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Introduction

For centuries philosophy and religious doctrines have argued various points concerning the fundamental ways in which man comes to know things, in other words, to form ideas. Plato with his theory of ideal forms sought to bridge two worlds, the world of metaphysics and the physical world. Plato's work has been an inspiration to the ages yet it cannot be claimed that his epistemological theory satisfies the most rigorous criterion of logical clarity. However dazzling his ranges of intellectual command, we are still left today with the question posed by his work—the problem of the "real" and the "ideal." and their manifest
relationships. In the final analysis, however subtle and sophisticated Plato’s theory it fails to integrate through logical continuity the conceptual and the physical. We shall attempt to show that this work may greatly help to understand what is referred to as the ideal and the real and to demonstrate, in fact, they are both expressions of certain mental operations and do not point to a dualistic theory of knowing, or of being.

What are some of the issues which face us when we turn to the question of thinking? It is an activity full of wonder and mystery, every human being shares in its marvels and its sorrows. The relationship of thinking to feeling in the basic lives of all the peoples of the world is so profound, so utterly beyond complete expression that it would be the-heights of immodesty to presume to encompass even a significant fraction in a piece so short, as this one is. Here we are interested in a basic question which deals with fundamental questions of logical form, logical language in short, and their relationship to basic philosophical issues.

The issues we must deal with had to necessarily involve also issues very dear to the religions of the world, particularly the western world.

Nietzsche, to whom this writer is greatly indebted, offered much startling insight into some of the psychological dynamics of philosophical enquiry. Probably only one other before him, Dostoyevsky, had even deeper insight into the psychological substratum of philosophical efforts. This writer is cognizant that one could not hope to speak of the nature of thinking without revealing in method, language, or conclusion the psychological elements which play their role in any such endeavor. Yet, it is believed that the very nature of the objective experience must be wed to the subjective
reality or there is no truth at all, only a confusion of various kinds of undifferentiated experience.

**WHAT IS THINKING**

Thinking we know is an activity of our biological natures, beyond this little 1s known for certain. Disturbed brain wave patterns can be detected with electroencephalographic test, and recently the human brain as well was found to possess an electromagnetic field. Experiments at U.C.B.A. have shown that alpha waves-- which are directly related to powers of concentration and feeling of euphoria—can be brought under conscious control through trial and error recognition methods. The human eye which is directly connected to the brain and uses over half of the brain for its activities (the other half is utilized by all the other systems combined) has been found to posses incredible powers of detection. One photon (which has no mass and travels at a rate of 186,284 miles per second) can be detected by the human eye. Not surprisingly, the human eye probably does not operate on previously assumed crude mechanical principles of the camera, but on our most sophisticated understanding of holography.

Libratory experiments in sleep analysis tell us that dreaming or subconscious thinking is directly related to rapid eye movement, REMS. Philosophers from Plato to Sartre have pondered the meanings of thinking and even before them the ancient Egyptians developed, and no doubt perfected, methods of rendering the mind into a high state of suggestibility through hypnosis. Freud opened the world to recognition of "unconscious" forces; acting upon the conscious mind and directing its behavior. Poets and Artists have provided rare and exciting truths about the mind. Yet
even today our knowledge of the thinking processes is still greatly limited.

In the subatomic world and in outer space we are discovering that our previous theoretical thought structures are inadequate to explain physical phenomena. Obviously; these issues have profound bearing upon the nature of our thinking processes, contrary to our classical Biblical conception of epistemology (and ontology) we find that we cannot predict subatomic phenomena without introducing Heisenberg principle of uncertainty. Quasars, whose relationship of visible light and high intensity radio signals, are also unexplained in terms of classical theory. Position of electrons and momentum cannot be determined simultaneously, quasars baffle our basic assumptions about their behavior of light and radio signals. Light is conceived of as continuous wave-length or as a packet of energy, photons, depending upon the experiment) yet we do not have an adequate theory to explain why. It is believed that these issues, too, bear greatly upon the subject of thinking.

From Plato to Descartes, Leibnitz, Kant, Nietzsche and Sartre, the problem of thinking, which is also the problem of knowing and perceiving, has been grappled with. And it is not often enough understood how profoundly basic assumption of science are based upon philosophical and even religious values.

Nietzsche, in this author’s opinion, was perhaps the first great European thinker to understand how deeply our most abstract conceptions are products of psychological stress of mind. And even more, Nietzsche was the first to identify the philosophical passion as a “will to the thinkability of all being”—a critical insight as we shall see.
In this essay we will attempt a logical reductionism of the thinking process. The basic assumption of all philosophical and scientific theoretical structures, as well as psychological systems, is that ideas logically ordered can bring to man a legitimate understanding of the relationship between the inner subjective worlds and the outer objective worlds. Truth for any given time occurs when there is a wedding between man’s most intimate experience and its relationship to the objective "other" world.

It is believed that the results of this investigation may bear great fruit for an understanding of not only basic philosophical issues but issues of human psychology as well; and we have cause to believe this work makes possible the formation of a general theory of psychic phenomena, previously, perhaps, not possible.

Also, it is hoped that it will be seen that much scientific theory has suffered from a basic assumption concerning the ultimate nature of being, and that Einstein himself made a fundamental assumption which no doubt domed his unified field theory in advance. We shall see that the issue of thinking through and the lack of clarification of some of these problems, as we shall discuss, has hampered the advancement of a truer more modest knowledge.

The philosophical pursuit of the ultimate nature of being is an ancient pursuit. Through the sheer powers of general observation and the developed scope of theoretical inquiry the early Greeks attempted to come to an understanding of such questions as the one in the many, the principle of opposition, limits and unlimit, being and nothingness. The Greeks had a genius for basic questions and they sought, as modern physics does to determine the ultimate substance of the universe. Implicit in Greek philosophy is the assumption that ultimately it would be possible to reduce all worlds to
being and becoming into a unified, coherent principle which would embrace the physical world in its explanation. The pre-Socratic search for the underlying substance to the world lead to considerations of energy and motion and sought to define the elementary, fundamental cause for change. Heraclites thought it was fire which was the one fundamental principle which brought about change. This concept approaches very near concepts of modern physics, especially when we substitute the more modern understanding of energy for fire.

With Parmenides we find purely logical arguments brought to the fore of a naturalistic metaphysics. Parmenides denied the existence of change. He taught that there was only the One and that there is no coming or passing away. Also he denied the existence of empty space for logical reasons, arguing that all change requires empty space. Change, he believed, was an illusion. But it is with Empedocles that a decided turning toward a materialistic view of the fundamental principles of the universe. Empedocles taught that the mixture and separation of a few substances, which are fundamentally different, accounts for the infinite variety of things and events.

With Anaxagoras arises the concept of seeds which are numerous and infinitely small. The nature of these seeds their relative number and proportion determines—and accounts for infinite being. "All things will be in everything; nor is it possible for them to be apart, but all things have a portion of everything." Further he taught that the universe is set in motion by "Nous," which is usually translated as "Mind."

From Anaxagoras to the philosophy of Leucippus and Democritus we arrive at an atomistic view of the universe. The antithesis of Being and Not-Being in Parmenides is
reformed as the “Full" and the "Void" Here motion is explained as the movement of indestructible units of matter through empty space.

Only atoms and empty space have a real existence.


But the possibility or empty space has always been a controversial problem in philosophy. In the theory of general relativity the answer is given that geometry is produced by matter or matter by geometry. This answer corresponds more closely to the view held by many philosophers that space is determined by the extension of matter."
Man is that creature to whom his own inner nature is as mysterious as the stars. Man's unique intellectual nature is the very foundation of his creativity from which he determines meaning of his relationships to himself and the world.

A certain kind of mental activity which he experiences allows him to penetrate the meanings of relationships crucial not only to his survival but to his happiness and the enrichment of his humanity. The celebration of reason and a deep working respect for logic has lifted mankind from this planet, set him in orbit around the moon and finally allowed man to set foot on a foreign celestial body—the moon! This event is not only awe-inspiring to the human imagination but the day may come when this feat will be seen to have been necessary for the very survival of our species. Through reason and a spirit of love mankind can help to free the whole world from primitive paralytic fears? Through reason, deepened and enriched through modesty, man can achieve a far reaching emancipation."

It has been the ennobling goal of humanity to comprehend and give relative expression to the living wonder of man and his native kinship to the world. Philosophy, science, art and religion have all made inestimable contributions to this liberation. Through a world-wide communication this success of a single individual can quickly be enjoyed by millions, even billions of people. And international culture is seen more clearly everyday to be absolutely necessary for a deeper understanding of the universal brotherhood of man, and, indeed, for the survival of the human race—and perhaps other species as well.
What is it that all men profoundly share in which gives one the right to hope that in the near future it may be possible for all to join together in a universal effort toward a greater more loving enlightenment?

The task of philosophy and its challenge is to see the deepest dimensions of thought and to bring into the light of reason the living wonder of man and his relationship to the world. The beginning of all philosophical enquiries is to lead man to a legitimate understanding of his relationship to himself and the universe. Through reason man strives for a richer fulfillment of his subjectivity and the wedding of his spirit with the objective world of the senses. Through ideas expressed in sounds or images man not only lives but creates meaning for his life. After centuries of liberating and enslaving epistemological inquires, after generations of arguments about being and non-being, perception, intuition, the ~subjective and objective principles, we come to a point in time when the most fundamental question underlying all these speculations and assertions must be asked. The question is a simple one: What is an idea?

Man relates to the world through ideas, his logical structures through which he perceives the world constitutes and creates the very experience which he lives. Through the magical lens of idea man defines and differentiates, gives shape and form to his inner nature and its fullness in the world. A deeper understanding of the nature of ideas may yield a broader perspective to -the great, creative, and compelling question to which all man’s thoughts are ultimately directed: Who am I and what does It mean?
TWO

Ideas—the ability to form ideas and to signify and objectify their meaning rises out of the same dynamic capacity as man’s ability to create language. Words or symbols are ideas about experience and it is impossible to segregate idea from language since both are born out of the same ground of being. One of the ways we may characterize this "ground of being" is to say that ideas are born out of man’s actualizing potentiality to create and discover distinctions. We are not concerned here with the question, ultimately irresolvable, of why man has this capacity; we are, at present, only concerned with the phenomena of ideas themselves.

Words or mathematical symbols are significations of references and relations; the greater man's ability to differentiate experience and phenomenon, the greater consciousness he achieves of himself and the physical realities which surround him. It is probably true that intelligence, the ability to form ideas and objectify them into educative cultural expressions, first grew out of the practical exigencies of survival. Nietzsche has pointed out that logic grew out man’s ability to see himself separate from the primordial life flux. This inkling of “otherness” shall become one of the subjects of this paper's concern. It is the purpose of our effort to examine what is involved in man's ability to discern and create distinctions.

**Being and Nothingness**

In considering the nature of thinking we are at the outset involved in issues which have had a long and philosophically tortured history, we refer to the concept of being and nothingness! The examination of this subject has intrigued some of the greatest philosophical minds of the ages. It is
necessary to confront implications of this philosophic concept.

Sartre began his monumental philosophic effort *Being and Nothingness* with an examination of the origin of negation. His approach is a rhetorical one, tracing the development of being and nothingness through Husserl, Kant, and Hegel. However instructive and historically illuminating Sartre's remarks we find we may take another approach to this whole question.

Rather than examining nothingness or being from the philosophical perspective of a description of “consciousness” we would attempt a more direct route. Rather than asking what nothingness is, we would inquire into the fundamental logical basis for this concept. In other words, it is believed that by analyzing what is meant by the terms, we will come closer to resolving the subject into a much simpler logical perspective, the issues at hand.

It is our conviction that the results of the examination will through into greater light the weakness of the logical necessity for a philosophy based upon the relations of being to nothingness. If the approach to this problem seems absurdly simplistic, we can only reply that the act of consciousness is as much involved in our attempt of a logical reductionism as is Sartre’s and that the principle of parsimony should apply in the realm of philosophical speculations as it does in science. That our conclusions will be more in conformity with the eastern point of view (though there is an essential difference) merely provides testimony of the great influence of the Eastern philosophy upon our own efforts.

The philosophic problems involved in the explication of the historical concepts of being and nothingness are great and
numerous. To venture an addition, however small, to the voluminous commentaries on the subject presumes on the author’s part the recognition of belief that there is some lack or failure of previous attempts, at least in some significant areas.

The concept of nothingness will be challenged in this essay and, hopefully, if the efforts prove successful, a great many implications will be glimpsed in theoretical physics, psychology and theological belief-systems.

It is the author’s view that the concept of nothingness is not derived from logical necessity and that its ontic reality is a matter of pure conjecture which neither clarifies phenomenological problems nor adds substance to psychological theory. In fact, we are of the belief that, at this date in time, the obscuring problems involved in this subject has had an arresting influence on the development of philosophy) psychological and non-dogmatic religion.

**Language and Ideas**

First we must make some comments on the relationship between language and ideas. It is impossible to separate man's ability to create language and man's ability to form ideas. They are the same, whatever theory to the contrary. Even in the realm of mathematical notation, the most abstract form of language, we find that symbols are used to designate and differentiate mental experience. This has not always been clear. Bertrand Russell) in seeking to determine the set of all sets came to the conclusion that such a determination was not possible because of language considerations. Hence he came to the opinion that there was a fundamental paradox that existed when one tried to symbolically conceptualize basic mental operations. In this he was. There is no such paradox involved if his failure to
express a "set of all sets." What he arrived at, however, was a recognition of the limitations of the method of his inquiry, though he did not realize it. We will demonstrate that it is not possible to conceptualize the “set of all sets: not because of certain idiosyncrasies of common language but because he did not understand central issues of the problem.

What is language from a philosophical point of view? Language is a means of conveying in spoken, written, or symbolic form various kinds of differentiated experience, be it the purely abstract or the most emotional, subjective sort. Though it would be possible to view language in the abstract, that is, to make a “set” out of language, we would approach our logical reductionism and arrive at this same conclusions. This we will not do since it is believed that a simplified, less cumbersome approach will makes the issues more quickly and more clearly apparent;

The ability to create language arises out of the same fundamental dynamic as man’s ability to form language. Thus, in dealing with the most abstract questions, we find that we will be still involved in the most general issues which relate to all forms of communications. If we are on the right tract it will be possible to embrace any expression of language and to subject it to the same analysis.

Further, we will state that the logical approach we shall employ is not based on any particular linguistic idiosyncrasies of the English language. The issues we will raise are fundamental to the thought modes of all the peoples of the world.

Idea And The Concept of Limits

The intellective processes is essentially a process of selecting limits, discriminating experience. This has been given its most
noble expression through the work of Aristotle and the work of Camus. Though neither of them to our knowledge sought to make any fundamental ontological reduction (though Camus sometimes verges on it particularly with his concept of freedom) yet we recognize their singular significance in the history of the concept of limitations. It is necessary that we probe this meaning of limits for it is in this examination of limits that we shall hopefully aid a little to the understanding of basic philosophical insight.

For anything to have a limit, it is logically necessary that we presuppose that from which a particular thing is differentiated. In other words, to limit a thing necessitates a logical acknowledgement of that from which a thing is differentiated. A limit presupposes “otherness,” that which is not itself. We find that to limit a thing, or idea, involves a profound recognition of a reference by means of which we know we have limited or differentiated a particular thing.

It is important that we understand the fundamental meaning of references in relationship to knowing.

If we categorize all ideas or things into a single unit we shall see. that we shall not be able to resolve the primary issue at stake. Ideas are ideas only insofar as they are linked to some reference other them themselves. In examining how it is that we can come to know a particular unit or thing we are in fact analyzing a basic dimension of how we come to be able to conceptualize. Many fields of knowledge employ terms like “ground” and “figure” or dualistic concepts involving either a dialectical approach of opposites (we know white in relationship to black, etc.) But suppose we have included in our unit all ideas or all things, in other words, all conceptualizations. This being the case it becomes apparent that our unit cannot have a reference to another reference because for it to be a reference it, too, would have to have a
limit. We see that such a unit must contain its own limit, which is logically absurd. This is precisely the point which we must probe.

For it is here that great confusion has arisen in the history of ideas which have obscured our understanding. We are in reality faced with the question: what is the ultimate reference for any conceptual unit? We find that at any point in our analysis we can still ask the question what is the reference for our knowing that we know the particular limits of a particular thing. Whether we use a reductionist method or an inclusive method the question logically remains the same. Yet we are not involved here in problem of infinite regression, for we can still ask how do we know we are dealing with a problem of infinite regression?

All we need to do is to postulate a reference which is the reference of all references and yet is not itself a reference. What could this be? Obviously we cannot know or define it conceptually for however we defined the reference (define means to fix a limit), our answer would be merely another conceptual unit.

To make this clearer, suppose we mark an X on a blank sheet of paper. The existence of the X then has a reference (the page) and a location (namely the boundaries of the page). Now if we mark another X on the page it, too, has its own reference to the page and its relationship to the original x. Whether we use the inclusive method and fill the page with X's and/or other symbols, we are still left with our original problem. The problem is namely all the X's and/or other symbols and their conceptual relationship in reference to the their position on the page.

If we employ the reductionist method we can reduce back to our original problem and continue with our method of
inquiry by probing the relationship of the single X to the page. Now to what ultimately does the page and the X refer? Simply, everything that is not its unique self, everything, that is, that is not-page and not-X.

It is here that we confront a fundamental problem in logic and, hence, the nature of idea itself.

When Bertrand Russell attempted to deal with this problem by asking what is the set of all set, he could only conclude that, as such, a set must have references to a class. In other words, he believed that precisely at this point we must acknowledge a fundamental paradox of logic and ordinary language. He was not correct in this for we are not involved with a paradox at all, only a misunderstanding of the nature of thinking itself. Let us examine this issue more carefully.

We have in a fundament of logic a curious phenomena in the passed-over question of a basic assumptions of logic. I refer to the established criterion of determining a logical truth in a particular table, the Logical Truth Table. We may ask, do we have a phenomenological principle of this?

We have a phenomenological principle of this in relationship of a thing to itself negative principle, P and not-P. Briefly, I should like to point out certain assumptions built into this concept of not-P (P and not-P discussed here are only arbitrary symbols used for our purposes, any symbol, unit or conceptual designation would serve the same purpose. We would ask the question straight forward: What is meant by not-P?

Not-P has meaning only insofar as it is linked to P, for P is the is the defining factor of itself. We find we cannot know what not-p is in itself without including an infinity of existent things, as the defining factor of what not-P is. We cannot
limit not-P except by limiting the infinity of existent things that P is not, which again is logically impossible.

What is the logical necessity for assuming that this basic condition of the unknowable is indeed nothingness—or, once again, the void.

True, the convenience of the term helps in the realm of mathematics. Yet, even here when we encounter basic problems of contemporary physics we may even wonder if the assumption that there is a void has not confined man's constructive theoretical efforts. Recent information regarding the physical nature of the universe would even seem to conjur against the use of the basic assumption in the physical sciences of a void. Einstein himself could not conceive of the physical universe without the idea of nothingness. The void became for him an idea of almost religious significance. How deeply the concept involves his unified field theory is a matter for specialists to ponder.

Actually we see that the concept of nothingness and its ontological roots can be viewed from another perspective, a perspective best glimpsed perhaps by considering this matter for an inclusive approach rather than from a reductionist’s foundation.

In saying that not-p is unknowable is an unknowable state of consciousness and hence an unconceptualizable physical state does not of course prove that no such state “exists” only that we cannot know if it exits or not.

If we were to say that not-P is simply everything that does not participate. in the fundamental uniqueness of P we have merely posited an infinity of being other than P which P is not. By introducing the concept of infinity we find we have once again merely turned to an unknowable condition.
Even Hegel’s remark that "Pure Being and Nothing are the same" does not lead up into an understanding of his meaning, though we shall discover that something truly coherent is expressed in the remark. This we shall return to. But, if pure being and nothingness are the same what is to be gained by use of the term nothingness?

**Principle of Unresolvement**

'We have discovered that it is at the very heart of logic there is a unresolvable principle, that it is not possible to ultimately deduce an ultimate knowledge of the physical, psychological or conceptual worlds. This is not possible because of the very nature of ideas themselves. Thus, we are led to the Principle of Unresolvement.

The Principle of Unresolvement states that logic or reason can never lead us to any ultimate understanding of the ultimate nature of Being, neither man’s nor that of the universe, nor anything thing whatsoever. Whether we think in interstellar terms or, subatomic, psychological, or whatever. The very nature of ideas embodies at its heart a fundamental mystery that only through the unknowable is the knowable known.

The question is how we know things: everything is known through its limitations and we know limitations through our ability to differentiate experience. In other words, I know or can make a mental image out of a cup because I can differentiate this cup from this table, for example. The ability to differentiate experience is the foundation of man’s thinking capabilities.
Since there are so many philosophical and theological schools that go under the banner of existentialists we shall confine most of our remarks to the work of Sartre, certainly one of the most lucid exponents of existentialism’s monumental work in Being and Nothingness. Sartre’s monumental work is an attempt to reduce the study of the ultimate nature of being (ontology) to its most simplified logical form through an analysis of consciousness.

Through a very strict and logical pursuit he arrived at his fundamental reduction of the ultimate nature of being into the categories of being and nothingness and examines the various aspects of being –being-for-itself, being-in-itself, being-for-and-in-itself, etc. Sartre’s work is highly complicated and brilliantly dialectical. However we are of the opinion that nothingness cannot be logically deduced and the concept of nothingness is an unjustified assumption. We say it is an “unjustified” assumption we really mean to say it is an assumption pure and simple and an assumption neither sanctioned nor unsanctioned by reason or the logical method.

Sartre began with an examination of consciousness, but if we assume what is known about consciousness is known through thinking, and that what we know about thinking rests most firmly on the method of logical inquiry, then we can begin with an examination of the thinking process as it directly related to a fundamental examination of the root premises of logic.

Our point is precisely this, nothingness is an ontological assumption unsupported by reason or a reductionist examination of logic. In other words, logic cannot lead us to knowledge of nothingness. We cannot, in fact, know if there is or is not nothingness. Any point of view is a matter of
personal conviction which can neither be affirmed nor denied by logic.

Everything we can think must have a limit and for everything to have a limit presupposes that from which it is differentiated. We know thing through the Principle of Opposition and the Principle of Uniqueness—in other words, a word or anything that is known is known by that from which it is differentiated. However purely abstract we become this fundamental reality confronts us at every turn. Nietzsche has stated that logic developed out of man's ability to see himself as separate from the primordial flux of life. I think this is a very pregnant observation. In other words, mankind was able to develop his logical faculties precisely because he could differentiate himself from the world about him, see himself as a concept rather than an activity. That ability to conceptualize himself must have been the primitive root of the development of the “ego” or better the sense of selfhood. And it is through this mental operation that man came into the realization of an essential principle of the universe, the Uniqueness Principle: no two things in nature are the same. Rather than an amorphous flux of life or being man perceived the magical uniqueness of everything that gives content to the universe. From this insight he was able to make relationships between himself and the world and the more clearly he perceived relationships the more “rational” he became—rational means to make relations.
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Thus, we only know a thing by its limitations. For example, I only know cup by that which is not cup, by the table by that which is not table, the floor, walls, sofa, etc. I only know white by that which is not white, blackness and so forth. In psychology this is frequently referred to as “ground” and “figure.”
Logic deals with symbols and the various kinds of relationships those symbols have toward each other given certain mental operations. The question we would pose is a simple one, namely, “What is an idea? If we look at this in the most simplified term, using the symbolic language of logic we can simply designate P as an idea and go from there. As we have stated before we can only know a thing through its proper limitations. P is P and not another thing. Fundamentally, all ideas, like nature, must begin with the principle of uniqueness which is only another way of stating the identity principle, P = P. The question is how do we know P?

As we have already stated, we only know a thing in reference to another thing. Just as we only know a cup by its limits, so we only P by its limits. In other word P exist in reference to that which is not P. Now what is it this P which is not, which gives P its unique meaning? We can ask the same question by simply asking what not-P. is This issue is important. Philosophy has made significant assumptions about this not-P. Not-P has been assumed to be the counterpunctual reference of nothingness in relationship to P. P represents being and not-P represents non-being—the principle of negation or opposition.

Just as the opposite principle of white is black, or the absence of white, so it has been assumed that not-P is nothingness. This is the very point we challenge, we challenge the assumption that there is a logical necessity for the assumption of nothingness. We would like to to make this point as clearly as possible for, in our opinion a great many implications arise out of this issue.

What is not-P? Simply it is everything that is not-P, the absence of P. But where or what is this absence of P? P is
thingness but is not-P nothingness? Not-P can simply be viewed as not that (namely P) thingness. This does not necessarily imply nothingness. The reference or limiting factor of P is not-P. In actuality not-P can be conveyed as that infinity of being other than P which defines the uniqueness of P. Still what have we really said?

This issue is really a question of references. What is the reference of P? Isn’t it not-P? A reference to be a reference, however, must have a limit and we must ask what is the limit of not-P? Here we touch upon the critical point, the logical basis of Sartre’s ontology.

Not-P cannot be conceptualized. It is presumed to be the ground of nothingness out of which being (P in this case) gains its phenomenological significance. It is true that not-P cannot be conceptualized, but does the fact that it cannot be conceptualized give us any indication what it is? Even if we accept the line of thinking that it is understood that not-P has no content and is merely a word used to designate an unconceptualizable state of consciousness, still we may properly challenge the ontological assumption of the language. In other words, take, for example, the word nothingness we cannot know if this not-P is an infinity of “being” or an absence of being. We might just as well assume that not-P is pure presence and P is being.

If we define not-P as pure presence logically we can make a phenomenological reduction to Being and Pure Presence. In this way we accomplish the same logical function as the "negation principle" and can deduce everything from it that the negation principle can. It would follow, as with nothingness, that pure presence also does not have content meanings since it is not being but pure presence. Those psychological states which Sartre has so brilliantly described can then be logically interpreted from this point of view. Any
criticism, it is believed, that can be lodged against this point of view will nonetheless stand up better logically than the assumption of nothingness. With the concept of Pure presence we can satisfy a logical problem that Sartre’s philosophy cannot.

Fundamentally our logical problem is this: what is the reference of all references that is not itself a reference? Obviously this is beyond comprehension. And obviously any statement about this state or lack of it is an assumption which cannot be logically reduced.

And, in fact, if we consider the issue from the point of view of knowledge we can point to the phenomena as the principle of Unknowability. Logically we have the situation that only through the unknowable is the knowable known. The unknowable is the fundamental principle of that state of mind (or consciousness) of which the human mind cannot conceive-- a reference of all references which is not itself a reference. Because of this fundamental principle, however, it is possible that the human mind can learn infinite relationships with given identities.

If we could conceive of the reference of all references which is not itsle a reference we would already have absolute knowledge, which is again impossible because we only know things through references and for us to know we have absolute knowledge we would need a reference, which implies the whole logical tautology again.

Further, we would say that by supplanting the concept of nothingness with the concept of Pure Presence we can be more faithful to all the factual information presently known about the physical universe. We could say that this pure Presence is pure energy, like light it has no being (no mass in
the language of physics) its limitlessness in only “known” by its relationship to the most rarified logical relationships to being.

Furthermore, we could make logically unchallengeable statements about pure presence without in any way defining or limiting it. Pure Presence is as the Taoist say, the motionless source of all motion. If pure presence is not limited then it is everywhere, if it is everywhere it is not moving anywhere and motion, and like P gains its motion from it, Pure Presence being creative. Creative in that without pure presence there would be no presence and before creativity could exist there must be something which is Creative, i.e., The Spirit of Creativity.

**Faith And Logic**

Yet in regard to all this we are met with and interesting question of the relationship of faith to logic.

While the concept of pure presence like the concept of nothingness cannot be claimed to be a logical deduction yet the above mentioned relationship of pure presence to being and not be shown to conflict with logic. One would be entitled to believe in them. Logic can neither prove nor disprove these assertions.

The ability to conceptualize involves this very fact of consciousness. To have a concept of limits makes necessary the limitless, time implies timelessness. the finite the infinite, etc. This Unknowability is not subject to further logical reduction. The Unknowable is a fundamental fact of nature.

Heisenberg’s theory of indeterminism points to the very issue we are talking about, namely that it is not possible to know
the velocity and position of a given electron simultaneously. All the physical facts corroborate this principle. Actually though quantum physics has greatly subverted many of our classical notions of matter, we are not in the theoretical bind that many think. The issue is a question of references.

Einstein considered that in the future it might be possible to determine velocity and position coordinately simultaneously and urged that we must try. He points to the idea that it is not by assuming fundamental barriers that science has made its great progress. Yet Heisenberg’s principle state, and will stand in our opinion, unless by some as new incomprehensive way a method will be created which will allow us to use other references. Einstein’s main objection to indeterminacy was that “God did not play dice with the universe.” But Indeterminacy does not really upset in any way the concept (or faith commitment) in the rational order of the universe. As we have already stated, we are dealing with a fundamental issue of references.

Now actually Einstein may be right about his faith that in the future man may be able to make such a determination, as Heisenberg’s word may stand as a fundamental law of nature. But we can only accept Heisenberg’s position on faith since we cannot know the unknowable. It may be that w will never be able to know if a set of problems is an expression of the Unknowable, or merely the Unknown.

The implicit assumption of philosophy and science is that ideas logically ordered can lead to a legitimate understanding of man’s relationship to himself and the physical universe which surrounds us. What comprises the world of true knowledge is, in fact, a wedding between the two principles of self and other-than-self. In other words, the phenomenological world. Now knowledge is a matter of the relationship between these two domains. When there is no
conflict in these two principles that is what we call truth. This "truth" is a question of relationships and the study and exploration of mental or conceptual relationships is the work of logic. Our approach to this whole issue is to examine how we know things by examining the very method used to arrive at logical truths, namely logic itself.

What we are saying is that when we attempt to go to the fundamental basis of logic we are also saying that what applies fundamentally must also apply in the most embrace sense. Logic deals with symbols and the various kinds of relationships those symbols have toward each other, given certain mental operations.

Everything we could still ask how do we know that we have imposed a limit on everything, for a thing is only limited through its reference to a reference. Thus not-P in this sense is an expression of the limitedness of everything except P. Conceptually Not-P is essential to P and is, in fact, a function of it. Consequently not-P is merely a linguistic designation of that which cannot be conceptualized for if it were conceptualizable then it would not be not-P. We are still dealing with the problem of the thought form of ideas, i.e., the nature of ideas themselves. Hence it is only through the limitless that the limited is known. We may even restate the problem thusly; Only through the unknowable is the knowable known.

**Sartre and Nothingness**

Sartre and others, approaching this problem from a rather cumbersome dialectic viewed this phenomenon as a fundamental issue of Being and Nothingness. Although nothingness is pointed out to be merely a word to designate the phenomena it is explicitly not meant to have conceptual
content, still we think the word itself is inappropriate in that it contains certain ontological assumptions crucial to the issue, assumptions which we believe obscure the issue of concern. How are we to know that that which is the referent of all references yet it not itself a logical reference is nothingness, or another word from the physical sciences the void. We maintain that we cannot know or conceptualize that to which we refer and, therefore, we should use a word which is stripped of any ontological assumptions. In the introduction of Sartre’s *Being and Nothingness* we read: "Does this mean that by reducing the existent to its manifestations we have succeeded in overcoming all dualisms? It seems rather that we have converted them all into a new dualism: that of finite and infinite." He then goes on to show the difficulties with the concept of the finite and ends his paragraph with this remark:

Thus the appearance, which is finite, indicates itself in its finitude, but at the same. time in order to be grasped as an appearance-of-that-which-appears, it requires that it be surpassed toward infinity."

This is all very fine but we resist many implications which he tried to draw from this line of reasoning. We believe it is not logically necessary to bring into the picture what is called appearance in these regards. In fact, we should even substitute the relationship of the knowable (conceptualizable) to replace concepts of finite and infinite

It is precisely this point, the ontological assumptions built into the Western understanding of nothingness that we challenge.
It is here that we would continue with our method of approach. It is believed that the very line of reasoning we have employed can be used to explicate the fact that at the very heart of the nature of idea we discover and unresolvable principle, namely that we cannot conceptualize the unknowable which renders the knowable known.

**Principle of Opposition**

Now for a principle of opposition to exist there must be a form which has within its nature a characteristic of resistance. For resistance to occur there must be within a living form contending energies within that form. The best way to represent this is to make a form which pictorially conveys the form. First, let us make a circle (O) to represent form which is a unit. Now we want to represent contending forces. If we make a circle and draw an equatorial line we have O, but our line merely represents a division within a whole which could represent a static quality. We need a line to symbolize movement, therefore let us make a circle with an active line (we did not use a square or a triangle X or other shapes for as we can see only a circle with a line of movement at its heart returns to itself to complete the single unit which is used to symbolize a life form). So far so good. Now, if we are to have opposition or differentiation or resistance to be a fundamental principle we cannot leave off here for now we only have a divided form in motion returning to itself to create an absolute symmetry. If, indeed, opposition is fundamental then we need the one half to also be embodied in the other half. How are we to do this? Bet us take of O and designate the division O. Now is X is a fundamental principle and Y is a fundamental principal X must also contain Y and Y must also contain X. Let us represent this phenomenon by putting an X factor in Y and a Y factor in X.
What would be the best way to do this? Obviously if we use black to designate X and white to designate Y we can easily create a simple representation. Thus to symbolize a fundamental life principle we have the Taoist symbol. This simple ancient symbol is a genius of logic. We have in it form, energy in movement, resistance or opposition and balance.

The only factor previously established in our previous definition of life form that is missing from this is adaptability. But on closer scrutiny we find that black is adapted to white and conversely. Neither section &r, the whole is gaining sway other the other and a sense of harmony dwells in the symbol. Now it could be argued that adaptability, the principle of adaptability is not truly represented by this symbol since the symbol as unit must be capable of changing. There are two replied to this objection. one,

that the question of adaptability is a question of change and involved therefore a principle of action in the future, hence whether a thing is adaptable depends upon the future and obviously we cannot represent the future in our diagram.

The second reply is that a circle such as the Taoist symbol represents in fact the most adaptable and perfect geometric shape that can be represented in two dimensional space. We will comment on this further in the past scrip.

REFERENTIAL AND RELATIONAL THINKING

We see from the foregoing that the ideational process involves two different thought functions. Each thought function is not an exclusive category since all referential thinking is in great part a function of relational thinking. For the sake of clarity however, let us examine each category separately to discover the unique dynamics of each.
**Referential Thinking**

Referential thinking is a cognitive operation which mainly seeks the ultimate defining basis for any thought construct. Theology and systematic philosophy have historically had a pronounced affinity for the referential. The questions "What is the set of all sets?" is an example of referential thinking. The referential sets the limits to any inquiry or logical pursuit. The absolute reference as we have already discovered will never be found, but it is a process which defines its territory of inquiry and then generally pursues to meaning of the relational elements which it has discovered and synthesized. Having already endeavored through and examination of the ideational process, to explicate the logical realities of referential thinking we come to relational functions. Again it must be noted that for referential thinking to occur requires a relations. basis at the outset. Once we have a relational basis, S in reference to T we can enquire into the referential meaning of the relationship. Ultimately of course referential cognitive inquiry leads into the unknowable.

**Relational Thinking**

Relational thinking is a cognitive operation which occurs when all the essential elements are given and one seeks to synthesize the most significant (predetermined) information from a particular collection, i.e., a set of equations, a group of given objects, how to solve S and Y through relational processes. Mathematics and physics and everyday problems solving most employs the relational method. The relational method is not involved with the questions which referential thinking is involved in, but relational thinking which comes to dead ends must turn to referential concerns to establish a new limit to its inquiry. By employing another reference to
problems of celestial mechanics (through the curve) Einstein for example created a new thought construct. However when confronted with indeterminism Einstein could only make reference to God, saying, in his famous remark that “He doesn’t dice with the universe.

**Circle and Line as Fundamental Thought Forms**

Line is an expression of the concept of limits, ie., it is pure concept and involves a linear function. Line is a fundamental thought form and is indigenous to any systemized thought construct.

Circle is line with force action upon it to create curve. Circle 1s an idealized curve which expresses thought form of motion. There is no circle without line. Line and circle are both fundamental to all thinking modalities. Circle has three fundamental forms in homotopic space 0 0 8. All closed curve forms are ultimately reducible to one of these three circle forms.

Two functions of line ________ and _____ ______

Three functions of circle p 0 8
The Fundamentals of the Will to Resolution & Knowing

The Will to Resolution is a primary force dynamic for the expansion of consciousness-learning. One may say it is the necessary driving energy for the formation of idea and insights. Yet, it cannot be overlooked that when ideas come into logical conflict and a new insight is needed to expand consciousness faith is the ground dynamic out of which new ideas are born and either affirmati0n or denials of an idea is a faith commitment.

**Growth of Knowledge**

Will to resolution→ ideas→ faith affirmed → knowledge

The above is a schematic representation of the process involved in the expansion of knowledge. The diagram is itself an idea, and hence subject to affirmation or denial. If affirmed it becomes knowledge of the process of consciousness. If denied one is turned back to the question—what is the process of knowledge expansion? In this latter case the will to Resolution sets about construction a new idea for affirmation or denial. In the affirmation or denial of any idea faith is the underlying dynamic that affirms or denies the idea.

**Because of the Unknowable, Faith is a Necessary Dimension of Knowing**

When there is a conflict between the Will to Resolution and the Principle of Unresolvement, fait is the only possible position. We may ask the question, how are we to know when (or if) a particular problem is, in fact, an expression of the Principle of Unresolvement? We have already stated that
only through the unknowable is the knowable know and that we can not know what it is that is unknowable. This being the case, it follows that logic cannot be the fundamental force of its own dynamic of knowing. We can never absolutely know if a particular problem is an expression of the Principle of Unresolvement or not. To assume any position is an expression of faith.

As an example, in contemporary physics there is a seemingly unsolvable problem in quantum mechanics. Heisenberg has taken the position that physics has reached a barrier in the examination of electrons which he called the Uncertainty Principle. The Uncertainty Principle expresses the fact that we cannot know the position of a particle and its velocity coordinately simultaneously.

Einstein however, while acknowledging that Heisenberg Principle is a description of the facts believed it may, in the future, be possible to determine simultaneously the position and velocity of an electron. Einstein’ further believed that it is not through the acceptance of seeming barriers that has lead to the great success in science. Quite the opposite seems to be the case. Now Einstein believes on faith that this seeming barrier will be dissolved. Heisenberg believes on faith that the Uncertainty Principle is the barrier (since he cannot know the Unknowable his position too can only be a faith commitment). Now, obviously if 3everyone accepts the Uncertainty Principle we will never know if it is absolutely valid. Yet the problem cannot be forgotten since the Uncertainty Principle is at present an expression of the facts. In other words, one can only proceed on faith to try to upset the Principle of Uncertainty, or accept the Principle of Uncertainty on faith (that that it is not a description of the facts however). Not surprisingly, Einstein thought it was a question of faith. Whether one is partial to Einstein’s point of
view or Heisenberg’s the fact remains that either position is an issue of faith.

We have chosen this example (though others lie at hand) for both sides of the coin point to faith as a fundamental dynamic of logic. Heisenberg’s Principle states that we cannot absolutely know (and in this he is correct) the nature of the subatomic and Einstein says that we will only know that we cannot know by attempting to resolve the problem (and in this he is correct). Of course, it once was a fact that man could not fly. Both positions are legitimate and both are commitments of faith. We are then led to the realization that faith, which gives direction to the will of resolution, is a fundamental dynamic of consciousness.