

Three Fundamentals of the Introceptive Philosophy

Part 15 of 16

Franklin Merrell-Wolff

April 8, 1974

You who have listened to the tape which was delivered on April 7, 1974, have been in a state of philosophic despair, or at least should have been in such despair if you understood the implications of the philosophy put forth by David Hume, for he reached that position in which there appeared no more a substance behind the objects which we experience or perceive and no substance behind the mental being who did the perceiving. There was, thus, no thing and no self. But this is not so startling, for if one studies the philosophy of the Buddhists he'll find that much the same exists there, that with *Anatman* there's a denial of a permanent self and with the theory that the qualities are all that there is of the things that appear to be in the world, there is there also a denial of a substance behind the appearance and behind the thinker. But the consequences of Hume's philosophy went further than this, for he showed that if we assume that all our knowledge comes from experience, there can be no knowledge of law, no knowledge of an order in things, but only a mass of chaotic presentations in consciousness that have no meaning; and in this respect Hume's position differs radically from that of the Buddhists, for Buddhism affirms the ineluctable principle of law as underlying all that is.

But there was over in Germany a sleeping philosophic giant, and, as it were, a great bolt of lightening with a peal of world shaking thunder went forth from Scotland and struck a little wizened, scarcely five-foot man in a room in the city of Konigsberg, a place that now is in the hands of the barbarian; and this little man bore within him a mind that is to be rated among the half dozen or so greatest minds of all Western history, and mayhap was the greatest of them all. But he had been slumbering in a dogmatic state of uncritical acceptance of the philosophies that had been handed down to him. He had been a teacher in the University of Konigsberg, mostly a teacher of science, but to some extent a teacher of philosophy—the then existing philosophy which he had inherited. He had been a good teacher. He had produced out of his thought certain scientific conceptions that became very important, among them the nebular hypothesis and certain theories of the construction of mountains, which were taken quite seriously by geologists, although he himself had never seen a mountain in his life. The stroke of lightening awakened him from his dogmatic slumbers, as he later said, and then he went into a twelve year period of philosophic meditation during which his lectures became duller and duller; and at the end of that period he wrote a book, too rapidly, for it was a great book and done in five months and the composition was far from as good as it might have been, thereby rendering understanding unnecessarily difficult. But this book opened the door to a degree of certainty and assurance that had been destroyed by the thought of David Hume, who had merely carried out the implications of pure empiricism.

The step which Immanuel Kant took he himself called a Copernican shift, and this is the point which is of especial interest to us; but to understand this shift, we must

consider the viewpoint held before him. It was generally held that the laws of nature were inherent in objective nature itself apart from the cognizing subject, but as the empiricists had shown that our conceptions of order, logical and otherwise, were not deducible from experience and that there was no ground for a notion of innate ideas, the problem that Kant faced was that of showing how law could be possible and yet our basis of knowledge still remain oriented to experience through the senses. Instead of viewing the law as existing in objective nature, he introduced the idea that man as a knowing subject, in effect, legislated those laws, but he did this unknowingly, that the subjective aspect of man, taken in a broader sense than the pure Self or *Atman*, carries with it organizational forms which determine the nature that we experience. He introduced the conception of the thing-in-itself or the *ding an sich* as a border conception with respect to a nature beyond our cognition. But the world in which we live had an order, not of the pure thing-in-itself, but an order which was legislated by the forms of our cognition. These were of two types, one called the *transcendental aesthetic*, which consisted of space and time, but space and time not now conceived as external existences as is the ordinary view that existed before Kant and is the ordinary view of the man in the street and even of most scientists, but instead Kant predicated that the subjective contribution of man to his experience included cognition in forms of space and time; and beyond this there were the *forms of the understanding*, which included the whole of logic and all of the process of conceptual cognition.

There was, thus, reintroduced the conception of an *a priori* conception which was not an existence in nature apart from man's cognition, but a form which man carried unknowingly within himself. I have used the figure of a capsule which surrounds the human being with windows in it and that those windows lead to contact with that beyond, framed, however, in the shape of the windows—the windows being the forms of sensuous perception and of the categories of the understanding. Man can discover an order in the modes of his experience, but that is not an order attaching to the thing-in-itself. Thus, Kant established a basis for the continuation of science; but, however, he had to draw the conclusion that through sensuous experience and conceptual cognition alone, no knowledge of a metaphysical reality could be attained. What Kant positively achieved was the possibility of a continuation of science, but no possibility of any positive knowledge concerning the subject matter which is of greatest importance to religion. Yet, nonetheless, Immanuel Kant in his way was a very religious man, and was concerned about this, and did make a suggestion for the reestablishing of some sort of cognition with respect to the religious objects of most importance such as the points implied in the questions: "Is there a God?" or, as I prefer to call it, a transcendental modulus, "Is there essential moral freedom?" and, "Is there immortality?"

To a degree we have now opened the door again which was closed by David Hume by treating the relationship between sensuous cognition and conceptual cognition in this way. But the concepts were valid only in so far as they were related to a sensuous filling. They were not valid when used apart from such a sensuous filling. Thus, it was shown that the ontological argument for God had no ground upon which to stand. You may recall that this argument follows something of this form. Man has within his mind the conception of an absolutely perfect being; but then it is argued that a perfect being cannot lack the predicate of existence, therefore from the idea of a perfect being we can infer the existence of God. But Kant showed this, that he can have an idea of \$100.00 in

his pocket, but he cannot spend that ideal \$100.00. There must be in addition the sensuously existing \$100.00 before it can be spent. The *idea* of \$100.00 by itself does not command a *real* \$100.00. It annihilated the ontological argument for God and along with that the other less pretensions arguments. There was thus undermined, in effect, the whole conception of a metaphysical order.

Now, it is true that the idealists who followed upon Kant's feet attempted to fill in this gap. I feel that in some measure they had intimations of that which could fill this gap, as is reflected in Schelling's conception of an intellectual intuition, but it does not appear that there was any really successful effect growing out of this effort. Nonetheless, a rich philosophic development followed Kant which is represented by the thought of the following men: Fichte, Schelling, Hegel, Schopenhauer, von Hartmann, Nietzsche, and Spengler, with representatives in our own country and elsewhere such as Josiah Royce. In this line of philosophic development, the religious problem takes a preeminent place. Kant reestablished the possibility of a mundane science, but at the price of no certainty with respect to a supermundane reality.

It is at this point that I personally became engrossed with the problem, and in the end, after a 24 year search, succeeded in determining that what is lacking in the cognitive organs recognized by Kant is a third means of cognition, foreshadowed by Schelling's *intellectual intuition*. Kant made the point that conceptions that do not have a sensible filling are empty, but at the same time, sensations without conceptions are blind. By the use of the two a mundane science was possible but no certainty concerning God, freedom, and immortality.

There remains to be considered the standpoint of Immanuel Kant with respect to the existence or possibility of pure mathematics. Pure mathematics stands, as I have pointed out before, upon a different basis from that of the empiric sciences. To introduce the position here, I shall quote from the "Introduction" to the *Critique of Pure Reason*:

According to his [David Hume's] conclusions, then, all that we term metaphysical science is a mere delusion, arising from the fancied insight of reason into that which is in truth borrowed from experience, and to which habit has given the appearance of necessity. Against this assertion, destructive to all pure philosophy, he would have been guarded, had he had our problem before his eyes in its universality. For he would then have perceived that, according to his own argument, there likewise could not be any pure mathematical science, which assuredly cannot exist without synthetical propositions *a priori*—an absurdity from which his good understanding must have saved him.¹

That pure mathematics exists cannot be questioned. That it is effective is evident to our experience, since from it applied mathematics is derived by giving to certain of the variables in pure mathematics a specific value. This renders possible such developments as constructions of entities such as buildings and bridges which will stand and endure. It

¹ Immanuel Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, trans. J. M. D. Meiklejohn (New York: Willey Book Co., 1943), 12.

renders possible also practical navigation upon the seas and in the air so that one may arrive at objectives that are determinant, and, in addition, in our day has rendered navigation in space so that a trajectory for a capsule can be predetermined which will in time arrive at a point in space which will be occupied by the moon at that time. This is empiric demonstration that mathematics works. Yet it is a well known fact that, with one great exception, all applied mathematics is derived from pure mathematics which in turn has been developed by creative mathematicians oriented to the pure science unrelated to any application. The one exception was the invention or discovery of differential and integral calculus by Sir Isaac Newton who had a practical interest in this development. In other words, a pure construction led to a practical effect, and this is a mystery. To emphasize this mysteriousness, I shall make a quotation from Albert Einstein:

How can it be that mathematics, being after all a product of human thought independent of experience, is so admirably adapted to the objects of reality?²

Here, then, we have a pure action of the mind akin to that of the pure action in metaphysical thought which is abundantly proven in its effectiveness, and yet is independent of experience in its development. I have a thought in this connection which I will introduce as an additional postulate, namely, that pure mathematics and pure metaphysics are in reality two wings or branches of the same Root Source which is in the last analysis ontological, that mathematics is the principle of form and that pure metaphysics is the principle of substance or an actual filling. Mathematics by itself, then, is a development of form in its purity but empty when separate from a metaphysical or empiric content. On the other hand, pure metaphysics is a substantive Reality without form which may be and has been symbolized by a vast sea or ocean. Applying the principle of form we have a combination that is thinkable and expressible. Without the principle of form, the pure metaphysical Substance may be realized but cannot be expressed. But if the metaphysical Substance is realized and there is the form contributed by pure mathematics, it may be formulated and expressed in some degree so that communication becomes possible. Thus, if we dip a vessel into the sea, such as a cup, a pitcher, a bucket, a barrel, or whatnot, and lift it out of the sea, the water in the vessels takes the shape of the vessels. Let this represent as a figure the use of conceptuality with respect to a metaphysical content. The sea takes the shape of the concepts if they are fitted to the necessities of that sea so that the sea of metaphysical truth takes the form of the concepts, which in their purity are mathematical concepts. But as there are many forms that will serve this purpose, there is not one exclusive philosophy that is metaphysically true. There can be more than one. On the other hand, there are concepts which will not serve as such vessels, as for instance sieves. They will reproduce no metaphysical content at all. Thus it is that there are empirically valid concepts which work in this world but which are metaphysically unsound. We may call them sieves. There are other concepts which will hold the metaphysical essence within their embrace and these constitute the philosophic systems that form the authentic *sutras*, *shastras*, and scriptures of the world.

² E. T. Bell, *Men of Mathematics* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1937), xvii.

As I have noted already, out of the Copernican shift or change of Immanuel Kant's approach to the philosophic subject matter, there grew a system of philosophies known as Idealism or Spiritualism. The shift in this case was from orientation to the objective world, the world of supposed things which exist external to our perception and conception, to the subject to consciousness. These philosophies are oriented to that which is conscious rather than to that which is contained by consciousness. This is Idealism or Spiritualism in the philosophic sense.

Let us ask ourselves, where do we stand at this point? We have emerged from the state of complete philosophic and intellectual despair, by which I mean that there was no possibility of knowledge at all—both metaphysical and empiric, and also mathematical. That was the position in which David Hume left us. Knowledge was completely undermined and repudiated. From that point Kant took us to a position by his Copernican shift whereby both pure mathematics and empiric science became possible, but metaphysical knowledge, which indeed is the prime subject matter of religious feeling, was impossible. The next step is one which I myself contribute, for this is the problem to which I addressed myself when I left the university. How can a metaphysical knowledge be achieved? For this purpose I will ask you to accept, or to entertain rather than accept, a presentation in the speculative sense, not in the sense of having to accept or reject as true or false, but simply in the sense of entertaining a possibility. And for this purpose we will introduce a still further postulate, namely, that in addition to the two organs of cognition, sense perception and conceptual cognition, there exists a third organ which by the appropriate means may be awakened, and, secondly, that the governing principle in this form of cognition is *knowledge through identity*, namely, through the cognizer becoming identical with the cognized. The philosophic implications of this new standpoint were only partially evoked in the book called *Pathways Through to Space*, only the nascent beginning of a formulation which was then carried further in *The Philosophy of Consciousness Without an Object* and is more fully developed in various tapes that now exist. What we will require, in addition, is a second Copernican change. Remember, the first Copernican change introduced by Immanuel Kant was from an orientation to the object of cognition as having law existent in itself as external nature to the position whereby the subjective component predetermines the form of our cognition by the forms of the transcendental aesthetic and the forms of the understanding supplied by the subject. We thus deal with a world which is partly constructed by ourselves without our knowing it. We are not dealing with the thing-in-itself, but with the world of appearance or of experience, as we know it. I take a second step in the form of a further Copernican shift from the subjective pole to the Pure Consciousness itself and treat this as the ultimate foundation of all that is, viewing the subjective pole and the object of consciousness as existences within Consciousness itself that initially may be viewed as potential but in our state of understanding have become objective and actual.

Let us predicate as the Root of all that is a Field Consciousness which is not a function of a knower or self, but rather the container of all potential knowers and of all possible contents of knowledge. The question that confronts us in this series is how is it possible and by what means is this a producer of the cosmos which surrounds us? I shall take you to a thought that may prove rather startling, and we shall seek our foundation stone not in the developed relationships that we know empirically in this world, but rather to that largely despised form of unconsciousness which we call the "hallucination." This

is the simplest form, and I shall suggest that it is the building block out of which ultimately all the cosmos is produced. Ordinarily the hallucination appears as a modification of consciousness in terms of one sense, most commonly the sense of vision. It also appears in the form of the auditory sense—a hearing of sounds, of music, or even of conversation. And it is reported that it appears also in terms of some of the other senses. It differs from our ordinary perceptions in certain respects. Thus, for instance, if we have a perception which we call a tree, it appeals not only to our sense of sight, but if we strike it we also hear a sound. If we get close to its blossoms or perhaps its sap, we may smell it and even taste it. It also will respond to our tactile senses when we touch it with our hands; to our temperature senses, it may feel either cool or cold, on one hand, or warm or hot, on the other; and most important of all, perhaps, if we put forth an effort against it we'll have a kinesthetic representation in our consciousness—the very sense upon which is built the whole conception of mass and weight, for a being without this sense could never have developed such conceptions. And it also appears generally in a particular point in space in a given environment that is relatively fixed, although not absolutely fixed. And it can be the object of reference in communication with other supposed centers of consciousness which we call other human beings or, in general, other entities. It is, thus, a collective experience. In contrast to this, as I've just noted, the hallucination is generally a manifestation in terms of one sense only. We see it most commonly.

Now, think of this as the building block upon which we construct our world. I suggest that the hallucination becomes stable, sensuously integrated, and collective, is the ultimate nature of the sensible world we live in. In other words, this world is not a dead external existence totally independent of consciousness, but a construct from consciousness. Consider what is implied in this statement. If the hallucination is sensuously integrated it means that it has ceased to be an existence for only one sense, but for all of the relative senses. How then will you distinguish between it and the objects that we ordinarily envisage? It would respond to all of the sensible indications; it is stable, in other words persists, and is not transitory; and, third, it exists also within the consciousness of the collective whole. How does that differ from the experience that leads us to suggest an external world? It has everything that we need, and its foundation is consciousness *per se*.