules of chess, for instance. Only if you don't observe the rules, you lose the benefit of being able to play the game. For some the moral law is like this. For others, the moral law must have a policeman who will punish those who violate it, and were

there none, they would have little trouble breaking its rules. "All moral qualities," Hutcheson asserts, "have necessarily some relation to the law of a superior power to make us happy or miserable." [110] Still there are others who take a position somewhere in between the two. In any case, violation of the rules does involve some kind of penalty. But whether the penalty takes the form of missing out on something, or consists of pain being deliberately inflicted as punishment views will differ. The latter naturally would require someone to inflict punishment, while the former does not. From one perspective, the views could be seen as the same thing, that is, the bringing about of some manner of suffering for failure to observe the moral law. Yet it would seem evident that those who choose to obey the moral law out of a desire for their own or others improved well-being will make a better citizen than one who obeys the law merely out of fear of punishment. For many, it is the belief in law as a means to achieve a positive good, rather than means to avoid what is bad which ultimately separates the true person of faith from the falsely religious, and which separates the free from the slave.

Berkeley wrote: "[O]ne may make a great progress in school-ethics without ever being the wiser or better man for it, or knowing how to behave himself in the affairs of life more to the advantage of himself or his neighbors than he did before." [111] This is true, yet the study of ethics or morals is valuable for some who may be confused on the subject. More importantly however, it serves as a necessary adjunct to epistemology. Regard, incidentally, that Berkeley's remarks, somewhat modified, can also be justly be applied to aesthetics as well, probably more so.

Henry More believed we have an inborn moral sense, a "thing divine" which he called the "Boniform faculty." Hutcheson took a similar view, adding that the moral sense is similar to the aesthetic sense, and that both need to be cultivated to be realized. Our moral sense, said Hutcheson, may be likened even to our perceptions. For example, the moral sense knows good and bad the way perceptions or sensations know bitter and sweet. Kant's opinion was that the moral law is derived from reason. On this basis we will have to think that he too thought our moral sense was fundamentally innate, inasmuch as our knowledge and understanding of reason arise from a priori intuitions and principles.

Hume thought that "Tho justice be artificial, the sense of its morality is natural."[112] Yet for him, like Hobbes, morality is a convention, since "if men were endowed with such benevolence, these rules (morals) would never have been dreamt of." Desire and self-interest, which are inborn in us are the source of discord. As a result, moral laws and notions of rights are devised to prevent chaos. "Self-interest is the original motive to the establishment of justice; but a sympathy with public interest is the source of moral approbation which attends that virtue." But there is a moral sense originating in nature on which this convention of approval is founded. He goes on to explicitly state that morals do not stem from reason. Reason cannot demonstrate to us what is good, but it can, indeed must, be used to tell us how best that good can be realized.

"Ideal observer," utilitarianism (in its various forms), and intuitionism are some additional theories which attempt to explain the basis of moral beliefs, and there are others.

Yet which ever view of the grounds of morals which we take, there is this division between seeing the observance of moral rules as something to be actively pursued for their own sake (or something higher) versus morals seen as rules which should be obeyed merely to avoid pain or discomfort. This, in the final analysis, is the difference between the moral law and mere civil law.

The laws of legal systems, or civil laws, are not "moral" laws as such. Because civil laws are created by fallible human beings, people tend to see them as less authoritative, by comparison, then moral laws, which are seen as divine in origin or else naturally inherent to us. While civil laws usually require the support of moral laws for their observance and enforcement, moral laws seek no such assistance from civil laws, since moral laws are seen as superior to and the foundation of civil laws. Communities, it is true, will often try to promote morals by means of civil laws. But this is merely to encourage respect for moral laws, and such civil laws in no way can pretend to take the place of the moral law or laws on which they are based, since such civil laws are, by derivation, inferior in overall importance.

Wrote Henry More: "if nothing were just, but in virtue of some written Law what need then would there be of Emendation; seeing the Law (whatever it were) made everything just? But 'tis the part and province of Equity, to over-rule and correct the very Law (even as the Intellect does the Will;) and as Aristotle says, To establish such things in such Cases, on the Legislator himself had not failed to have provided for, had he but forseen the event. But the saying of his had been very ridiculous, if the Nature of Just and Unjust had not been grounded on the Nature of things and the various Circumstances that attend them, but depended merely on the Will and Pleasure of a Legislator." [113]

If, ordinarily speaking, moral laws originate with God, Reason, or Nature are they then eternal laws, or fixed and unchanging laws? The answer would seem, at least ultimately, to be yes, since if fundamental moral laws were subject to change by what rules or standard would we know that modification or change was

---

[110] *An Inquiry Concerning the Original of Our Ideas of Virtue or Moral Good.*
[111] *Principles of Human Knowledge.*
[112] *Treatise on Human Understanding*, Book III.
[113] *Enchiridon Ethicum*, II, 7.

valid? A standard which itself changes? By fundamental moral laws I mean such as the categorical imperative, the authority of right reason, and commonly understood notions of essential right. As Cicero states: "Let us for determining and constituting of Right take our beginning from the Supreme Law, which did on all ages subsist both before any law was written, or any city or society of men were in being."[114]

There may be some legitimate disagreement as to what are the fundamental and unchanging moral laws, yet that there must be such would seem to follow from the nature of the moral law itself. Peirce and others, on the other hand, have contended that no laws are absolute since all laws are a result of and answerable to evolution or the march of "habit." This seems a strange and self-refuting argument since it suggests that evolution itself is the ultimate or absolute law and authority. Whatever our fixed assumptions with respect to our capacity to know truth and right conduct, these become the basis for our morals. And so to say that these fundamental assumptions are subject to change is to say that there are no fixed laws. Cosmological and epistemological doctrines of chance and chaos consequently can be no doctrines at all since they assume a rule which says there is no rule, which is self-contradictory, and makes reference to a rule (i.e chaos) meaningless and unnecessary.

[114] *de Legibus*, Book I

VIII. The Mind's Role in Moral Formulation and Observance

The mind and heart each contribute to the formation of moral systems. In addressing the mind first in this role, we see in the dialectic's temporary suspension of judgment, its "desire" to see more than one side of a question. There is an inherent element of fairness; a wariness that we pause and think before we judge lest we decide "wrongly," a sense that equilibrium must be taken into account before we proceed in judgment. The "true or false" in factual judgment, bears a non-coincidental resemblance to "right and wrong" in moral judgment. The impartiality as to possible conclusions in formal logic is closely related, if not identical, with the notion of "fairness" in moral reasoning. Logic, for all its various forms, is a system of rules, which if they are not (so to speak) actually prior to moral rules are simultaneous with them. Logic's rules serve as a model for what rules in general are and might be, including moral rules. The "if-then" of logic, lays the groundwork for the "if-then" of certain moral rules.[115]

Logic alone, however, cannot dictate a system of morals, because its formal rules do not of themselves apply, nor can they be substituted for either our inner desires, or the outer experiences which do or might influence those desires. Logic does, however, provide us, at the least, with a caution, and hence prudence, as to our rushing to judgment, and a sense of fairness --- both via the dialectic. It will be argued that this "caution" and "fairness" are rather psychological rather than logical in origin. While I would not cursorily dismiss this objection, it can at least be said that that it is impossible to conceive of logic as we know it without the dialectic's principles of caution and impartiality. In addition to the dialectic's assumption of logic, note how the dialectic and syllogism both necessarily imply a *regulated* sequence. Consequently, as good a case can be made for the dialectic being, with its caution and fairness, a necessary aspect of logic, as well as an innate psychological component of our rational faculties. In any case, which we decide will not affect our conclusion that the dialectic's sense of both caution and fairness in judgment serve as an enhancement (or compliment) to that sense of fairness we commonly associate with moral judgment. It is also interesting to note, in passing, how frequently it is the case (at least to this writer) that despotic and immoral people tend to frown on, warp or suppress intelligent and rational discussion.

"Reason," says Hutcheson, "provides the rule which will show what means are fit to obtain the given end." And many years later Schopenhauer said: "(F)or the pursuit of the virtuous life, the application of reason is needful; only it is not its source, but has the subordinate function of preserving resolutions which have been made, of providing maxims to withstand the weakness of the moment, and give consistency to action. It plays the same part ultimately in art also, where it has just as little to do with the essential matter, but assists in carrying it out, for genius is not always at call, and yet the work must be completed in all its parts and rounded off to a whole."[116]

Experience can only participate in the formulation of moral rules if assisted by reason. Reason spots insincerity, hypocrisy, inconsistency which are detrimental to the realization and fulfillment of moral rules. The consistency of logic is needed to avoid false assumptions and mistakenly inferring causes based on superficial appearances, both of which are detrimental to the formulation of effective moral rules and principles. This point is very important in applied morals, as jumping to conclusions has been a frequent cause of tragic error and injustice.

Though our idea of what is good may differ, our desires are best achieved through following and adhering to certain laws, and experience demonstrates that the most effective laws are those dictated and circumscribed by right reason, or else better reasoning. On the other hand, irrational morals and morals based on superstition or blind custom have been and can be found in experience. As a practical matter then, it becomes a matter of preference, just like choice of "good" itself, whether people will recognize a more or less rational approach to morals.

Many modernists look to psychology and medicine to solve problems of crime and misbehavior, and in a sense equate these with morality. This is to say, that moral problems are actually psychological and medical problems. If morals matter, they are seen as a supplement to psychology and medicine. Such a perspective tends to view issues of behavior and character in materialistic terms.

For certain religious moralists and philosophers, such as Philo and some Church Fathers, and as well some Platonists and Stoics, among the primary purposes of the moral law is not so much the betterment of the body, but the betterment of the soul, which lives to serve God. In taking this view, the body and sensual pleasure are seen as something negative, or else relatively negative as contrasted with the well-being of the soul. "Soul," depending on the thinker, might denote mind, unifying spirit, or both. One of the reasons behind this theological view is that no good is possible outside of divine edict (via scripture) or divine reason. Accordingly, the highest good a person can know is behaving in a manner that accords not with the needs or well-being of the body, but with the duties and obligations pronounced by divine edict (in the case of the religionists) or else reason, in the case of the philosophers. In both cases divine edict and reason are something not material. The

[115] In the Code of Hammurabi, laws are typically phrased in an "if-then" manner. In the Decalogue, of course, the Law is phrased by way of imperatives. Is there perhaps a parallel in that the mind tends to "if-then" conclusions, while the heart tends to more preemptory predicate statements?

[116] *The World as Idea*, First Book

more a person is astray from divine edict or reason, which are eternal and unchanging, the more depraved is their soul, and therefore more susceptible they are to the demonic[117] or irrational influences which are destructive, and render the soul more mortal and corporeal. Such opinions while not necessarily selfless in the charitable, altruistic sense, are selfless insofar as the individual's soul and its well-being cannot be seen as exceeding the good itself which is God, or else the divine law or reason by which He speaks to us.

The doctrine of soul's well-being as the basis of morality is essentially a doctrine of the intellect. However, some thinkers, for example St. Augustine, have tried to unite the religious and philosophical views, and have seen the moral law known by the heart through love, as equally or more important than reason or the intellect. Despite this, they still maintain the position that it is the soul's well-being, not the body's, which matters most.

Kant, as we know, taught that the moral law arises from reason, and that the purpose of the moral law is not our soul's or our bodies well-being as such, but the moral law itself. Duty is for duty's sake, and the moral law is for the moral law's own sake.

It is interesting to observe that as speculative and subjective as we might prefer to see them, the metaphysical and transcendental systems of Rationalists, Kantians and Idealists have great practical value in offering encouragement to a more moral viewpoint. And how this encouragement of morals is worked into or essential to their system (be it epistemological or cosmological) is often quite ingenious. Descartes preliminary skepticism tells us to be careful about what we believe, and hence to be all the more careful about the choices of belief we might make, including our beliefs about what is right and wrong behavior. Spinoza's philosophy calls us to be grateful for, better appreciate and make the best of the here and now. Leibniz's system tells us to see the world as full of souls, or degrees of soul, giving a dignity to experience and all that is found in it, which encourages us to better respect others and to see a divine value even in seemingly inanimate things. For Kant reason itself is the source of our knowledge of the moral law, and reason knows no greater function then in the pursuit of its realization and fulfillment. For Fichte, the "I" or ego, for the truly rational mind, sees its purpose and reflection in the universal moral will.

One of the reason's for such rationalist and idealistic views is the fear that the more a person is driven by external objects and events, rather than pure and detached reason, the more they drive themselves away from concern for the soul and morals, with the result that a person becomes like a senseless physical object, devoid of personality and purpose. If someone or something is less than a soul why respect them? Though the use of reason does not always assure right moral judgment, experience shows that the irrationality of a proposed moral claim argues against its credibility, and hence argues the need for us to be more rational in moral formulations and judgments.

[117] Or demonistic belief, which is to say to think like a demon, that is destructively and with wanton, unwarranted and excessive animosity.

IX. The Heart's Role in Moral Formulation and Observance

The heart is vital to the nature of and our following moral beliefs in that it is the source, in us, of love and provides strength to our faith and hope. Courage, pity and compassion, commonly seen as moral qualities, are emotional in their origin, and conscience works in us as much through our feelings as our thought. Most often what we find in ordinary life is that persons who least possess genuine sympathy and affection, and who are without concern for the woes of others, are more inclined to disregard moral principles than those with such traits.

It is no wonder then that:

"Destruction of all disposition to critical thinking in the SS men had to be accompanied also by annihilation of the formerly acquired ways of effective reactions in the range of higher feelings. The degradation in the sphere of the intellect had to comport with the affective degradation. An ideal SS man could only be such an individual who both ceased to think critically and who deprived himself of all adequate tender reaction, above all compassion."[118]

Love in morals foster open-mindedness and empathy, openness, which is also conducive to greater learning and understanding. Great genius, at least that which is not outright evil, is usually accompanied by a pronounced disinterested and selfless sympathy of one kind or other.

Nonetheless, love requires the moral law and right reason to give it guidance. Otherwise love as affection could be easily deceived into behavior that would be destructive of its own ends. For example, a person could be duped or fooled on the basis of sentiment to do the wrong thing, in being taken in, for example, by a con artist posing as someone benevolent and charitable. Passion which goes too far astray of reason can then be the undoing of morals. A person lacking capacity for reasoning, as well as positive emotional affection, will be that much more susceptible to external influences. As well, alternatives available to them in their actions, and choices as to what means to select, will be that much more limited.

Positive or optimistic thought is a weaker moving force in us than positive emotion, yet so is negative thought weaker than negative emotion. Positivity is best realized in emotion, but for the same reason negativity in emotion is that much all the more to be avoided. Negative emotions do have their moral purpose, as in justified outrage over an injustice for example. Yet their utility is limited in bringing about positive change, certainly compared to positive emotions. Ordinarily their utilization and expression is best restricted and kept to a minimum

Where the heart seeks long-term moral vision it must look to the mind. Hume observes: "Actions…not proceeding from any constant principle, have no influence on love or hatred, pride or humility; and consequently are never considered in morality."[119] Though the heart has constant principles of its own, constant principles are something the mind best discerns and defines. So while the heart gives life to the being and furthering of moral belief and action, the mind is necessary to guide it on its path to moral fulfillment -- but without usurping the heart as our life's center.

---

[118]Prof. S. Batavia: (Regarding) Rudoplh Hoess, Kommandant of the Concentration Camp in Oswiecim, as quoted in *Kolbe and the Kommandant* by Ladislaus Kluz, O.C.D.
[119] *A Treatise of Human Nature*, Book III.

X. Moral Principles and Problem Solving, As based on selfless versions of the higher good

Given the different notions of selfless higher good or excellence, namely God (or the Absolute) and higher ideals, mankind as a community, our own given provincial or familial community, our place in Life in general, is it possible to identify moral principles or rules which will, to some extent anyway, be consistent or at least not conflicting among these different notions? For one thing, we can see that it is not hard for all these notions of selfless good to overlap and be co-present with another. For many who believe in God, serving the needs of mankind and their local community are very much compatible. On the other hand, there are those who do believe in God, certain Stoics might be used as an example, but who might feel no compelling need to look out for the welfare of others, other than to treat them fairly and justly with regard to respecting basic rights and needs.[120] Similarly, there are those who express love for their fellow man, but who do not feel God (or the idea of God) is relevant, or if he is, only as little more than a myth or practical fiction a heuristic principle, designed to foster moral belief and religion as community stabilizers. While these differences of view may be a source of major dispute in problem solving, experience shows it is usually still possible, as a practical matter, to look find grounds for agreement on which to build consensus – at least among people respectful of reason.

There are two kinds of morals: *Pro-active* which promotes certain beliefs, values and behaviors (an example might be the work ethic) and *Prohibitive* morals, which discourages certain beliefs, values, and behaviors (an example might be a rule against false witnessing.)

Between pro-active and prohibitive morals, pro-active morals would seem to be the more problematical as finding common ground for assent between people coming from different viewpoints.

A religious person might, for instance, feel that building a church or synagogue should take precedence over building a medical clinic, while a non-religious person might feel oppositely. In a dispute of this kind over pro-active policy, the different notions of selfless good are bound, at some point, to disagree. Of course, even within a single kind of selfless viewpoint of the higher good, such as religion, there will even be disagreement on matters of pro-active policy, and the question of what kind of moral behavior or measures they might promote. Put in a hypothetical way, should the religious institution spend more money on educating people about the importance of honoring mother and father, or would more money be better spent educating them about the ill effects of covetousness? In making such a choice, there is nothing in the morals themselves (in this case the Ten Commandments) which will answer our question. Spiritual inspiration, a certain amount of subjective interpretation, and perhaps a sizing up of the current state of moral conduct in the community, are as much as one could avail oneself of in resolving the dilemma. If theft is rampant, but mother and fatherhood are highly honored in the community, this would seem to suggest that education on the evils of covetousness would be more appropriately invested in. Yet there is nothing in the moral law itself which will settle the dispute, other than the logical and general implication that all the moral principles should be lived up to the maximum level possible, and in a way consistent with better reasoning.

The utilitarian view of that which promotes the greatest happiness, and applying a cost-benefit analysis to moral problem solving can be of help in resolving such difficulties

Utilitarianism is sometimes unfairly criticized as necessarily promoting short-term interests and then only the interests of the majority. But this need not be so. It is possible to weigh costs and benefits to a community in such a way that the mere short-term interest or the mere interest of the majority are not the penultimate standard of what is best for all. When Hutcheson says : "To procure an inconsiderable good to many, but an immense evil to few, may be evil: and an immense good to few may preponderate a small evil to many,"[121] he is not speaking of the greatest good for all based on say what will make most or everyone happy in the immediate future. Rather, he is speaking about what is in the best interests of the whole in the long term. The weakness of utilitarianism is in the delusion of thinking all moral problem is as simple as some mechanical application cost-benefit analysis, when, of course, the truth is that such problem solving is as much an art as well: an art which needs to takes into account personal feeling and individual civil rights, as much as it does rational calculation and the interests of the whole.

In addressing any question of disagreement among subjective beliefs about what is good and what is the best way to achieve it, objective criteria will come into play, and how and what objective criteria apply will depend on agreement among communities members. This "agreement" might be brought about by sheer brute force, at one extreme, or free and rational consent, at the other. What approach the community will use in deciding questions of utility depends entirely on the character of their morals and intellect prior to any determinations of what is "for the best." Hobbes' relativism teaches that whatever pleases is virtuous, and what ever and displeases is vicious. Yet, if we accept this view, we must be prepared to accept the belief that

[120] In fairness, many of the later Stoic teachers such as Cicero, Seneca, Epictetus, and Marcus Aurelius (to name the most well known), make a point of advocating beneveloence and altruism, as being necessary to one's acting in accordance with Nature – a Stoic's primary goal. It would seem, however, that among more ordinary Romans, regular observance of such injunctions and sentiments was the odd exception rather than the everyday rule (as say we find insisted on in Christian teachings.) Further, it is not inaccurate to add that generally speaking Stoical serving of others sprang more from a concern for justice and preservng one's own character, rather than heart felt compassion as such.

[121] *An Inquiry Concerning the Original of Our Ideas of Virtue or Moral Good.*

irrational brute force, as a general rule, could be considered as "virtuous" as free and rational consent, but that mere convention makes us think otherwise.

Regarding morals as principles *prohibiting* certain behavior, as opposed to *promoting* certain behavior, the question of objective determination is much less problematical. Reason makes possible the formulation of rules which are consistent with all the needs of the different selfless good viewpoints. Such rules we will call objective moral principles, which are mostly prohibitive in character. These are rules or principles which if followed would be least conflicting with the different selfless good viewpoints. The Golden Rule, "do unto others as you would have them do unto you," is taught in Buddhism, Hinduism, Judaism, Christianity, Islam, Confucianism, Taoism, Zoroastrianism, Jainism, Native American spirituality, Sikhism, Taoism, Baha'I faith, Unitarianism.[122]

The Golden Rule does not, on the surface, seem an appropriate example of an objective moral principal insofar as what one might wish for themselves, might be far from what another person wishes for their self. True, the good I might do for others may indeed work toward their benefit, and they might reject such benevolence out of great ignorance. The objective problem, however, is who shall decide what is good for another? My idea of what is good for me is a subjective one, and there is no objective assurance that I will not be in error in my idea. While it is fair for me to desire such and such a thing for my own perceived good, it would be rash and presumptuous for me to try to force that good on another who rejects it. We can imagine a situation where a person refuses basic medical treatment, say to stop bleeding, where many would concur that it is folly on their part to do so. Such scenarios involving involuntary medical treatment can be complicated by a number of factors, and one cannot easily settle them with a few simple guidelines. But improper refusals of good, such as perceived medical good, are relatively rare.

Most I think will agree that an adult person should have the right to refuse proffered good from another. This is because one might not share the other's view that what is offered is actually a good, or something desirable, in the first place. That something is good or desirable for their own self, and as it concerns their own personal welfare, is something subjective, and hence should be a decision they ought to be able to decide themselves, and not someone else. One person, an extrovert, might like great applause and being a center of attention, while another, an introvert, prefers quiet and anonymity. If the latter, politely, rejected receiving loud positive attention from the first most would say they were acting reasonably, since to them such attention is not a good, but rather a nuisance. Now if the extrovert says the quiet person must receive this noisy applause, not for their own sake, but for the sake of others, we *might* say the extrovert has more weight to their argument. But if we consider the matter from the quiet person's perspective and interest, clearly it would be wrong for the first person to force noisy applause on them. In the case of forcing the good on one for the benefit of a larger group, the issue is much more complicated, and again not something that can easily answered. However, instances where forcing a perceived good on one, in order not so much to benefit that single person, but a larger group of people is highly unusual, and would have to be considered with respect to the particular circumstances. In general and in most cases, it would seem that forcing a perceived good on another, which that other rejects, is not objectively justifiable. If it were justifiable then a masochist would be excused for going around physically injuring others, since they themselves welcome being physically injured. In sum, "Do unto others," can be said to make objective sense, but only if the proffered good is willingly accepted by the receiver.

If "Do Unto others" means merely "I want 'good' and therefore I mean for you to have 'good'," this is acceptable but only because "good" is used in the most abstract sense. This would not be merely the case, however, if "good" could be decided objectively, like the way we decide questions of mathematics. Of course, there is no reason to assume this. Objective good might be said to be theoretically possible on some divine plane of existence. But given man's "fallen" state, the nature of the highest "good" is not something we are yet in a position to *objectively* assume as we can assume something objectively in logic and mathematics.

The corollary to the Golden Rule, is the prohibitive, "Do not do unto others as you would not have done unto you," stated, among other places, in the early Christian church document, the Didache. The corollary, by contrast is more reasonable as an objective moral rule than its sister, and makes eminently more sense as a universal principle. It says if you don't want something done to you then you should not do that something to someone else. This rule I have so taken for granted as being so self-evidently fair and wise that it has been a source of puzzlement to me why there should be the least bit of hesitation by anyone to accept it. Yet I have known some to think of it as inferior to the Golden Rule (hence my distinguishing and denoting it here as the "Golden Rule Corollary" or, here, more simply "Corollary.") Psychologically and based on experience, their attitude seems to be based on one or both of two arguments. First, that the Golden Rule is explicitly in the Gospels, thus rendering it obviously superior to the Corollary. Second, that the community of which that person is a part sees it as one of their obligations (or else their right or entitlement, depending on how you might view it) to be able to force "good" on another. I have never heard anyone state or imply this latter reason explicitly, yet because of behaviors observed I would infer as much. Speaking more personally, I must say that I find such an attitude potentially most arrogant and most pernicious, for reasons presented previously. If someone has a right to force their idea of good on me without my consent, with the purpose allegedly being for my own good, than what guideline is there to delimit in what such good can consist? What assurance is there that what they see as their idea of good, will serve me as good?

[122] See *Formal Ethics*, by Harry J. Gensler.

Sometimes certain ideologies will want to force their idea of good on another in order to justify it. Even granting that there are circumstances in which forcing one person's idea of good (which is usually going to be of a highly subjective nature) on another will work to that others advantage, we have no clear or probable way of assuring that result. At the same time, one can easily see how one person's idea of good may not only *not* work to make another's circumstance better, but possibly render it worse or much worse. If someone thinks taking certain drugs to sedate themselves is a good, does it necessarily follow that my taking such drugs will be good for me? Given that one's idea of good tends to be subjective, it would seem we should err on the side of letting the individual receive or not receive a good offered by another. This way, the would or would not-be receiver would be responsible for availing or not availing themselves of that good. If it is a true good they decline, then it will be their own fault if they suffer by refusal.

If we say one person can force a "good" on another, not for the other's sake as such, but for the sake of the community, that is a different question entirely. The matter of concern here is not the other person's good, but the community's. This is a more challenging kind of dilemma. But if we do accept the premise, whether or not something is good for the community would need to be decided by that community, and not by a person or person's acting independently of the authority of that community. Even so, such a rule, need not in itself trespass on an individual's right to determine their *own* good. The community might well be in a position to say that it will work better for *them* if such and such a good is forced on Mr. Smith, but they have no justification in deciding what *his* good is. Only God and Mr. Smith are properly in a position to decide that.

The Golden Rule Corollary, by its nature, involves no potential forcing of anyone. I will not do anything to you which I do not want done to me. Now it is true, we can imagine a bizarre circumstance, where one person might rather starve to death than accept charity, and hence they will not give charity to another. Yet, again, such cases are so extremely atypical in real life that I hardly think such possibility seriously impairs the obvious good sense and fairness of the Corollary. The reason certain people are not charitable is rarely because if they were in great need they would not accept charity themselves. Rather they are not charitable simply because they are selfish, which is an altogether different reason than one might hypothetically give using the Corollary as their excuse for not being charitable.

Kant's Categorical Imperative, given in *The Grounding for the Metaphysics of Morals*, states: "So act that the maxim of your will could always hold at the same time as a principle establishing universal law." His Practical Imperative is, "treat a person (i.e. any and all persons) as an end rather then as a means." These imperatives are more sophisticated formulations of the Golden Rule and its Corollary, which some might prefer to the more simple Golden Rule for reasons Kant himself gives. It will not be necessary here to go into them here, however.

Much of commonly accepted moral principle directly or indirectly relates to the minimizing of unnecessary pain and the maximizing of happiness. Understandably, some like Kant have taken strong exception to the idea that morals should be merely a determination of what does or does not promote happiness for their individual and their community. One possible explanation for their objection is that happiness and avoidance of pain, if taken as a first principle, tend toward selfishness, and consequently detract from the selfless focus which is the proper foundation of true morals. If I seek my own happiness, then what reason is there for my caring about the happiness of others? True, I can be told that concern for others happiness will enhance my own. But not in all circumstances, and certainly not to all people, will this enlightened self-interest kind of reasoning seem correct, particularly if we ignore the idea of deferred happiness, or of that of greater happiness in a future life. Even so, the criteria of happiness and avoidance of pain if not, in and of themselves, the foremost justification of morals, they are, at least, of sufficient importance as practical incentives in promoting moral belief to warrant their serious consideration.

As stated earlier, some have argued that morals are not innate, inherent or intuitive, and are something drawn from experience. They (morals) are something we must be taught, and that rewards and punishments are necessary to teach morals. As principles that will make our possible happiness, or else help us to avoid unnecessary pain, rewards and punishments give people the necessary incentive for people believing them. Is happiness (including hereafter the avoidance of unnecessary pain) then the justification of morals? For some it is. If following moral rules will not help them toward happiness, they would think there was no reason for observing them. Those of an altruistic and or purer religious disposition, on the other hand, mere meeting our needs for our own personal happiness is not, of itself, sufficient justification for morals. Morals must serve the well-being of the community (in whatever extent or terms they view it) and, for the religious, God and his purpose for us. With the altruistic and religious, we can likely expect a more full and robust moral sense than in a person for whom morals are a means to better secure merely their own happiness. Yet, it should be noted on this score that, if the altruistic and religious person is not both rational and imaginative they will that much be less able to calculate what act or deed will best serve the common good, or discern between circumstantially conflicting moral principles which should prevail. Blind faith may imply salvation, but it doesn't necessarily imply wisdom in problem solving, and high mindedness and altruism are not a substitute for good sense and coherent reasoning.

We are reminded that moral rules, as we ordinarily receive them from religion overtly state or imply some reference to reward and punishment, as say distinct from Kant's view of moral rules for their own sake. The basis for observance of the moral law in Judaism and Christianity can be interpreted from the Kantian

perspective. Yet there is no denying that ideas of reward and punishment, as incentives to obedience, would be the more commonly held interpretation. Even close fidelity and obedience to the laws out of gratitude and love for the Lord, such as the psalmist expresses, can be seen as a point of view arising out of the person's desire to better realize their own happiness, and avoid needless pain and sorrow. Certainly scriptures of various religions are replete with reminders of various rewards for those who observe the moral law, and, as well, punishments for those who neglect or disregard it. It can be debated whether the emphasis on rewards and punishments, in one form or other, is to be preferred as the primary reason for our obeying the moral law. Yet, this said, it would be very difficult, if not impossible, for us to conceive of obedience to the moral law without them.

We see a beautiful world, its plant life its, animals, and people, yet it is filled oftentimes with such ugliness and horrors. "Disastrous and humiliating is the state of man! By his own hand is constructed the mass of misery and error in which his steps are forever involved."[123] If we reflect thoughtfully on the matter, we will realize that most of what is wrong with the world comes from man's wrong choices and wrong-doing. If some will object that nature is flawed as well as man himself, we might suggest to them the theologian's belief that what is seemingly wrong in nature is a result of man's fall from grace, and the impact that fall has had on the world he lives in. But this aside, we can nevertheless see for ourselves most of what is truly evil in experience comes from the wrong choices people make and have made. Evil is not something that exists in nature. Rather it is something that exists in a rational and sentient will which rejects moral good. Even nature would suffer less from defect if humanity acted in such a way, and within its potential powers, to care for and look after nature, at least that much of nature as is within humanity's reach. If there were no people at all on the planet it is not in the least implausible to think that "nature" would work things out in a fairly harmonious and balanced way, and such suffering that did exist would be relatively infrequent, brief and incidental. If we are honest with ourselves we will see that it is human pride, arrogance, irresponsibility, immaturity, irrationality gross immorality that are the origin for what is most wrong in our world, not life or nature as some assume it to be.

Arguably the most just system of morals is one which takes into account the interest of all who might be affected by a given act or decision. What degree of importance we might place on a given person, animal, plant or thing will of course be a matter of dispute. Yet if we say, like William Blake, "All Life is Holy," this lays a foundation for morals that is best calculated to best serve the interests of the whole and each individual.

If we live in great comfort, prosperity and peace, while, on the other side of town there are some living in great poverty, squalor, discord and degradation, can we ourselves say we are living happily by ignoring their plight For some, the misfortune of others would not seem as affecting them, and they would have no trouble looking the other way and seeing the world as a bed of roses. Yet for those who are honest, who have a greater sense of fairness, compassion and conscience, it would disturb their own happiness if others suffer unduly or unnecessarily. If they ignored the poor, miserable and victimized, such altruists would reason, they would see that focusing on their own immediate prosperity would be only living in a world of illusion and fantasy, not the *real* world. As the Buddhist *Dhammapada* statess: "How can there be laughter, how can there be pleasure, when the whole world is burning When you are in deep darkness, will you not ask for a lamp?"[124]

So it is, that those of conscience and compassion, out of what we might perhaps call enlightened self-interest, will desire to be charitable, to promote justice and fairness. If they do not do so, they will show themselves that much less possessing heart, character and intellectual honesty, and therefore will be less in reality, and that much less eligible *and* less able to enjoy *true* happiness.

According to one interpretation of this "injustice to one is injustice to all" view, the injustice suffered by even one, be they person, animal, or even plant, is an injustice which to some degree will directly or somehow ultimately affect all, all the more so as those who suffer excessively are innocent. The cruelty and injustices committed in our midst will not just disappear, but will return into the system to be suffered in some measure by all its citizens or inhabitants -- in one way or another. The injustice will create a cost or debt that, at some point, and according to some mind or minds, needs to be paid back. In some society's this is done by making not the guilty pay for what was done wrong, but the society as a whole, or perhaps be imposed on completely innocent parties (as say in the case of scape-goating.) Such an approach, however, particularly when scape-goating is resorted does not actually remove the debt, as is made to seem, but rather increases it. In the Christian view, such debt is paid by Christ's suffering, one's belief in him, and their sincerely following his teaching and example (as best God gives them to). Those who sincerely look to God, according to this teaching, will, at least in the end, have redress and remedy for injustices committed against them.

This belief in divine reparation and redress has sometimes been mocked and belittled by certain anti-religious who reject God, and will impose the cost of individual or collective guilt on the religious (be they Buddhists, Christians, Jews, Muslims, etc.) arguing, while they persecute, that they (i.e. the religious victims) looked to the Lord "let the Lord save them." At the same time, it is occasionally understood that the anti-

---

[123] Charles Brockden Brown, *Edgar Huntly*.
In Homer we find Zeus saying:
"Oh for shame, how the mortals put the blame upon us
gods, for they say evils come from us, but it is they, rather,
who by their own recklessness win sorrow beyond what is given…." *Odyssey*, (Lattimore) I.32-34.
[124] 11.146, Juan Mascaro, translator.

religious will take out of life what they can get now, while the religious are expected and understood to be gambling for the hoped for better "reward' to be received in an after-life. While there may be a sense in which certain anti-religious of this bent have a point, I think most will share the view, and fairness make evident, that the matter is properly one between the religious person and God to decide whether they should have to suffer. It is not for the anti-religious or others, who sees the religious victim as to someone to be compensated by God, to impose the collective guilt on them, since, for one thing, the religious person's hope for reward (in and of itself) obviously has no nothing to do with redressing the collective guilt to begin with. But of course, that the violent oppressors of genuine religious freedom will predictably feel little impeded by such arguments is all the more a caution for our more strict safeguarding religious liberty and freedom of conscience in general.

XI. Some Conclusions

"The man that hath no music in himself,
Nor is mov'd with concord of sweet sounds,
Is fit for treasons, stratagems, and spoils;
The motions of his spirit are dull as night,
And his affections dark as Erebus:
Let no such man be trusted."

~~~~ *The Merchant of Venice*

"You only have as much morality as you have philosophy and poetry."

~~~~ Friedrich Von Schlegel, *Ideas* (fragments), #63:

Every conclusion we make has assumptions underlying it. Consequently, it is often well to think over what those assumptions are before going on with our conclusion. The very questioning and examination of our assumptions promotes both the morals and the better search for truth by helping to protect us from rational and factual errors of judgment.

Though knowledge, as such, outside of formal logic, is invariably problematical, due to the shortcomings of our ability to take in and comprehend all possible concepts, phenomena and relations, we can, despite this, be justified in a belief, if only because it is inherent to our nature that we will and must believe something. All propositions will contain some degree of epistemological uncertainty. Yet by applying certain tests and criteria it is possible, as a practical matter, to determine, and to some extent, whether a given belief is more or less true, or more or less false. What we do, is take a proposition (or set of propositions) and establish its truthfulness by seeing whether it logically or factually conflicts or contradicts with the aggregate of all our other held or hypothecated beliefs. This approach is sometimes referred to as the coherence theory of truth. We know something clearly only by comparison and relation – taking something in isolation without comparison or relations we know little or nothing of it except, perhaps, its existence. The more our proposition is consistent and not conflicting with all other beliefs, the more reason we have to place our confidence in it as a belief. This will not necessitate that the belief is true. Yet we can, as a matter of degree at least, have some success in establishing the extent of its truthfulness relative to all other beliefs.

Kant put it this way: "The difference between truth and dreaming is not ascertained by the nature of the representations which are referred to objects (for they are the same thing in both cases), but by their connection according to those rules which determine the coherence of the representations of the concept of an object and by ascertaining whether they can subsist in experience or not." [125]

The only fully viable alternative to this kind of coherence approach would be a very a practical, prudent, and non-dogmatical skepticism, which some might justifiably prefer to the coherence method.

But aside from unbiased skepticism, the validity of belief then is realized according to how well it fits in with all other belief, and this is done by applying First and Secondary criteria. In addition we can say, one's belief, in some measure, depends on:

1. What rules of thought we choose to observe
2. What rules we cannot ignore (e.g. gravity)
3. What we anticipate or expect to find or look for in life experience

The process of belief verification based on coherence is similar to how a note or chord is played in a piece of music and then fits the harmony of the piece as a whole. By itself it merely exists and is meaningless. In the context of other notes and musical effects it finds its meaning. We do not really say the note played *is* true, but rather that it *rings* true. And it rings true, not by itself, but in its relation to other notes. So it is with correct belief. To say a belief *is* true, is perhaps saying too much. Essentially all beliefs are contingent, and in effect ultimately take on the character of theory, whether the belief concerns the foundations of epistemology or simple matter of fact conclusions we take for granted as true in our daily life. Again, we cannot truly say that something is true or not true, without some qualification. Even then what is determined as being true or false is established by a given belief's degree of truthfulness relative to all other possibly held beliefs. Or put another way, truthfulness is established according to what is more and what is less plausible.

Our being is not just in our heart or mind but both. The mind governs, but the true longing and realization of longing is in the heart. Though there are significant exceptions, normally the mind decides judgments as to fact, while the heart is ultimate arbiter of value judgments. It can be convincingly argued that the beliefs that "we ought to desire the Absolute" and "we ought to desire honesty and logic" are rare cases where a belief is both a value judgment and an objective factual judgment. If there is one common principle between mind and heart processes it is the moral law, with aesthetics fulfilling a not so inferior function. Morals

[125] *Prolegomena to Any Future Metaphysics*.

without aesthetics suffer, and aesthetics without morals suffer, so that both have their irreplaceable function as the support and justification of the other.

Morals, at least in the way of honesty, must be at the foundation of all true objective belief. Morals are known and communicated to us by means of: mind, heart and, if more theoretically, spirit also. Views of what morals are and what they consist will to some extent vary among people. Yet if we accept the qualified Golden Rule and its corollary there is possible grounds to reach something like objective agreement about what is moral.

With the ancient Egyptians "Truth" and "Justice" were synonymous. Their word "maa" or "maāt," means justice, law, measure and truth. In contrast, their word "Asft" or "isft" means untruth, lies, falsehood, evil, sin, rebellion. In both these terms and their definitions we see a very early recognition of the necessary relation between the factual and moral judgment. Factual judgment and moral judgment are necessary complements of the other. True factual belief implies or requires true moral belief, as in and honesty and sincerity, while true moral belief requires that true factual belief not be in contradiction to moral belief, that is to say no true moral belief should be in denial about otherwise objectively established facts.

If there is no honesty, there is no truth, and if there is no basic morals sense and values there can be no such thing as honesty. As a result, it is proposed that all true beliefs presuppose a moral sense and values. Further, given the contingent nature of claims of fact, it may be that our moral sense, like logical intuition, is even more valid than our sense of experiential facts or physical phenomena, since all true and valid judgment presupposes it in the way of honesty, but not all judgments assumes any particular physical fact beyond the mere consciousness of self. My sense that something is true or false morally exists simultaneously with my sense that something is true or false factually. If someone speaks of true and false facts without a sense of right and wrong then they are either a fool or a liar. Judgments that purports to accord with truth and fact supposes and demand honesty, all the more so as the claim the judgment asserts is general or wide encompassing in its real or theoretical implications.

Actions without principle have no moral weight. If we believe the universe or our understanding of the universe is without a moral basis, no actions can possess moral principle except that conferred by arbitrary and artificial convention. If all actions are amoral, i.e. there is no real moral principle, there is no value to honesty, as there is no valid principle to confer opprobrium on a dishonest expression. This would mean that a dishonest claim would be equally valid as an honest one, and that there is therefore no truth -- which is evidently a contradiction.

That something has value is more intuitively true in the long run to us then any particular empirical fact. Our sense of worth or value of someone or something arguably acts more on our consciousness than matters as to fact. Indeed, our concerns about fact are typically built around such valuations. We might not be so sure, what the morally right or better belief is. But that there is a moral belief as to something being valuable awaiting our choosing is unquestionable, that is, at least, if we grant that true/false judgments are a valid and legitimate exercise of thought to begin with. Might we even go further and suggest that what is most moral, that is "selfless," is what is most real, and what is most real is what is most moral? Since, as our empirical sense assumes the moral sense, has not the latter an even more sure epistemological basis of absolute validity then the former? If the answer to these is yes then to the extent our value judgments are distorted or unwise the less we are or are capable of dealing with reality.

If we assume a potential correlation between judgment and reality then there must be a moral basis, a tacit *belief* that *trust*-worthiness is necessary, at the foundation of all such judgment. The source of this moral sense may, when all is said and done, be a mystery, but that it is a necessary component to correct judgment is logically and experientially self-evident.

Moral belief is even more a choice, than the choice to believe logic is valid. It is not intuitively dictated like logical belief because moral belief asks the heart's assent as well as the mind's consent, and this the heart can only give if it wills to do so. Logical belief does not require consent of the heart. Morover, even if the heart consents to logic, it need not accept its conclusions. The heart in being moral must love a selfless good. And if it loves it must love from free choice, else such love is not really love. By selfless love, I mean a sincere empathy combined with a feeling of disinterested giving toward a certain someone or something, and seeing them as an end in themselves.

Love requires morals because morals are the rules of love, and love completely without rules and order of some kind is no love but chaos and strife -- that is, its opposite. Immorality causes disharmony and cacophony in love, for instance when hypocrisy, falseness and insincerity are present. Where hypocrisy and insincerity are present in purported love, the love in question is that much more less real and that less powerful. This is not to say that love is a moral legalist. Yet without certain pronounced consistency – hence rule adherence -- love risks serious misunderstanding or at worst becomes a liar.

A better respect and following of compassionate morals makes one's love stronger. The more one does the right thing, the more they exercise the power of love, thus making their ability to love that much more great. The more powerful one's love, the greater one's capacity to assist others, understand others, and make them happy, and in this way better fulfill the Golden Rule. At the same, those disposed to love, in the

affectionate sense, seem to love those who are morally good more than they will love those immoral. Those who are good, the innocent for example, and those who suffer unfairly for doing the right thing, we tend to love and admire more. Granted, goodness is not always recognized in a just or timely way, but when it is, its effect on our sympathy cannot be denied.

In strengthening morals, love strengths the moral belief necessary for greater truth discernment by promoting the moral principles of honesty and fairness advantageous if not required for such discernment. In addition, love can be a spur to courage which is sometimes indispensable as well in the higher pursuit of truth and understanding. How many great discoveries and innovations would we have had not certain thinkers and scientists had not the true courage of their convictions, standing up bravely in the face of rude tyranny and or oppressive conventional wisdom? Finally selfless love, as empathy, provides the open-mindedness that enhances one's ability to consider different points of view fairly, and thus empower our objectivity.

Since morals imply rules or law, and law, by its nature, gives us more freedom then no law, moral law tempered by sound reason give us more choice in actions or projects we might choose to be involved in. Without rules we are subject to the forces of chance and caprice, and are therefore limited as to any plans or goals we might pursue. What amount of laws makes for greater freedom, on the other hand, may be open to question. It may be true, as is sometimes averred that the *fewer* laws make for more freedom. Note, in this regard, that there was only *one* law in paradise, and the gospels speak of only *two* great commandments. Some might argue that the liberty you lose in behalf of doing good is far less than the liberty you lose in doing evil. In any case, it would seem to be that some amount of law, makes for greater, not less freedom, in our thoughts, feelings, and deeds.

Similarly, as with morals laws, laws in thought strengthen and free us to a greater grasp of the truth. Without rules of thought, our minds are without a framework on which to construct or improve our greater understanding. Imagination is an important part of intellectual freedom and truth inquiry. But imagination applied to factual and moral beliefs without the due input and scrutiny of reason tends to confusion or even madness.

In this way, all three, selfless love, moral laws and rational understanding each empower and are vital to strengthening the force of the others. Our loving, and ability to love selflessly, gives life to and provides the basis and purpose of our morals and understanding. Our morals make for the quality of our selfless love, and are irreplaceable in our search for truth and freedom. The seeking of higher knowledge, understanding and wisdom can give our love and our morals greater scope for realization and durability.

Our *belief* in selfless love, in morals, and whatever brand of cognitive and rational understanding one prefers, requisite for knowledge and understanding, are all subjective choices, and purposeful acts of will. If we do not value or choose belief in these things we lose both our capacity for higher truth and real purpose.

The foregoing perhaps leads one to conclude that thoughts, words, feelings, phenomena, sensation, in some mysterious way, are mediums by which the mind and heart know and communicate with each other: mind with heart, heart with mind. Our minds and hearts are aspects of our soul, which is and brings together all that we are. Goethe said: "Whatever a man wants to accomplish – by deed or word, must have as its source his united powers in their totality, since all that is divided is worthless."[126] Our soul is the essence of our unity as beings. But it is the role of our minds and hearts, by means of correct chosen belief in selfless love, morals, and rational and imaginative truth, to provide our soul with true power, harmony, fulfillment and meaning. In morals and aesthetics do mind and heart find their common strength and unity. Because mind and heart are most brought together in our moral and aesthetics natures, any given individual soul is necessarily and first and foremost a moral and aesthetic being. So that what the poets have long believed may well be considered true that what unifies and gives life and purpose to our complete selves are love, truth and beauty.

Moral law and aesthetics free our volition and give power over other feelings, give us ideas of excellence and a unifying positive purpose. Other unified purposes, those tending more to the sensual, experience shows, degrade the soul and are more transient. As well we tend to love what is more beautiful, but beauty with moral goodness is even more desirable than mere physical beauty to those who see Truth. Beauty can be realized as long as it participates with virtue, and the more virtuous someone is the more beautiful. And though such beauty may not be the kind recognized by insensitive, or shallow people, we can have a justified confidence that higher intelligences and sensibilities will ultimately recognize it for what it is.

We see ourselves as limited by the physical, but the physical is ever changing therefore not fixed, not necessary. Yet by contrast, logic, morals, aesthetics, though intangible, are, because our understanding of the physical relies on them, more necessary and for that reason more real. Some existentialists have wondered "why existence?" But might not the better question be "why existence in *this* physical form?" And is this physical form, that is physical form as we know it, the only possible physical form? And is this physical form the only one possible to existence? Do not logic, morals, aesthetics and our imagination suggest greater possibilities of existence beyond physicality as we (perhaps erroneously) know and conceive it? If so, we may

[126] *Dichtung und Warheit*, Book 12.

not be so inextricably bound to *this* physical realm, with its own unique kinds of form, as we think. A more selfless love, logic, morals, aesthetics, imagination and faith in these, it can be argued, offer us legitimate hopes beyond both our mundane pre-conceptions and mortal possibility.

XII. Applied Peithology

As much as I have tried to make possible, peithology is not an "ism." The word and perhaps some of the outlook I have presented make it sound like it is such, but it is possible then to avoid this. In the course of this work I have expressed a number of values and opinions which need not necessarily be embraced when it comes to the use of peithology *as a method*.

With peithology as a method, we endeavor to 1) become aware of the role of belief in our thoughts, feelings and actions. 2) Identify our beliefs and get at their underlying assumptions. 3) Attempt to extract what truth there is from beliefs we find false, or which we otherwise disagree with.

Not all our knowledge we normally understand to be faith. Yet most knowledge may be retroactively made into faith by merely reflecting upon it to be such.

Beliefs serve as means of our realizing our purpose, or the ultimate good we seek. Without belief we can think and do nothing. Peithology recognizes that decisions of belief made are such as for any given individual to freely make. In saying this, it encourages a greater respect for freedom and choice of belief. At the same time, it tells us that when we ask question or arrive at conclusions that we should be as aware, as much as we can be, of the assumptions implicit in such questions and conclusions.

And even more than this, peithology tells to go further and seek the assumptions underlying our assumptions, underlying those assumptions, etc, as best we can and circumstances permit. Often times when we seek answers to questions or hold beliefs, we invariably assume things, which we are not always fully conscious of. And even if we are conscious of our assumptions, we do not always comprehend their full implications. In getting at our assumptions, we help to free ourselves of possible error, by means of a more thorough than usual scrutiny and creative introspection. By helping to better understand our beliefs and correct any errors they contain, we improve the quality of our judgments with respect to our thoughts, feelings and actions. Peithology as a method doesn't presume to solve all our dilemmas or always insist on what is in our best interest. But it is a method which helps us in detecting and deterring possible problems that exist or might arise from false assumptions, while opening up to our consciousness alternatives and positive possibilities that may not have previously occurred to us. Of course, more traditional philosophy and science have in many ways done this. What makes peithology somewhat different is the particular approach it uses, some of which is new, and some of which is based on what has for a long time been already known and understood, but which has been neglected.

Every thought being contingent, there is then no thought without something it assumes. If then you reject the whatever other it is that is assumed, you can reject the thing. This is of value to know, because any assertion can be rejected if we reject the assumption, and sometimes emotionally we reach a wrong conclusion, and this happens invariably because we are unthinking or else thinking in a sloppy way. Reject then the assumption (or more specifically, reject that the assumption implies the conclusion) and you are then logically free to reject the conclusion. This doesn't mean you will necessarily be right in your doing so. But as a practical matter and in most instances, odds are you will be, especially if the thought in question lacks rational specificity, and is sudden and unwelcome. Images, feelings and sounds can almost always be faked, but not correct reasoning, at least for those who know what they are about.

To give you one example, let's say we like A, but then come to the false conclusion that its value is based on X.[127] We can then (applying the above principle) reject the idea that X is the standard of the value for A, and else posit or assert that it's real standard of value is W or Z, etc. rather than X. Therefore we reject the idea that the value of A is in X (i.e. if we care to.)

Every thought being contingent, there is then no thought without something it assumes. If then you reject the whatever other it is that is assumed, you can reject the thing. This is of value to know, because any assertion can be rejected if we reject the assumption, and sometimes emotionally we reach a wrong conclusion, and this happens invariably because we are unthinking or else thinking in a sloppy way. Reject then the assumption (or more specifically, reject that the assumption implies the conclusion) and you are then logically free to reject the conclusion. This doesn't mean you will *necessarily* be right in your doing so. But as a practical matter and in most instances, odds are you will be, especially if the thought in question lacks rational specificity, and is sudden and unwelcome. Images, feelings and sounds can almost always be faked, but not correct reasoning, at least for those who know what they are about.

[127] We of ourselves cannot unilaterally place value on something. Instead we look to someone or something else as a standard for what is good.

The following are a few brief, but I think helpful, illustrations of how unfounded assumptions can dramatically or drastically affect our lives.

Many of us can remember when we believed something that wasn't true which caused us pain. But when we ceased to believe it, the pain was no longer there, nor did it trouble us. For example, a child may have been frightened by having the lights off, because they believed there was something threatening about the darkness in the room. When they later realized the mere darkness in the room (of itself) was not something to be feared, they developed to a new belief, namely that the darkness in the room was not something to fear. Thus by simply changing belief, in this case through better information and understanding, a potentially debilitating pain or difficulty is avoided and negated.

For another example, let's say we have bad opinion of Mulligan because we believe he did something wrong. If he did do something wrong, then our opinion is somewhat justified. But if he didn't do it, only we mistakenly thought he did, then our conception of Mulligan, as "bad," is wrong and so is our opinion of him. Another variant of this example might be where Mulligan did what was said he did, but the truth of what actually happened turned out to be not nearly so bad as it was made to sound. Thus by getting the facts straight about what Mulligan did or didn't do, an innocent person is spared undeserved antipathy, while we avoid being unjust and, as well, succeed in getting a better hold of the truth.

To use a historical case:

At one time medical thinking believed swamp air caused malaria. Along then came Walter Reed who, at the suggestion of another scientist, C. J. Finlay, questioned this assumption, and by doing so came to realize that it wasn't actually swamp air that transmitted malaria, but rather the disease was being carried by mosquitoes. This realization opened up the door for better cures and treatments of the disease, saving many lives, and much in the way of resources as well.

The conceiving of truth is both a mechanical and creative process: mechanical in answering to facts and reason; and creative in our freedom of belief and emphasis, which is ever subjective. In objective formulations of reality, we have relatively less choice, but in our subjective understanding our freedom is comparatively greater. In the *Dhammapada* we find "…our life is the creation of our mind…," (1.1) and in the *Bhagavad Gita* "Mind is stronger than the world because it discerns the world." (Ch. 3.) Ordinarily speaking, of course, we cannot by ourselves change and make the world into what we would like it to be. Yet to a certain extent by taking stock of and examining our previous assumptions,, and acknowledging our subjectivity (while being careful not to trespass other's rights and freedom), there are certain reasonable and morally legitimate ways we can change and recreate the world to suit ourselves. Above all the key to doing so, is more consciously selecting and taking charge of our beliefs.

Applied peithology begins with identifying our beliefs, both as to fact and value, labeling them such. Then we seek to discern our reasons for holding a given belief, while keeping a mind to various ways in which someone or something might be variously interpreted.

Most often what is very important in this process is our asking the value related question of what we (whether as individuals or as a community) desire most. This can be expressed another way by asking what do we love or care about most? Why do we love or who or whatever it is? Why are they or it so important to us? Where, when, and why as best as we can recollect, did this love first manifest itself in us? In doing so, we might think of going back to our childhood when we first became aware of this love. One of the reasons for addressing these questions is the recognition that our deepest desires frequently prompt and shape much of our other beliefs. We may not be able to identify the source of our deepest desire, but we can identify and or better realize through introspection what we love, why we love what we love, and what beliefs will best bring fulfillment to our love. We may not be able to actually choose our heart's desire. Yet we still may, like the repentant sinner, yet better realize it, and in doing so rediscover it in a completely new and different light. Not infrequently, it is our losing sight of what is really most important to us that is source of many unnecessary difficulties.

Next we might next ask how important to us is our being logical or rational. Our decision on this score will greatly affect the character of and how we arrive at our beliefs.

There are and usually have been social and natural pressures which cause some people to ignore logic, morals, and proper science. In some cases, espousing these can even risk alienation, and social rejection. A rational, moral and or scientific minded person who finds themselves in such a situation has little recourse but to try and seek out his or her own kind. Yet it is not always possible to do even this. Nor is it an easy task make rational or moral people who have no desire to be so.

If one is challenged by another as to why they should care about being especially rational, an answer one might give them could be this:

"What seems to be the obvious physical order of things to you is something that can be understood by reason. Without reason, there is no science. Scientific conclusions are the result of evidence organized for the understanding by reason. We know of no unity in the physical world which does not conform to reason. Nor is their any unity or power in the world which cannot, to some extent, be understood by means of reason.

What's more there is nothing in the physical world which we can understand (in our mind) to any great depth but for our using and applying of reason. If there is someone or something else that can do this, then I challenge you to tell me who or what it is. If you do, I can demonstrate, if you are willing to listen and be fair about it, that who or whatever you bring forward can be made consistent with and better understood by reason."

I offer this as an off hand and convenient model for those at a loss how to speak to people who tend to be irrational. There is, it goes without saying, no guarantee this line of arguing will make any difference, but with some persons it might.

This said, in dealing with others it is often well to give them credit for more intelligence than we normally would. While we intuitively think ourselves capable of potentially infinite and eternal thought (after all we can in any number of ways conceive of infinity or eternity) what most probably everybody fails to realize and appreciate is that the same is true of everyone else, so that seeing infinity and eternity in other people (and their real or potential capacity to think), does not ordinarily occur to us. If those we would assist or else our opponent is not so bright as we would wish, let's at least allow that, were circumstances different, it is possible he might be wiser and smarter than we take him to be. Even if an opponent is clearly wrong, we need to be fair, both to them and ourselves, and consider how important this matter or question (in which they are in error) really is. It may be better just to let it go, rather than assert a right, which, taken all and all, is of little importance.

There are occasions when we will think, feel, and believe differently because of the physical or social environment we are in. What ought to be remembered is what we think "the world" to be is for many people a highly subjective mental construction based on their immediate circumstances. Often we will find that what bothers us is based on a wrong theory about what is going on (the state of things), and what alternatives are available. Our ideas of "the world" then can impact other beliefs we have.

When confronted with a mentally or emotionally trying situation we might as "whose *world* is whatever it is taking place in? Is it the world as we see it, as God sees it, as others or someone else sees it? If it is ourselves, are there circumstances in which we might see the same differently if circumstances were different?"

Value judgments can very much affect how we feel about the world and how it appears to us. So much so that it is possible, in a decisive sense, to change reality as we experience it, by changing our value judgments and beliefs. Sometimes great pain can be mitigated if we better recognize and or modify our beliefs as to what to us truly matters, while being careful to be honest with ourselves.

Similarly, our beliefs are sometimes under the influence of feelings we are not aware of and which seem beyond our control. Potentially strong impulses like fear and appetite, as well as high-pressure situations, are not conducive to reflection, and usually a person will want to wait for a time and space of peace and quite to introspectively examine their assumptions and beliefs. Formally recognizing and identifying such feelings, impulses and high-pressure situations for what they are is an important help way in our dealing with them. By doing so, we are better situated to avoid succumbing to their powers, powers which potentially hinders us from effective reasoning and reflection. Invariably feelings are accompanied by beliefs, both beliefs as to fact and to value, which if we changed the belief, we might very well be able to change the feeling. In this way, there are ways in which we can disbelieve a belief arising from feeling, as there are ways we can disbeliefs relating to fact. Bear in mind, one is not forced to believe most things necessarily. Though feelings may make us feel otherwise, we can insist that a suspicion be justified before believing it, and if it isn't we can tell ourselves that we at least don't formally believe it. Even if our feelings continue to prompt us otherwise, we can still have the useful power of saying our feelings are in error, and we don't (or will try not to) believe our feelings. Results will vary greatly for given people and circumstances, but as a general principle this approach does and can work in lessening or removing troubling feelings.

I think it will be found that most psychological problems are typically emotional in character or origin, and if we thought about it, solving a given problem might be as simple a matter as recognizing a negative emotion and refusing to be victimized by it. This ability could be strengthened and developed over time. In other words, do we feel bad? If so, then perhaps we should avoid feeling, and do this by being aware of the feeling and rejecting or at least have a clearer idea that it is a feeling.

In general it is well when one is bothered by something to ask, am I bothered more because of concern for myself or am I more bothered more because of concern for others? If I stop and take the time to think about it, what do I *really* care about? This sort of questioning can often very much change our point of view and understanding of a problem. We might go so far s to ask ourselves, why do I matter? Why do my concerns matter? We do, after all, have the freedom to ask whether our own needs are so very important as we think.

When someone praises or criticizes you, they are making a value judgment. You should ask what criteria they are using, and similarly for any value judgment that particularly arouses you or catches your attention.

Though we will at times feel set in our attitudes towards others, circumstances can change those same attitudes, and in fact change in us unawares. We can take control of this through better exercising and developing over time our powers of belief.

One's capacity for choice of belief then is one of the greatest powers any one of us as individuals possesses. Not all are equally capable of examining and changing their beliefs. Yet the power to examine and choose beliefs is something that can be developed if we so desire it. Some of the ways this could be accomplished might include philosophical reading and study, reasoning exercises, and uninhibited self-honesty. Ultimately we have no control over our external circumstances, yet we do have control on how we deal with those circumstances, and our power of control is that much greater as we are and choose to be wise, rational and virtuous

Should we, in our conscience, feel bad when we have previously harbored prejudicial and erroneous preconceived notions (e.g. the people of that country are dishonest)? Yes, we should. Yet at the same time we *must* also appreciate the fact that we have the power to change those pre-conceived notions, and have therefore less reason to feel bad about our error than we would otherwise.

Desire is forced on us at birth, but as we gain experience, we learn how other people desire and compare our desires to them. In this way we learn that we need not always desire as we have done in the past. And as we gain and develop powers of reflection we further acquire the power to choose our beliefs about what we should desire. Also, an improved ability to think and reason, helps us better attain or achieve what we desire. For religiously disposed people, prayer, accompanied by a sincere and selfless moral desire, can be very efficacious in keeping one from certain wrong beliefs, and guiding them to right ones.

Our moral character and aesthetic sense empower the control over our beliefs as well as when we seek to be more rational. However, the less innocent a person is the more necessary is it for them to desire the moral and aesthetic good. A more innocent person, by contrast and definition, is already more healthily endowed with what they require in these regards, even if they are weak in other areas of their life. For the rest of us, we must purposely seek the moral and the aesthetic from the basis of selfless love, perhaps also, as some believe, while invoking divine assistance. Such effort and desire make it possible to better unite our thinking and emotional nature's, and in doing so reach the greatest perfection and power of which our beliefs are capable.

Practical circumstances have prevented my addressing more fully the role of aesthetics as they relate to mind and heart unity, a shortcoming which it may be possible to remedy in a future work. I would, nevertheless, make here the following brief remarks.

Beauty, like moral character, is something that we ought to encourage in ourselves, with the understanding that we are most beautiful when we help others to be beautiful -- that is, so long at as we are acting morally toward those others. In promoting beauty in ourselves and others we further foster that aesthetic unity of mind and heart which is a good in and of itself, and something which directly or indirectly betters our morals and understanding.

By beauty I do not so much mean cosmetic or physical beauty. Cosmetic and physical beauty, insofar as they aren't tainted with excessive vanity or crassness, need no special pleading since they are so universally admired.

Instead I mean moral beauty, a kind of beauty that displays our power for selfless love. Being or attempting to be beautiful can be a very effective way of looking at and dealing with trying situations. If we are in desperate straits, and there seems little we can do to extricate ourselves from the pain or danger we are in, we might think about how we can be beautiful. No matter how troubling the situation, we can usually find virtue in it. This is not always an easy thing to do, but if we can find and realize that virtue, we are able to make ourselves, and consequently the world about and around us, more beautiful.

THE END

Appendix.

On Form and Desire:
An Epistemological Excursion

"For pleasure causes us to do base actions and pain causes us to abstain from doing noble actions. Hence the importance, as Plato points out, of having been definitely trained from childhood to like and dislike the proper things; this is what good education means." -- Aristotle, *Nichomachean Ethics* 1104b3-13.

There are (or there can at least be reasonably posited) three primary and elemental modes of *Being* or Existence, and without one or more of these modes being present there is no Being, (at least none such that human minds are capable of knowing.) These three primary modes are:

a. *Reacting* to an action (of someone or something external)
b. *Initiating* an action that will cause an external change of some kind
c. *Resting,* i.e. avoiding action.

These in turn can be naturally formed into secondary or sub modes by means of combinations (with perhaps one or more of the others.) Put slightly different when these any or all of the three primary modes are combined sub-modes are formed so that, for example, someone or something might be both (somehow) resting and reacting. Now it will be observed that these primary definitions already assume existence is possessed on the part of something or someone else,[128] so that one would infer from this there is no sole or single primal *existent*, but rather, if our characterization holds, primal *existents*. By taking this approach we need not assume there is no God (i.e. he does not exist) or that he is multiple. What we might do instead is say that he somehow precedes and is above existence as such.

In addition to the above thee modes, *Contemplation* might perhaps be considered a fourth primary and elemental mode of Being yet (and as well) a unique kind of synthesis or combination of 'Reacting,' 'Initiating' and 'Resting.'

Being and *Action* (or an event) can, for practical purposes and under certain circumstances, be considered synonymous, and that for *someone* (or *something*) existence can be legitimately thought of as an action of a kind -- whether an action initiated by themselves, and or someone else. Yet events presuppose persons and or objects, so how far can we take the similarity?

To account for the seeming contradiction, a theological minded person might say only God or the Absolute is a true person or object (all others of that description being contingent and dependent on him.) What we speak of as persons or objects, viewed literally are really quasi-persons and quasi-objects. In our blindness and ignorance of our fallen state we think of persons and objects as being definite and real, when perhaps it could be maintained instead that these are all rather events whose meaning is realized at their greatest, most real or most divine height in the one true person, one true object, and one true being, namely God.

Yet this hypothesis or perspective aside, we can -- at least -- say that persons and objects have the quality of an event about them,[129] and that being and action imply each other, so that motionless Being, or a Being which is not in some way an event, while plausible in theory, is far from anything we know in fact. Anything can in some way be said to affect or have the power to affect something, and to this extent anyone or anything that exists also must be assumed to be able to act (i.e. insofar as they, or it, can affect anything, including our senses) and implies an event or potential event. In all, I make note of the association of persons and objects with events as something some might overlook, but which is otherwise not crucial to emphasize.

Judgment, that is decisions as to fact and or value, are initially brought about as a result of our reacting to someone or something. We are placed in a situation where external circumstances coming in contact with our own interests call upon us to come to a conclusion, or else call upon us to accept someone else's conclusion. To the extent we do initiate judgments (for example intelligent people deliberately analyzing and cogitating) it is still in reaction to something else apart from us taking place beyond our control. Hence (again, *initially*) it would seem it is as a reaction that we find ourselves judging and forming conclusions. This combination of external circumstances and our own (perceived) interests forcing or prompting a conclusion (of some kind of other) then is a judgment: the *conclusion* being the crystallized or identifiable form that the judgment takes.

Can necessity create fact and or value? *Must* this or that assertion or thing be *decided* as being true false, this good or bad? Possibly, and in a manner of speaking yes, but only insofar as we allow such. We can, (depending on our power as individuals of thought and will) chose to not accept what others or circumstances say is a necessary factual or value judgment. But more on factual and value judgments later.

---

[128] As say in something or someone else to react to.
[129] Also compare "object" and "event" to the different yet identical concepts "particle" and "wave."

This said, *after* the initial reaction our judgment or opportunity for judgment can switch either to our mere further reaction or else our choosing to initiate reflective judgment.

By a judgment which merely reacts I mean a circumstance where the physical or sensual "decisively" overwhelm or override our rational and moral faculties (including our conscience), such as in the case of unreflective instinct. This then would be a *reacting judgment*.

A judgment which initiates judgment is one in which reason, objective reflection, and moral consideration (to some degree or other depending on the person) are more or less *consciously* invoked or utilized to bring about the conclusion. This is an *initiating judgment*.

A judgment is a decision as to the fact and or value of something, including decisions in which true or false (in some form or other) are explicitly or implicitly part of the conclusion.

Judgments can be said to be arrived at when we *conclude* something. We can conclude something consciously or we can also conclude something semi-consciously, as we do, for example, and typically when we reason and or act based on assumptions. Judgments (whether factual or value judgments) previously arrived and which might serve to assist in our forming a present judgment are what we call *assumptions*.

Any task we might do involves a number of other accompanying tasks, and this is true as well of judging.

Though as common as forming or assuming conclusions are, most people most of the time do not or rarely think of themselves as making judgments, or consciously denote conclusions they reach as judgments. One can and does make judgments without use of the word (judgment) or the need to describe to oneself that judging is what we ourselves or someone else is doing. Rather, more usually, we apply or relate (say for purposes of further judgment) the conclusion we make to some event, including a thought or an action, treat and utilize it as an assumption, and leave it at that. While true and false conclusions might be implied, say logically, by any judgment, it is not necessary when we conclude something to assert that such and such is strictly "true" or "false." Instead we merely take something as being a fact; it "works for us," and that is the end of the matter without reference to the concept of truthfulness. This would seem to be the case with the majority of people certainly. This said, one of course can do both, that is we can conclude "the boat is seaworthy" while at the same time asserting "the conclusion 'the boat is seaworthy' is true, or is a true conclusion." But again, most as a practical matter would ordinarily not think this second step or exposition necessary.

A judgment requires a consciousness and a conclusion as to fact and or value, which in turn then is to some degree based on prior judgments or assumptions.

We can a) hold assumptions consciously and be thus clearly aware of them, b) hold them semiconsciously, or c) maintain them such that they seem unconsciously built into our way of thinking and feeling -- which is perhaps the same thing as b) except that with c) the assumption is more deeply rooted in memory and instinct.[130]

There is a process in a our thinking by which it is possible to willfully call up an otherwise ignored or forgotten recollection. This ability to recollect or seek recollections will naturally vary with a given individual and depends in large part on their familiarity with the given subject to which the object of recollection is most related. In other instances memories may come to the fore of our conscious which we just as soon prefer they not do so, such that we then find ourselves trying to forget them (at least for the present moment.)

Prior assumptions can include past value judgments, and these in turn based on past factual judgments. Such value assumptions can be so deeply ingrained in us over time that even though reason speaks against or to dispel them, we have a hard time controlling or ridding ourselves of them. Say for example a person does not win a contest. Reason tells them that losing a particular sewing contest is not, in the grand scheme of things, really all that important. Yet the emotional memory of frustration of not winning still prevails -- especially if we think it is losing the immediate contest that is the cause of our frustration, when in true fact it is the memory of past such frustrations that really bothers us (not *this* losing the specific contest.) In this way a mistake in characterization of something, in this case the importance of winning a present diving contest, is further mistakenly given greater value or concern than it really warrants, based on an unconscious assumption we have yet to consider the value and merit of -- namely the overall frustration arising from past losses in competitions (and is this value judgment or assumption warranted?)

Additional ways of characterizing judgment (or a judgment) are:

---

[130] Groups of people can be spoken of as forming judgments. But here, to keep things uncluttered, we will focus only on individual judgment.

*Something intellectually and or emotionally which takes place (in us) and results in a decision to mentally conclude, and or to act or not act.
* A conscious decision that an assertion (or something that might be expressed as an assertion) is formally true or false (or perhaps some combination, or qualified "true," qualified "false.")
* A semi or else unconscious decision to act or to conclude that such and such is or is not a fact. As a rule, we oftentimes judge or assume an opinion (perhaps of others) without realizing that is what we are doing. This is especially true of emotive value judgments (such as in our losing the sewing contest example.)
* Circumstances in which *impressions* – where (we allow) circumstances, immediate and or otherwise – to "take hold" of our decision making processes and assumptions, and allow ourselves (intentionally or no) to be manipulated by them. It may be described as a kind of laziness, usually excusable in us for being so common, in which we let circumstances impose their impressions on both our perceptions and other thoughtless assumptions (yet assumptions which we could freely and consciously weigh and re-consider, but which we instead accept "thoughtlessly" as assumptions.)[131]

Judgments or assumptions (we can equate the two) may be:

a. Held or maintained with great intellectual (say rational) and or emotional conviction ("necessity")
b. Held or maintained as a practical and probable truths
c. Held or maintained as uncertain and hesitant truths, gambles.
d. Held or maintained as wished for truths; the hope of something being true.
e. Not held and or ignored

These degrees of true and false in effect are the (rough) measures or the *Truth Value* of a judgment. A given statement or possible conclusion then is capable of having a Truthfulness assigned to it by someone, and possibly more than one truth value also. Whether a, b, c, d, or e, applies, and or whether or not a person's assesses an assumption properly or adequately depends on the capacity of the thinker and the given *criteria* they use for determining the truth or falsehood of an assertion or belief. Of course, people oftentimes will vary greatly in their believing what makes something true or false, or fact of fiction.

The truth value one places on say a factual conclusion might differ for them if immediate and contextual circumstances were different. For example the business venture which yesterday we believed with rational certainty as being unpromising, we might presently have an entirely different idea of due to unforeseen developments. What seemed almost absolutely true before, we come to find is now not even true even in a small way. Our assumptions and conclusions therefore can change, perhaps drastically.

In practical experience, judgments are arrived at in different ways and kinds of temperament, and in every day life we are not always disposed to reflect on them objectively and impartially. Instead we "know" or are so caught up with emotion that more close rational consideration seems unnecessarily perhaps even repugnant to us (so sure of we of ourselves and our conclusion.) Is this a bad thing, that is to reject close reasoning? Well, whether or not it is, it is something we all do, and many times we just "know" without examining closely and without feeling the need to examine more closely and thoroughly what we conclude or assume. After all, as a very practical matter, unreflective judgments are unavoidable and necessary to some degree. Yet the natural question then is to what extent should this properly be so? For clearly careful thought and close reasoning are indispensable to us also.

People will routinely differ with respect to the amount of rational support or qualification they will allow or provide for their true/false or good/bad conclusions. At the same time, it is often the case that any conclusion could, at any given time, be said to need qualification or amending in the interest of greater accuracy and correctness. Moreover, more precise and correct judgment often suggests that the answer to a given question is not absolutely true or false (at least if one is such who assumes we are not capable of either absolute factual or value judgments.) This understood, we nonetheless essentially see the world in true/false, and good/bad terms, as part of the basic form judgments and conclusions take. As seen in ordinary communications, qualifying a truth statement may under certain circumstances lessen the force of its persuasiveness. This I think pointedly illustrates how pronounced is our tendency to prefer that our conclusions be either a decisive true or a decisive false.

It would seem that the more given factual or value judgment are made clear and validated by (to us) "right-est criteria," actions can be more easily chosen or taken up, and questions more easily decided, because our conclusions and potential assumptions are made more sure and confident by rational and conscientious use of such criteria. Yet while it might be argued that wisdom necessarily implies conviction with respect to an action following upon a wise judgment, it is clearly true that lack of wisdom does not at all necessarily imply lack of conviction. Though. this recognized, it may well be that the conviction which an ignorant or irrational person displays or manifests may be something conferred on or instilled in them by a higher intelligence.

To speak of superior versus inferior judgment is normally to speak of measuring the difference, in degree and quality, of the reasonableness, coherence, and comprehensiveness, and knowledgeableness of a given "judge" and their assertion. Of course, people will have different ideas on how such superior or more

[131] In *Peithology* I refer to this event as "apprehension," while drawing on William James concept of "apperception."

valid versus inferior factual judgment criteria might be established. Here, by this distinction (superior versus inferior), we are merely asserting that, practically and generally speaking, there is such a thing as a more intelligent versus a less intelligent judgment. If we allow that truth quality of factual judgment can be somehow estimated or ascertained, obviously the degrees between superior and inferior judgment could (at least approximately) be compared and, relative to each other, be measured and distinguished. An example of this would be comparing the truth value of the assertion "Dorothy has a biological mother and father" versus say "Lisbon is the capital of Portugal" versus say "there are Aleutians who are Eskimos" versus say "this vase can be dated as being 4,000 years old" versus say "so-and-so was the most esteemed and accomplished painter this country ever produced," etc. The measure and truthfulness of such assumptions or potential assumptions are presumably to be determined by some arbiter who applies their own and or some other's criteria, including their *standard* (or standards) for what is or makes a conclusion true (or false.)

These general preliminary distinctions having been noted and outlined, there are two fundamental and (for us) necessary kinds of judgments:

1. Factual Judgments
2. Value Judgments

A factual judgment determines the truth and falsity, the reality and unreality, of a given possible belief. Factual judgments can take on various forms including forming conclusions as to fact, and deciding whether an assertion is true or false (or qualified true or false.)

We can form value judgments as to factual judgments, and factual judgments can be used to temper, modify, or amplify value judgments. Otherwise judgments, assertions and statements of fact have a degree or measure of *Truthfulness*, while persons, objects, events have a possible *Worth*.

Both truthfulness and worth will, once more, to some degree and in some way necessarily entail the other. In ordinary experience, most people apparently see facts as preceding any valuation of them, that is they "know" fact before ascribing worth. But this is only how it seems on the surface, and we need not insist on this order or sequence.

Truthfulness (as I use the term here) is much like truth value and refers to the estimation of whether a statement, assertion or other belief is true or not, and this based on the designated arbiter and the truth and fact criteria they use. Truthfulness, however, refers only to assertions of fact, while consideration of truth value may more broadly be applied to both factual or value claims and assertions generally. A very simple example of truthfulness is when we say the statement "Trapezoids have only two sides" is false. In terms of "truthfulness" (or also, if you prefer, "truth value") then the statement is "false," as opposed to say "true," or "absolutely true," "possibly true," etc. or other measures of value as to fact. Such measures then are the truth value.

One form of truthfulness criteria is seen in standards of proof. Of standards of whether something is true or false, there are different versions, and anyone of these in turn can be applied with a greater or lesser strictness by the given arbiter of fact. One person's standard of proof, for instance, might be what is simply said in the newspapers or on television. Another requires a specific expert's testimony. Yet another requires that they be able to test for themselves the fact in question, and perhaps use a precise scientific method. And, of course, there are many and other approaches as to what constitutes someone's *standard of proof*.

Statements, beliefs, equations, sensations, perceptions, intuitions may have truthfulness or are capable of having truthfulness. Whether the notions of "true" and "false" possess truthfulness perhaps depends on how one defines them. Yet even allowing this to be a feasible question, what criteria could we possibly use to determine the truthfulness or truth value of the notions "true" and "false?" The former assumes the latter and vice versa. As things stand therefore, it seems we must (here at any rate) simply accept their reality and validity as necessary and ultimate measures or characterizations of fact and belief.

A value judgment determines *Worth* and refers to the degree or measure of desire-value (or desire related value, including utility for example) of someone or something, and is typically expressed or arrived at in terms of good and bad, or what we like and dislike.

As there are levels and or shades of true and false there are understood to be levels and shades of good and bad, again and also depending on the criteria we use.

With respect to *factual judgment*s, the kind of *facts* we can be said to know based on judgments which form or invoke their usage (in no special order) are:

a. Immediate facts (or data) of sensation and perception
b. Facts of sensation and perception known by memory
c. Facts formed from intellectual intuitions, the notion of "one" and "number" for example.
d. Facts formed from concepts (which are formed in conjunction with sensation, perception, and intuition)
e. Facts born out of or arrived by reasoning

f. Facts formed from Ideas (which are formed from concepts, and possibly but not necessarily involving close reasoning)
g. Facts formed from memories of concepts and ideas
h. Second hand facts (of any of the above description) yet which someone relates or communicates to us

Depending on the circumstances and our powers of judgment, there is some extent to which we can ignore or reject what (perhaps) are, or what others claim to be, facts.

Intellectually speaking at least, facts are typically based on and realized by means of *concepts* which the mind forms for the purpose of their mental embodiment and representation. Without some means of conceptualization, intuition, sense and perceptual data lend themselves that much less to our forming a clear understanding and consequently (also) control of them. Feelings are somewhat different as mere feeling can sometimes be said to lead us to a conclusion with little need for conceptualization, as in when one stubs their toe. In that case the pain speaks itself regardless of our intellectual conception of it. Yet if we are to make our factual understanding that much more clear about something (and thus empower ourselves to better deal with it or them at present or in future) we need to form conceptions based on memories formed from intuition, perception and sensation. For this reason concepts are necessary and make possible clearer intellectual ideas about something on top of and say in addition to conclusions brought about by brute force or other strong feeling(s.)

Depending on the rules of logic and association one uses or applies a given concept (or conception) may be an index, reference, or suggestion to innumerable other related and unrelated concepts or conceptions.

As part of our thought and language processes, symbols or signs (including words) may be formally assigned to a concept or conception inasmuch as we feel the concept needs expression and realization. To speak of a concept which is not symbolized or assigned a sign of some kind is simply to speak of a concept which isn't being considered or thought of.

This averred, and it is extremely important to emphasize, there may easily be more than one conception or version of a given concept (indeed perhaps infinitely so.) We are all the more reminded of the truth of this when we see to what extent a given person's conception (of a given concept) can be unlike another's, or even unlike a conception they held at an earlier time. Further similar or otherwise identical conceptions we hold may be said to go through stages of development in our thinking (with other conceptions and feelings being added to or taken away from it for example.) Another peculiarity of conceiving something is that something can be something by not being something else, or can be more than it is by being more of something else – even though it otherwise is the same thing (or person.)

There may be said to be such a thing as a *Notion*, which, as I peculiarly use the word here may refer to kinds of intuitions which are vague or latent concepts, such as we might experience in the case of certain intuitions or emotions, as when we say "here is *something* but I don't quite know what it is (or quite all that it is.)"Another way of defining notion is as a concept lying within us which has yet to achieve full or significant awareness and or relevance by us. We hear a strange cry is the darkness, experience it, but don't really have a clear conception of who or what caused it. At the same time there may be said to be notions and intuitions which, at times, have a certain greater reality to us than cognitive conceptions, as in the case of familial or biological instincts, for example. Every concept might be said to have a certain amount of notion to it, but a notion (again as I specifically use the word here) need not be cognitively conceptualized in order to affect our judgment or beliefs. Yet though it is possible to cognitively conceptualize a notion, again as in say an instinct or deep emotion, in our doing so something may be lost in the translation, or perhaps there are aspects of the instinct or the emotion which are simply (for us at least) inexpressible and or somehow cognitively incomprehensible.

As a general definition*, Ideas* are the form in which conceptions are gathered or formed into a unity and or group. They might also be described as concepts arranged or ordered in such a way as to heighten certain specific concepts, whose emphasis is otherwise lost. For this reason they can be seen as concepts of a heightened or illuminated character.

As with "notion," probably every conception can be said to have some amount of 'idea' to it.[132] But obviously some unities or groupings of conceptions have more 'idea' to them than others – at least based on the context (we might say 'world') in which they are conceived or received. Ideas, in this sense, are conceptions which are more meaningful to us than others. An odd facet of this definition, if we accept it, is that what might not be an idea to us might be an idea to another and vice versa, even though the conception each holds is mostly or essentially the same or similar yet different by its being viewed differently (or seen differently say by its being placed in a different context than another person's places it.) A natural illustration of this would be where one person's unwanted item requiring storage is another person's antique worth paying dearly for. Their idea (including conception) of the thing are obviously different.

[132] And, naturally, we might also say every idea has some amount of notion to it to help give it its greater significance beyond a mere conception.

There is a sense in which one concept can be seen through the filter of another concept, and this is very common such as when a patriotic person is inclined to see the achievements of his own people in a specially worthy light versus, similar or identical achievements on the part of members of other countries. As our "filter" conception[133] changes, so our conception of a second something (now seen through the new filter) might conceivably change also.

Like concepts, ideas can, of course, be expressed in words and other symbols. Beyond this both the basic conception or idea of something or somethings (or someone or someones) can be expressed in terms of *qualities*, characteristics, aspects, properties, or attributes, which in turn can be known intuitively and or through symbols. Qualities are what make up a thing and the fact that there are qualities seems to assume there is a thingness, or monadity which is real beyond quality, since qualities (or properties) are merely appendages of and assume them. Yet it is very common for us to mistake a mere quality for a real thing, so that what exactly is a quality and what truly qualifies as a real thing or monad is, in a given instance, understandably (at least for some) open to question.[134]

Among the most elemental of qualities which can be ascribed or attributed to someone or something are:

1. Specified (or nominal) identity

2. Logical placement (or classification)

a) All
b) Some
c) None

These are the (cognitively) necessary foundation of all conceptions, and all factual judgments require our invoking or making reference to these (i.e. one, some, or all of them) in one form or other. Any given something may be thought or spoken of in any one or all of these senses. For example, a person may be "Mary Smith," and she may be "all" and or "some" of the people present in the room, and she might be spoken of as among those not in the room ("none.")

When one says "some of the apples are green, some are red," "some" in a sense describes an aspect of the group of apples, and in this sense "some" can be considered a quality attributable to the larger group "all." Yet if "all," some, none, are treated as qualities they are the most general sort of qualities attributable to any single person or thing, and in this sense they are logically universal or universally applicable aspects and therefore qualities (or potential qualities) of anyone or anything. For this reason the above can be called *logical qualities,* or else *potential logical qualities.* Each of the given logical qualities, of course, will bear relation to some other something and its qualities, and therefore each is obviously a relative and contingent notion. Note we will only make reference to a specified identity, all, some, none, insofar as there is value in doing so. Hence, the reality of the logical quality is to some extent a question of its value or usefulness.

Qualities may be accidental, incidental or they may be necessary to a given person or object, depending on the criteria one applies. In both a practical and a real sense they might be thought of as the measures and degrees of Being – at least Being and forms of existence as we are capable of knowing them.

Truthfulness and Worth, of say an assertion, may themselves, in certain circumstances and according to certain conventions, be considered qualities of a sort.

Factual judgments necessarily make reference to objects, persons, or events as their main subject or concern.

To reiterate, the impression any fact or conception makes on us depends in no small part of the value we give or assign it. This assigning of worth to a believed fact (which is yet another way of saying "judgment"), is what we mean by a value judgment, and is something we can do both consciously and semi-consciously, and oftentimes some combination of both. We will acknowledge or be cognizant of something because it has some indirect or direct value or meaning to it. And we may do this instinctively and unthinkingly. In the example "look out that tree is about to fall" our self-preservation is something that was decided by ourselves long ago so that we do not need to decide that question. Instead what concerns us (avoiding the falling tree) is an instinctive

---

[133] That is the concept through which we see a second concept, as if the first acted as a filter to the second.

[134] We should note also that it is possible to characterize and determine qualities (as Duns Scotus was one of the first to realize) by means of quantification of parts, elements, and or components, as when for example a given color on a computer screen can be measured in pixels, versus say another color by means of the same measure. Further, every image has, and could be said to require, its geometrical equivalent, and every geometrical figure has a mathematical equivalent. Yet not every mathematical equivalent has or needs a literal image. This (I believe) proves the superiority of logic and mathematics over images, or understanding based on mere images, inasmuch as while images necessarily require logic and mathematics, the opposite does not seem much to be the case.

.

reaction/conclusion based on that previously determined underlying assumption ("I must save my life.") In other words, if our safety or comfort did not matter (a value judgment) the fact of the dangerous falling tree would not matter and therefore perhaps not require our notice and hence a conclusion concerning it. Without some connection or association to some value or worth it would not (for us) exist.

Technically speaking one can probably describe anything so as to recreate the idea and perhaps experience of it. But not everything is worth saying, or can, under the circumstances, be said properly so as to be worth saying. In the same vein, we can represent, recognize, or ignore things (persons and experiences) to ourselves in a way that is or might be considered:

a. justified,
b. excusable,
c. indifferent
d. frivolous
e. harmful.

Depending on the criteria we are using one can see many things, but not all things are worth seeing, just as one can say many things, but many (given) things are not necessarily worth saying. And as by not saying something one can still being saying something, it is possible to avoid or ignore persons or things in a way that gives them our attention.

When we ignore something are we not still somehow forming a conclusion of or about it? The psychological details we can (for convenience) refrain from exploring and describing here. Otherwise more or less unconscious value judgments are judgments based on previously determined assumptions, so that in the chain of consciousness overtime there may be said to be (based on there *having been*) a conscious value judgment (say way back when) which accounts for our present thoughtless disregard (and hence judgment) of something being a fact worthy or not of our notice.

Each factual judgment then has some amount of value judgment implied in it and each value judgment has some amount of factual judgment to it. The two are inseparable, yet the degree to which one requires the other can vary enormously. For example if I say "3 –1 = 2," some value judgments implied or applicable might be my love of (or need for) order, mathematical intuition, practical utility, school tradition. These are some things I value and are part of what gives the mathematical statement use, and hence value. Without this value (regardless of what it is based on or justifies it) the statement has no meaning or purpose. In a statement like "Hilda is the best horse shoe thrower" here value judgment might be said to take greater precedence than in the previously example because (at least one could argue) the criteria used here is of a less objective sort. In between these two are various other statements, conclusions, or assertions with shades of being more objectivity based and demonstrable[135] or more value oriented we might list, such as "Pakistan was once part of India," "honey pours more slowly than water," "you need to eat properly and get regular exercise in order to be healthy," "ostriches are larger and more well known birds than whooping cranes" "crime does not pay," "a trumpet is louder than a harmonica," "this budget plan will work to get more people employed," etc. Exactly which is more factual and which more value like an assertion some will dispute. Obviously much depends on how we define something, and a large part of any definition is the context (or again 'world') created or established for it, and naturally the person or persons making the judgment.

These finer points aside (for now), it seems otherwise safe and fair to conclude that the two primary divisions by which judgments may be sorted are those as to fact and those as to value, with the understanding that both will to some extent assume and require the other. For this reason at least, no judgments can be an absolutely pure unity.

Value Judgments

Value is the measure of the worth, esteem, satisfaction, and there may be one or many values (and kinds of value), just as there may be one and many facts (and kinds of fact.) Yet in comparing Value to Fact, note how, in normal practice, we think of value (singular) and *facts* (plural.) Value, in our seeking of it, is ordinarily conceived of and felt as a unity (or so it would appear.) Desire, by its nature, not only seeks but insists upon some unity of one kind or another. Facts, on the other hand, though we might fixate on one, are ordinarily conceptualized in multiple terms. For this reason there *seems* less contingency to value and more contingency to fact both as our conceptions and experiences of them. Yet when we desire something (or someone) ordinarily it is because it is connected with something else, and presumably some perceived and or latently conceived greater unity which is sought after.

We can well ask what good is this something if this something (or someone) needs something else? Hence God (or the Absolute) alone who is un-contingent, becomes (for many) the philosophical justification for all values, the standard and definition of supreme and all value (and values.) Yet even if we don't mention God, value inevitably involves the invoking of some higher standard, index, or ideal,[136] and it is that which gives

[135] For further exploration of the topic of First and Secondary Criteria see my *Peithology*.
[136] An ideal may be said to be the cause or source of something, i.e. we know the ideal by its effects, though never it.

who or what ever it is value, as when the value of the gold is said to be based on the temple or public confidence.

Value judgments are (or a result of) the seeking of a kind of form which suits or satisfies some or desires we have. Of these there are basically three possible kinds:

* Emotional Value judgments
* Intellectual Value Judgments
* Spiritual Value Judgment

A spiritual value judgment I would say (to be brief) would need to be manifested in or could be otherwise expressed by in emotional and or intellectual terms, so it might not be strictly necessary to include here, but do so for purposes of being open minded to the possibility. This remarked, someone else might argue that what is emotional and intellectual are manifestations of the spiritual, and so we make note.

Which of these three is stronger in a person, emotions, intellect, the spirit, and how well they are harmonized with each other naturally depends on the individual's emotional, intellectual, and spiritual constitutions, as well as their physical and mental environment, both of which "environments" they have some amount (real and potential) of choice and control over.

You could be (in a manner f speaking) unconsciously thinking about something other than what you are thinking about. You can be concerned with (that is place a value on) something other than what you are concerned about.

Emotional Judgments with most people and most of the time seem to hold the greater sway with us than *Intellectual judgments*,[137] and intellectual value judgments may after all may said to be only derivative of emotional judgments, inasmuch (at any rate) as we assume value originates in feeling, and prior to thought, since thought relies on feeling and presupposes it. As well and furthermore, we know of or have experienced feeling or emotions outside of conceptual thought.

When we desire we desire more than one thing. Even when we desire say health we desire it for some other reason. True, we may think of ourselves as desiring one thing. But if we look more closely whatever the one thing (or person) we find that it is attached to something else.

Every thing we desire then is attached or connected to some one thing or other, except again, as per the religious and some mystics, God. Further value by its nature,(as in greater versus lesser, better versus worse) is relative and hence implies two or more. From this it would seem there is (for us and our power of knowing, judging at least) no isolated one thing which can have value. Value requires two or more at the very least, and some would insist more than two. For this reason, we can never really desire only one person and or thing, and when we do desire or love someone something we should find time to ask who or what are we connecting them to or associating them with.

One value can complement or negate another (e.g. quality of some merchandise versus its price), and where values conflict or are contrary they can sometimes be harmonized by means of a *mean* (as in the "golden mean.") If there is a standard or index of value, it is presumably laid down, created or imposed by a person, whether ourselves or someone else. For how could a thing impart value by itself? Or put a quite different way, of what use would the whole world be to us if we were left all alone in it.

As a practical matter and most of the time, sometimes we arrive at a value judgment without consciously thinking that this is what we are doing. The exception to this might be say where a teacher grades a student or panel judge rates an athlete's performance. Else, making value judgments regularly and without realizing this is what we are doing is as common a psychological tendency or instinct as we possess. We rarely think of ourselves as valuing. But we value (and not value) and make value judgments all the time, both based on what we think and on what we feel, but, again, ultimately and mostly on the latter. People and objects carry emotional associations which we typically have apprehensions (or apperceptions) of without our being conscious, or especially conscious, of these apprehensions.

Also (as earlier mentioned) we commonly conclude without being aware that the belief we are adopting is being arrived at with the aid of assumptions, which is to say previous value (as well as factual) judgments. Both experience and inward reflection show that there are layers of both semi and unconscious desires and assumptions which might affect a given conscious value judgment we make. These, by definition, are conclusions we have pre-accepted, and have it in our power to change, modify or reverse, depending upon our power of self reflection and control we posses over our judgment and beliefs. Assumptions may be feelings and past feelings which still lie in us – say for instance as a matter of conscience about something someone did wrong and which, in some way or other, presently affects the conception they have of themselves. They might be consciously, semi-consciously, or (somehow) unconsciously aware of the past event in question.

[137] This is what I contend here though for brevity's sake without going too deeply further into the matter (which you or I otherwise might.)

Since *desire* is often expressed as being *love*, we can as a practical matter here assume them to be much the same thing, with the difference that love usually reflects something far greater in importance than mere desire, and includes or might include a*ppreciation,* a*ffection, well wishing* and *gratitude* whereas desire does not necessarily include these. We only use desire as the name here for what we are describing because desire is more commonly found among people than genuine love as such – regrettable as we see this.

In desiring we seek various kinds of form, at least this seems to be a common characteristic, and we seek form apparently because in some way we lack it, seeking from as something we had before and or as something new which we have never yet known or experienced, or again perhaps a combination.

At the same time desiring can also be characterized as reacting. We are separated from what we somehow lack (which say we once possessed or which imagination offer us) and which now we seek. Yet we can choose to encourage, ignore, or reject a desire. We can do this presumably if we have another desire greater than it.

Yet there is apparently no real valuing apparently without *decision*. Desire someone must spring ultimately from someone's choice, and it makes no sense to say we desire something which we do not in some way choose to desire. Now it is true we can desire something and in our mind clearly say we do not want that (though it tempts us.) Yet somewhere previously we did want it or someone or something connected with it, and it was the choice at that time that is operating now in us and which we (unconsciously or semi-consciously) persist in – even though now (using our example) the mind and reason speaks contrary to it.

The decision to value something seems to take place deep within in us, in our souls and from our souls to our hearts, bodies, then minds. Heart, body, mind all seek value and form in some way or other, and have their peculiar likes and dislikes which form the foundation of our judgments and beliefs.

Now the soul could be said to be the true ruler of our desires, and if the source of desire lies deeper in us than in our hearts, it could be said to be there. As with atoms, change within us comes about with greater difficulty than on the surface. In this way our soul might be said to be able to change: like the nucleus of an atom, which is to say with great rarity and greater power and forces required. Surface changes whether in the soul or an atom, on the other hand and by comparison, are much more easily had or obtained.

In common experience what we value or what we desire is what or something that *pleases* us. This being so we can be pleased in a variety of ways of which the following is a very general and informal list, with the understanding that and some of these terms might be defined or characterized differently, and to some extent do or might overlap.

We can then be pleased, or worth can be measured:

a. aesthetically
b. morally
c. sensually
d. spiritually
e. emotionally
f. intellectually
g. practically, that is to (loosely) say some ordinary and practical combination of any and all of the above as when we repair something or make something more efficient, we could, in a given instance, be said to be pleased morally, aesthetically, sensually, emotionally, and intellectually.

Desires can both be chosen, they can, in a sense, chose and pull us (say physically, emotionally, spiritually, intellectually), with of course many combinations depending on what in us is strongest and most developed.

Each of these as general headings can be broken down into and or combined into a variety of other subsidiary forms, so that emotional pleasure might consist of both laughter and merriment, or ecstasy and joy, sorrow and envy, etc. with perhaps an infinite (or seemingly infinite) variety of possible kinds of desire, both within one of these categories themselves and with the others listed. Whether there is or can said to be a summit of happiness and whether it would consist of all of these main pleasures and all their possible scope, and then all of these (main and subsidiary pleasures) in one whole is an interesting topic worth considering.

I desire (and or love) chocolate
I desire (and or love) my country
I desire (and or love) the Beatles
I desire (and or love) bunnies
I desire (and or love) my wife
I desire (and or love) my car
I desire (and or love) my church
I desire (and or love) the gang I hang out with…etc.

In each of the above given instances, the person's love might be said to be greater or less, that is compared to a) someone else's love, or perhaps b) their own same love, but that love experienced on a different occasion and circumstances. In this way all values are (for us) relative. There is no superior without there being some idea of inferior, and no good without bad, etc. Note however that bad or inferior do not necessarily imply evil (unnatural harm or destruction), so we are not insisting on the necessity of evil here, but merely the notions of inferior or bad. But more later.

Note, it is possible to express or state the *same* value judgment yet in either an affirmative or negative manner, as in "that is the best horse in the show," "that is the least worst horse in the show," "that horse is not second to any other horse in the show," etc.

When we love or desire something we care for it. If we do not care for something we do not desire or love it. It is commonly accepted for many that the moment of truth in a value or factual judgment is whether we will spend labor, money or time or perhaps even our lives on the someone or something it considers and concludes about. What undoubtedly makes one age or era most distinct from another, (or one spirit of an era from another) is what the people of that age or era cared most about. This, or so it seems to me, is one reason why people from time period often look different in photographs from people of another.

Great events are public, but life itself (is mostly) private. It is a unique facet of artistic expression that it tries to combine both public and private, and is only really effective inasmuch as the public has heart. This is apparently true of religion and politics to some extent also.

Some artistic expressions we know better in private, others are enjoyed better in public, or enjoyed better in public but only with a certain kind of audience.

What is heart or loving desire like in larger societies versus smaller? Can we assume smaller societies have greater hearts than larger societies? What difference dos size of community or society make? Well, for one thing intimacy, longevity of contact are distinguishing characteristics of a smaller community like a family or very small town. We are most comfortable in family like setting, our heart is more easily there. How is our heart at home in larger communities? It is it more like a temporary dress and superficial allegiance (by comparison to family).

All the while of this, it is clear that the more a person or something is loved the more they are worth, all the more so as the person loving is of greater worth (say according to certain moral or character standards for example.) Rejection can serve to decrease the worth of someone or something. Whether however the power of love or rejection works most effectively or forcibly on us depends in large part on the community we live in, and our own attitudes about love and rejection.

Value Dichotomies

Different desires we have may be harmonious or conflicting. Observe also how desire of one thing (or person) can be compatible and enhancing of our desire of another thing. Someone, for instance, might think loving (including desiring) their church is one way of loving their country. In other instances two desires we have may conflict, or only harmonize awkwardly. Further, loves which may be compatible in one circumstance, may be opposed in another. While it may be well for someone to desire wine normally, it might be a bad idea for them to like wine if they needed to stay on a diet.

Value (or the estimation we place on a desired someone or something) itself is known by comparing the value of one thing with that of another. Hence if we value something we will (consciously or unconsciously) invoke a standard by which the desire is understood and validated. This something is good because we are assuming that this other something is good. One person desires money because other people do and because it can buy things. Without this standard of other people and purchasing power, money might not mean anything to that person. As before then, every desire can be said to have another one or more underlying it. Because of this some will then proceed to argue that the God (or someone or something else) is the beginning and end of desire, or that the beginning and end of desire, who or whatever that is, must be God. Moreover if there is a supreme value (keeping in mind that values are relative) there must be a supreme example which serves as *the* standard, in order that value may be possible in the first place.

In any instance necessary for judgment good and bad (or better and worse) will be defined and measured according to some person or other's standards, and in experience good and bad can invariably be shown to be relative, unless we are trying to establish absolute statements as might be the case in certain metaphysics and theology.

Inasmuch as what is good or bad to us takes on a greater and lesser measure of quantity in a given judgment there may be as a practical matter be reasonably posited the following four (very basic) *dichotomies of good versus bad* – these in turn based on some sort of ultimate standard (or form) of Good. It might be said we need an ultimate standard of bad, but here I will reject this on the grounds that bad (as I see it) is simply the absence of good and therefore we need no ultimate standard of bad to know what is bad, or most bad. Others, however, are, and of course, free to contest or take exception to this assumption, which I otherwise adopt for convenience (in case you don't like it.)

The (at least) four possible value dichotomies with respect to worth (judgments) are:

a. Good-Bad
b. good-Bad
c. Good-bad
d. good-bad[138]

Capital letters means that what is "Good" (or "Goodness") and or what is "Bad" (or "Badness") is most real (to person) in a given judgment, and that for a given person "Good" means highest goodness, and "Bad" means rank evil; "good" means more immediate goodness or practical value, and "bad" refers simply to the absence of "good."

Such dichotomies may be invoked singly by a person or possibly in combinations with one or more of the others within a given statement or experience. In a statement like "Peregrine's is among the best dissertations," both Peregrine's work and dissertations, and presumably higher education are valued – and this is just for starters. One or more of the dichotomies given below then might be applied to each value judgment stated or implied.

a. Good-Bad.

In a "Good-Bad" judgment the person has a strong sense of what is good *and* a strong sense of what is bad.

With this sort of dichotomy things are seen as evenly divided between great Good and great Bad, in a sort of divine indifference, with possibly a slight leaning toward the Good. A person with this disposition might think that in addition to promoting higher Good there can be no such higher Good (properly speaking) unless what is really bad (if it is present) is in some way removed or kept separate from it.

Another way of interpreting "Good-Bad" is to say if something is very good it is also assumed there is something very bad. For example, such and such is my favorite baseball team because they outdistance in victories this other team. To assert my baseball team is the best without such comparison, according to this disposition or orientation ("Good-Bad"), what is "Good" loses meaning. "My team isn't good unless others whom they might compare to are real bad." Similarly someone or something possesses extreme Badness, because this someone or something or other is so Good, and is only so Bad because this other is so Good. Such an approach or attitude as "Good-Bad" might admittedly be thought unusual, but certainly is not one that is impossible.

Yet a possible other characterization of "Good-Bad" might be where someone, say God, for certain Gnostics or Manicheans is *equally* Good and Bad.

"Bad-Good" is the same as "Good-Bad" but in reverse. The person, in effect, sees Bad as that which is to be preferred, and (what we ordinarily think of as) good as bad, such as some dyed-in-the-wool demonist, a similar kind of approach is implied in "Bad-good," "Bad-Good," and "good-bad," i.e. Evil is as good or better than Goodness.

b. good-Bad

By contrast a person who makes a "good-Bad" value judgment sees what is Bad as most important, and should be of primary consideration. "good" exists, but by comparison, and perhaps at the moment doesn't matter. For example, someone is thought so Bad because evil is seen as more real than any good, that "good" exists to serve "Bad."

c. Good-bad

"Good-bad" means what is Good is most emphasized, without regard to bad which is otherwise a merely practical and experiential assumption.

d. good-bad

"good-bad" means what is being value can be measured as god or bad, but in either case is of relatively small importance. 'bad-good" is the same but with perhaps more of tendency to be negative.

Our disposition toward a given decision may then take on one of the four dichotomies (or their variant.) Whether a dichotomy is itself, or is applied, in a "just," "correct," or appropriate manner itself involves

[138] Of course these conceptualizations are something I have devised for the purpose of analysis, and it would otherwise be unusual or unknown for most people to demarcate their value judgments in this specified way, so that what I am describing is something we more or less do unconsciously, and it may be possible to express the same or something very similar using a different sort of value gauge.

a value judgment and hence must be decided by an arbiter and the criteria they use for making factual and value judgments (which may include yet another dichotomy.)

Yet if as a practical and simple matter we say there is such a thing as a "correct" factual judgment, a person may possess or lack the capacity for correct factual judgment, while still maintaining one or more of the dichotomies as their framework for making in value judgments. In other words, we could be reasonable and scientific people for example, and use the same dichotomy as an irrational and ignorant person, and vice versa. Objectively speaking, one's level of intelligence does not seem to necessarily imply one dichotomy or another is used by the person in question – bearing in mind the question of level of intelligence (or say accuracy in one's thinking) is itself going to involve some amount of value judgment.

The main point here is that in making judgments ourselves, or in assessing the judgments of others, we can approach any given judgment assessment from one of the above dichotomies (or dispositions): both with respect to the specific judgment (overall), and with respect to specific factual and value assumptions latent or otherwise it contains.

Of course, a particular individual might employ or use various dichotomies or orientations in one single judgment or assertion, in one combination or other, which distinct approaches toward value can be extracted by analysis. In some assertions of fact, value assertions might not on the surface be present. But the simple fact is that in any comprehensible or communicable statement there are some values or other implicit or inferable on the part of the person making it.

This four point outline of "good" versus "bad" is granted simplistic. We could, of course, go on to perhaps speak of "medium" (or intermediate) Good and medium Bad, or medium good and medium bad. This aside, the essential framework and forms for distinguishing values in our judgments, while observing their relative character, is otherwise clear and worthy of interest.[139]

Worth Comparison, Values Shuffling and Mapping

In common day to day life, when we form conclusions as to good and bad we not unusually find ourselves shuffling values, that is we might esteem say a number of things and we find ourselves in a situation where we must decide which value must or should override the others when there is conflict between them, for instance when choosing between painting, paneling, or wallpapering a wall. The worth of one thing or one interested is weighed versus that of another, and we conclude in favor of that which seems most pleasing to us. Whether what pleases us is actually wise or not is a separate question, the main point here being that when we choose between the worth of two or more things, and assuming such choice is somehow necessary, we choose the thing which (as we see it) most pleases us, and in this way arrive at worth. At the same time, of course, worth can be arrived at by balancing two goods, finding a means between them, and determining worth this way.

Below is an example of value shuffling or value assessment a person might undergo in the course of making a values choice, in this case deciding whether a eating a certain food[140] is (in a given instance) good or beneficial and, to that extent, something to be valued (leaving aside the question of whether the food itself has value outside our decision to consume it or not. I have limited the example to three basic criteria: a.) Hunger, b.) Appetite (or craving beyond hunger), and c.) Nourishment (the food is seen[141] as being good for me nutritionally.) Of course we could add another criteria or concern, and it goes without saying that in given certain circumstances and a given person a concern might come to bear not taken into account by these three. Values in turn could be broken down and analyzed into subsidiary values, etc. But for now, and to keep this manageable, we'll stick with this more simple outline.

* I'm hungry and the food looks appetizing and it would be good for my health to eat it. As well it would please my appetite. So I eat it.

* I'm hungry and the food looks appetizing and it would be good for my health to eat it. I don't eat it for some other reason, say because of reasons fasting or frugality.

---

[139] For a more close examination of the subject of "Evil"(as opposed to mere philosophical "Bad" as such) see my *Christ and Truth*.

[140] For purposes of examining applied or practical value judgments, we could use another activity aside from eating – say to play or not play volley ball; or to look or not look at a clock; to walk or not walk across the street, etc. All we require is a situation where a choice is made between action and inaction: the decision to act being essentially the result of deciding that to act is "good," while not acting would be the result of the value judgment that to act (in the particular circumstances) is "bad." Here I speak of eating a certain food or not eating it, the decision to do one or the other being based on the value judgment(s) that eating the food is "good," or else not eating it because to do so is (adjudged to be) "bad."

[141] That is the food is taken by the person to be of a nourishing kind, and that it would be fitting for their health (on that particular occasion) to eat. This is based on *their own* assessment and knowledge of the food and its benefits, though (on that particular subject and occasion) they may actually be in error. This further sort of distinction, i.e. justified versus unjustified belief as it pertains our assessment of whether we are hungry, crave the food in question, or it is healthy for us, I skip as not strictly necessary to my main point and focus.

* I'm hungry and the food looks appetizing and it would be bad for my health to eat it. I eat it because I am hungry and looks appetizing, though it really isn't (much) good for me.

* I'm hungry and the food looks appetizing yet it would be bad for my health to eat it. I don't eat it because its bad for me.

* I'm hungry, the food doesn't look appetizing, yet would be good for me. I eat it because I am hungry and or it would be good for me.

* I'm hungry, the food doesn't look appetizing, yet would be good for me. I won't eat it because it is unappetizing to me.

* I'm hungry, the food doesn't look appetizing, yet it would be good for me. I eat it because I am hungry and it would be good for me.

* I'm hungry , the food doesn't look appetizing, yet it would be good for me. I don't eat it because it isn't appetizing and or would be good for me.

* I'm hungry, the food doesn't look appetizing, yet it wouldn't be good for me. I eat it because I am hungry, though it isn't appetizing and or wouldn't be nourishing.

* I'm hungry, the food doesn't look appetizing, yet it wouldn't be good for me. I don't eat it because it is neither appetizing and or nourishing.

* I'm hungry and the food doesn't look appetizing yet it is good for me. I eat it because of hunger and or need for nourishment.

* I'm hungry and the food doesn't look appetizing yet it is good for me. I don't eat it because it is not appetizing.

* I'm not really hungry but the food looks appetizing and is good for me. I eat it to appease my craving and or my perceived need for nourishment.

* I'm not really hungry but the food looks appetizing and is good for me. I don't eat it because I am not really hungry and or I don't have a craving for it.

* I'm not really hungry and the food is not good for me but looks appetizing. I eat it to appease my appetite.

* I'm not really hungry and the food is not good for me but looks appetizing. I do not eat it because I am not really hungry and or is not good for me.

* I'm not really hungry and the food is neither appetizing or good. I eat it for some other reason, say I think I need to dispose of it to make space in my food bin, and for some strange reason see this as worthwhile way of doing this.

* I'm not really hungry and the food is neither appetizing or good. I do not eat it because I don't crave it and or it isn't good for me.

* I'm not hungry and the food is not appetizing but it would be good nourishment for me. I eat it as nourishment.

* I'm not hungry and the food is not appetizing but it would be good nourishment for me. I do not eat it because I am not hungry and or it is not appetizing.

Note that the strength of a given reason's acting upon me, e.g. hunger or craving acting upon me, can be arrived at relative to the strength of the other criterion's or criteria's effect on me, or arrived at by its strength on me taken by itself. So for instance I could arrive at my conclusion (that health is more important to me) either because hunger and craving have a small impact on me, or else my concern with my health I have otherwise and emphatically decided as being one of my highest goods. Concern for health then, using this example, could be arrived at because hunger and craving are weak in me, or else because my devotion to bettering my health is purposely and intellectually decided upon as my higher interest. Of course, we can think of any number of other possible combinations where our concern for one criteria, using craving for instance rather than health) is affected by our concern or lack of concern for the other criteria, or when one criterion by itself stands out above the others. Such we might, if we were conscientious people, find ourselves asking is that what we want? Is that what we really want?

If we were to form the standard for a single isolated criterion, the measure of say how hungry we were, this would be based (to some degree) according to and by contrast with past experiences of hunger we had, known on isolated occasions, and known cumulatively, from which then, (in effect), we had could arrive at our present valuation of how hungry we would say we were.

Should we say that being hungry, having the appetite for the particular food, and also that the food is genuinely nourishing, all these combined, is the best state or situation of desire (of all of these listed) which one could be in? With respect to food, the answer would seem yes. But this assumes there is no greater value than the best circumstances for eating. Needless to say, while we might desire the optimal food eating circumstances (i.e. we are hungry, the food is appetizing, and it is good for us), we might not care less about food at all if we valued someone or something else more highly (at least in a given circumstance), so that these values or desires which otherwise might otherwise move or prompt us, are negated and seen (at least for the moment) to be irrelevant. In such a case, we would say the lesser values have been supplanted or subsumed by something of greater value – given the circumstances. Again, keep in mind as I say this, that the worth criteria a person might use, or the measure of what pleases them might be based on morals, aesthetics, religious belief, tradition, reason, the views of others, bodily desires, etc.

Now truth-value shuffling (as in decision and application of truth criteria) as to factual conclusions, and further the question of worth assessment as applied to factual conclusions (those of experience and verbal assertions) I will (once more for convenience) leave aside for now. But clearly a similar example along the outline as the above, yet with its own peculiarities and extensions, can be constructed as well, comparing say logic versus evidence versus capacity of language (to express truth.), while (in some measure) endeavoring to distinguish more or less real data based persons and things from the concepts, representations, or inferences of them. Also of course worth noting is that there certainly is such a thing as avoiding or attempting to avoid value comparisons, as in peculiar circumstances for example where we purposely would rather not decide which of our friends presents a more agreeable appearance, because we hate the thought of offending either.

Context,[142] (or also place, setting, environment, order, arrangement, relations among "parts") is crucial to both truthfulness and worth. It is itself, or is otherwise an order adhering to certain rules, which might involve criteria or principles relating to (though some of these might be said to overlap):

a. Sequence
b. Space
c. Chronology
d. Symmetry and Balance
e. Contrast and or complementariness (of factors or elements)
f. Sympathy or Antipathy (based on past valuations of ours
g. Worth and or Fact declarations of someone other than ourselves
h. The state of our own physical health

With (as always) there being various types and many combinations possible, all of which speak to the possible value placed on certain relations which make up the context someone or something is placed in.

Form is something common to both feelings, thought, and utility, all of which have and are contexts of their own, such that context is a form (rather than say a thing.)

With respect to worth it can make something good or bad, etc., and may be said to be the most crucial form or criteria in the determination of worth. It may be said to be where form and value join. It will invariably be something controlled by someone one or more than one, but who and to what extent will or might be open to question. Context makes something good bad or indifferent. For example, in one circumstance more may be better (or worse), in another circumstance less may be better, and it is context which makes this so.

Context is created when one thing or relation[143] is given value over another, and the possible reasons for such. It can be circumscribed by any number of factors including immediate environment, past assumptions, laws of nature, etc. yet there is still a sense where if we possess free judgment we can always to some degree create context and therefore worth for any possible person or object of value.

Context is a choice, made out of standards, and to the extent we can choose the context in which to see someone or something *for ourselves* depends both on what we immediately value and or what we latently or more deeply value. When we do not quite form context for ourselves we defer, willingly or not, to someone else who certes the context for us (mostly if not entirely.)

Context or environment is created and arranged in such a way as to give each component its value and if we look at one part it will (more likely) have a certain value because of the context for it created or which it finds itself in. But observe even in a machine, context is ultimately a worth value, and worth value must come from a person.

---

[142] "The parts of a discourse that surround a word or passage and can throw light upon is meaning." (Webster's Seventh Collegiate.)

[143] Including when a relation is seen as one thing, as when we refer to a dancing couple, or acrobat team, and without necessarily mentioning the relations we are implying when we speak of them.

In both the designs of say a work of art, say a carving, or a mechanical device, say a wood lathe, we see necessary importance of value placement and arrangement.

Place and arrangement with respect to art, music, etc, have been addressed by various and many aesthetics to which we could refer you. Perhaps paradoxically, by controlling context one can (to some extent) limit or enhance value, and by limiting or enhancing value context can be formed. We see this, for instance in that there is a degree to which things are represented to us, and a degree where we have power of representing something. Our power of representation brings with it (necessarily) the power to ascribe value, both as an individual and (to a lesser) extent as a member of the community (though this power might vary greatly between one individual and another.)

Context can make something we hate into something we love; something we love hate. People and things, including ourselves, will look in a bad way if seen out of proper place or context., and context can deprive and deny value as well as confer it.

Now in the case of mechanical devices the connection between context and the parts (which make it up), is perhaps less generally understood and appreciated by us. Watt for example improved the value of steam engine by more careful, economical, and efficient use of heat. The *importance* of increasing the effective use of heat *itself* increased. In other words Watt was saying "we need to make more economical and efficient use of the heat, for it is the heat which will make it possible for our engine to possess greater power." At the same time of course other values were given a new opportunity for greater appreciation including: distance, placement, and configuration of engine parts with respect to achieving a certain specific effect in harmony with the effect intended for the whole (engine); the value of using one kind of metal versus another (which is say lighter), and, as another category by itself, the utilitarian level where we might expect social, personal, and business concerns come to the fore. All of these values played an essential part in what finally came out as the improved steam engine, such that one can see from this what a widespread network of different forms of valuing goes into the making of any mechanical device.

Ends and Means

Each desire, whether for truth or for worth, has an ideal, and if we think about it we can expand on and make more clear any given ideal, and any complaint a person makes bespeaks an ideal not being fulfilled. If we complain, we owe it to ourselves to ask what this ideal is, and what is really or realistically is required to bring it about (as opposed to our merely being upset that it is not being realized..

Now it is in an *end* or goal that we seek to realize an ideal, and for this reason *ends* might be characterized as that greatest ideal or ideals which we most seek. Despite the meaning perhaps implied, however, "end" for some does not necessarily imply finality as such, as perhaps when someone speaks of seeking highest knowledge or eternal peace, which might understandably be thought of as ends without end.

Means are a tool, avenue or aid which will bring us closer to the fulfillment of the given end or ends. While, as with Good and Bad, we don't ordinarily think of ends and means with philosophical distinctness in day to day life yet at least intuitively we know them very well, and have no difficulty connecting means we desires with ends we desire, though certainly we might at times confuse the one with the other.

Both factual and value judgments can be said to have *End* and *Means* aspects, though in a given case the roles might overlap or be interchangeable depending on the context (as by now we accept as being typical of factual and value judgments.)

For example the equal sign in a mathematical conclusion is a truth/belief *means* to a greater truth/belief *ends* (or the overall statement and conclusion of the equation.) This is so at least if this is how the mathematicians chooses to see the sign versus the whole equation. Otherwise true and false would almost always seem to be means. When someone says "the True or the Truth is our end (or final goal)" they can't really stop there but must explain who or what "True" is. In this way true (and false) are means, and cannot properly speaking be considered pure ends. One implication of this seems to be that when we value something we value it beyond its being true and or false, though these might be part of the necessary conditions of its being valued.

Of course, when we speak of ends and means with respect to worth we mean (or might mean) we desire *x* itself. In the case of *means* we might desire *x* because it reminds us or in some way will bring us to *y* which we desire even more.

Someone or something can be both a means and ends (depending on context), such as emotions. Someone gets angry. Why? So that everyone, or at least himself, will be happy or better know peace. In this sense anger might be said to be used as a means to a greater end. But of course the greater end itself is typically viewed as itself some great emotion, for example peace, joy, ecstasy.

Whether we decide someone or something is an ends of means we use criteria to make the determination. Kant formally expressed the view that people should always be seen as ends and not means. This sort of moral argument we won't go into here, but make note of it and its possible significance. For instance it

might seem possible, expanding on this, to view all being or beings as end, and that means is a false or at best practical notion, with many possible variations on this thought such as we might find in Hinduism or Buddhism.

Ends would seem to imply final or *ultimate end*, or final purpose. We do or want something for a reason, so that logic suggest that this reason has itself another reason. At the same time it is natural and instinctive for people to seek or desire ultimate ends, simply inasmuch as they manifest unusually great love or desire.

Some have seen *ultimate form* in various ways. It might be thought a very subjective notion. Yet assuming it is, it is not one without its objective possibilities and conceptualizations.

Naturally or else commonly found ultimate ends people have or might have:

a. Balance
b. Harmony
c. Peace, stability
d. Joy or Happiness
e. Removal of a certain desire or desires
f. Removal of all desire
g. Fulfillment of a certain desire or desires
h. Removal of pain
i. Removal of Injustice or (more than personal) Evil

One of these might but perhaps does not necessarily imply one of the others. Philosophy is itself love of wisdom (not knowledge of wisdom.) But is wisdom or knowledge an end in itself or a means to one of the above?

Now one of the key ideas of proper religion is to supplant (but not necessarily remove completely) lesser desire with more worthy desire. The form or forms to be recommended for doing this are of course various and numerous as there are religions. One such form or ideal which (so to speak) attempts (as means) to realize ultimate form might be "the form" of living in and fostering a more reasonable world.

As we suggested or made reference to much earlier, ultimate ends would seem to come in combinations, for as a practical matter what one, single end could we speak of? "Peace," for instance, might be a good candidate to pose for this purpose, but "peace" would seem to imply being, perhaps (or perhaps not) consciousness also, and more. In other words, as soon as we fix on our *single* end we run into something else.

Moreover lets assume we have decided on a single final good, in this case "Peace," what kind of peace might we have in mind? Peace with others, peace with ourselves, peace with God, peace with all three? Peace with our enemies? The question can obviously be answered quite differently, and any given single end, (or ends), is going to entail some someone and or something other.

The next question is are these persons or things which accompany the "one" end, are these themselves ends or means? In answering this we can begin to frame a hierarchy of values which a person might hold to. Having done this we might then see how circumstances might affect or change that person's hierarchy of values, and further whether we could or should speak of a person's long term hierarchy of values (that is such values as a person had manifested over the course of time) versus their hierarchy of values of the season or the moment.

In desiring and seeking ends we seek a higher form. Presumably this will include the highest form of truthfulness (and criteria for determining such) and the highest form of worth, bearing in mind the kinds of basic forms which most or might please us rationally, aesthetically, morally, and or sensually.

We might speak of a *process* or *spirit,* say in Logos, or Love, as ends, such that process or spirit is the Form of all form and of all forms, and the highest form to be sought.

Spirit is best known and most familiar to us in *heart* and *mind* (rather than say sensation), so we seek and realize spirit most through these, such that in heart and mind it could be said our life has its beginning and end.[144]

Guides to Higher Forms

The following are themselves or else familiar *Guides* to higher forms and purposes. Now I fully grant you, some of these definitions may obviously may, in a certain sense, be speaking of the same thing. But if the category is less than technically precise, this (hopefully) is offset by convenience and improved general

[144] Though of course some seem to prefer the stomach, but the stomach could be said to be a secondary motive to the primary motive of their heart or mind.

clarity. Any of these guides might be applied aesthetically, morally, rationally, emotionally, intellectually, spiritually, and with a mind to any given factual and or value judgment we make.

Sin has been defined as missing *the mark*. While Excellence is often thought of as hitting it. In some if not all contexts balance and or harmony are the mark to be hit.

Sometimes something is exaggerated, over done or overstated or under done or understated, in order to achieve the mean, or hit the mark, as when someone is encouraged to strive much higher than realistically they could otherwise expect to achieve, yet the higher aim raises their performance or capacity closer the mark (perhaps or evidently in compensation for something else we lack to do the job.)

Balance and *harmony* can sometimes be seen as hitting the mark. These might also be spoken of by the terms or descriptions: equilibrium, justice, centrality, unity, oneness, equality, restoring a deficiency, lessening superfluity. Normally speaking, balance and harmony are achieved when parts are given value or contextual placement in conformity to a higher form or unity.

We all are aware from ordinary experience, and under certain circumstances, that knowing too much can (as when say we are distracted by something irrelevant to the task at hand) result in ignorance, oversight, and misjudgment, as much as when we know too little for the purposes of whatever it is we are doing. From this we could say that too much light blinds just as too much darkness. Truth itself, evidently then, must be a proper balance between the light and darkness, and wisdom a state of knowing and not-knowing in which the knowing and the not-knowing somehow meet and join harmoniously.[145]

For some, *tension* is a necessary aspect of both determining and as rule for assigning placement. A bow without tension cannot shoot the arrow. The dialectic is a good example of a context where truth is sought by means of balance, harmony and tension. Tension is typically brought about by means of contraries, and inasmuch as tension is a good and of value, contraries or opposites (and quasi-opposites) are a good and of value. In a given circumstance we might have to choose being promoting excellence of some unusual kind or moral goodness for example. In resolving the matter we attempt some compromise involving both.

Naturalness, Moral Sentiment, Personality, Continuity, are universally desired qualities but these I think are only aspects or, manifestations of balance and harmony.

Occasionally balance and harmony are seen as being achieved by means of fixing on and arriving at *the Mean* (between two contraries or else extremes.) Observe in this regard how the earth must be in just the right spot else it would be too cold or too hot. This is evidence of the balance life and goodness demand. Not as well that a note must be tuned in just the right way else it will be too sharp or too flat.

Yet very often what we value most is what we see as highest, not that which is in the middle. In response to this perhaps we could say that balance and harmony are (in some way) the highest goods, while observing that there are degrees of balance and harmony which potentially allow for an infinite amount of color and variety.

The two contraries on which a mean is based is something which itself can be chosen. For instance we could choose.

* A concert versus a play

or

* A concert or play versus a hockey game

or

* Attending an evening event (such as concert, etc.) versus staying home.
Etc., etc.

From such as this or whatever contrary we have selected, it is usually possible to find a mean, or some sort of mean. Now what contraries we choose on a given occasion will be a result of some value judgment, thus creating the context in which the choice of contraries arises. When an elderly person chooses an exercise program for themselves, they would probably choose one different than that which a young military candidate would select. The difference might lie between the same contraries of rest and exertion, except that one would expect the military candidate to have a point of exertion which is much more demanding, and perhaps as well an idea of rest that is less relaxed and soporific in character (than the elderly person's.)

[145] As best we know, balancing light and dark can be done in time and space, but does this imply that there is no truth or wisdom beyond time and space? Or is there a superior truth and wisdom beyond time and space? Or no truth and wisdom at all?

Indulgence, extremism, or taking something to the limit is seen as a desirable alternative to finding the mean. We don't seek a mean between bread and cake, we want cake! In this way, indulgence is a seen as one guide to the ultimate. At other times, of course, extremism is something to be frowned upon, not least of which by those who seek balance, temperance or the mean.

Perhaps life then may be said to be finding the mean between indulgence and mean determination, since we can't help but seem to seek both to some extent.

Both the *infinite* and the *finite* (in one form or another certainly) have been seen as ultimate forms. As has been long observed by philosophers, the one implies or requires the other. So that neither the infinite (as we can intellectually conceive it) or the finite is a single simple entity, so that we are reminded that unless we posit God, Brahman, the Chinese *li*, or the Absolute, etc, each one or anything is a composite. So as much as we can tell, a thing is always at least two things, and others, such as in Charles S. Peirce will insist three, and for yet others a thing must be more than even three things.

Is there a mean between infinite and finite? Artists, poets, and musicians could be said to seek such an expression, and have (I think) tended to see the heart's conception of the infinite as better than the mind's, and through their works of art, poetry and music could be said to be striving for such a mean.

Of course, among philosophers the mind will have had its advocates, and the mean between the finite and infinite (if one can rightly speak of such) is to be had through the seeking and loving of wisdom.

Others of a perhaps more religious and theological disposition will see mind and heart as merely organs of the spirit which knows the true mean between the infinite and finite, and this through knowing and serving God (or Divine Goodness, etc.) through works of real charity and devotion.

Still yet others will or might strive to find some compromise between two or three of these.