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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

An Overall View of the Problems:
Rationale for the Study

We are alerted by the "back to the basics" outcry that general education is, and has been, faultering. In art education, the inadequacy is revealed by the provocation of "coming to our senses."¹ These views alone suggest that education is in need of re-assessment and change. Such change, however, must not be dictated by "common sense" which has been the directive for decades. It was common sense that got education into its difficulty in the first place. With common sense everything is seemingly possible, but without rhyme or reason. But how can change be dictated without a common sense origin? The position taken in this study is that it must be dictated by a philosophical origin. This alone is an abrasive proposition since educationally the populace has been schooled to the contrary.

There has been and continues to be a prevailing antagonism toward or fear of "philosophy" throughout the United States. This is not only true of the layman, but the educator and researcher as well. The average man on the street, "... finds philosophy's radical questioning ridiculous, at best, and morally reprehensible, at worst..."² The degree of repulsion depends largely upon which philosophy is being considered and the nature of the questions raised therefrom. Even so, the
average man has a prejudice against anything labeled philosophy as being "impractical activity." He has his practicality and his common sense, his beliefs and his opinions, which according to him are sufficient enough, whether philosophical or not. However, he may not realize that much of what he embraces as "practical" was made possible by that which he shuns as "impractical." The average man is often ignorant of philosophy and its influential role on his daily life. He is ignorant of the reality that his consequential world is not only made possible, but is determined by the philosophical antecedent world.

The educator, on the other hand, because of his educational curriculum, may be more able to comprehend his philosophical ignorance. However, this inadequacy tends to manifest itself as the "fear of philosophy" rather than the "repulsion" which laymen may experience. Their fear causes students' intellectualism to be either ignored or ridiculed by some educators. "It is virtually impossible for an educator to guide the intellectual development of the student when the educator himself is not at ease in the realms of abstraction and extended thought." Hence, the educator helps perpetuate philosophical ignorance by excluding it from the average man's "practical world."

The educator, as such, is not afflicted by "venality or indifference or stupidity but rather mindlessness." The single outstanding fact about teachers—especially in American public schools—has been their docility. "American teachers are dominated by cowardice and hypocrisy. There are admirable exceptions. Yet almost universally, teachers teach not what they would like, but only so much of it as they dare."
In combating such afflictions, higher education has attempted to strengthen the teacher through ready-made techniques, first-hand experiences, and methodologies. But "[t]he best methodology is a conscious application of deeply held philosophical convictions about what is and should be in human affairs." This, however, is wanting in higher education at least in regards to teacher preparation. "Ironically, the 'real world' of the public schools is teaching students [student teachers] that professional education needs much more than techniques and first-hand experience to be 'relevant'; it also requires a college-based component that is issue-oriented, political, philosophical and deeply intellectual."10

"Perhaps the most potentially alarming trend in higher education is the tendency among undergraduate and graduate professors toward subject matter specialization to the virtual exclusion of general educational or intellectual activity in the classroom."11 "More recent changes in teacher education have been the consequence of a variety of factors: [one such factor being] . . . the debunking of theoretical analysis as an 'impractical activity'."12 The debunking of theoretical analysis not only leads to the confusion of what is, but as well, the inability to reduce and categorize the massive data which continuously bombards the student and the teacher.

[Statement made by a middle school principal:] We have more "things" than any group of educators in the history of mankind, but we still have pathetically little insight into the function of conceptual schema to guide our use of these things. Even today, most colleges of education do not provide systematic and deliberate instruction in the nature and need of the theory. This is a serious omission. Those educators who guide the preparation of teachers should strive mightily to ensure that teachers understand the nature of theory. Teachers have the need of theory.13
"The intellectual aspects of higher education must be reaffirmed and reinforced." It is at this level that the ills are rooted.

The Nature and the Structure of Education as the Problem

Throughout the centuries education has primarily been viewed and treated as though it were monistic (a singular entity); albeit there have been technical schools and apprenticeships which could possibly be viewed as "education" in a second and different sense from general education. Yet, this might simply be a difference without a distinction. The nature of the technical schools is important, but its concern goes beyond the limits of this dissertation.

In the twentieth century, the American school system has stood for, and to a large degree represented, Pluralism. This would make education a multiple entity rather than singular. This was supposedly accomplished by the tolerance of various curricula, views, methods, and objectives whether the content was considered philosophical, sociological or even personal.

If one's view stems from "categories" or "context" (both considered to be common sensical in this dissertation), then it is possible to conclude education to be both monistic and pluralistic. But it is this very approach which has gotten education into its present difficulty. Basically, it is the fallacious approach that "ought can be derived from an is." This is not to say that an "ought" cannot be derived from an "is," but rather that it results in "nothingness" (which is very descriptive of education in the twentieth-century American schools). The same, however, does not apply to "schooling" which is rote memorization.
Philosophically, the educational system must be viewed as either monistic or pluralistic given that these are the only metaphysical options. But obviously there is another possibility—that of Dualism. The either/or state of two entities is a simple matter to deal with, but when a third entity such as Dualism is introduced, the situation becomes complex as evident by the following possibilities.

1. If all three exist in one, then there is only Monism.
2. If they do not exist in one, then either Dualism or Pluralism exists, but not Monism.
3. If all three exist "as" one, then Monism and Dualism exist, but not Pluralism.

In three above, Pluralism reduces to either a monistic or a dualistic state. Hence, there cannot be a series of monadic states existing independent of one another for that would imply Pluralism to be non-reducible.

The concern with Monism and Dualism is still not as simple as one might expect since "relation" and "interrelation" become very important for at least the following reason: there are no monadic states existing independent of one another. The interrelationship of a monistic state with that of a dualistic one is shown in this dissertation to be the nature and the structure of education and descriptively "confrontation." Confrontationalism is argued to be the actuality and the reality of education whereby the monistic is science education and the dualistic is art education. To argue the contrary is not only to presuppose Pluralism whereby incorrectly education implies a series of unrelated facts, events, concepts, or truths. But also that Monism is advocated and disguised as Pluralism, an unactualizable ideal.
It is necessary for the educational system to be structured according to what metaphysically "is"; otherwise, it becomes inert or simply nothingness as when it contradicts itself or attempts to derive an "ought" from an "is." Albeit that this is necessary, it is not, however, sufficient in making schooling an educational endeavor. Accordingly, for it to be educational it must also be intellectual. This brings forth a further difficulty—that of intellectualism itself.

**Philosophy and Anti-Intellectualism**

**As the Problem**

Philosophy gives rise to intellectualism as historically revealed in Idealism. And yet, there are also certain philosophies that are either non- or anti-intellectual. Such philosophies are basically science oriented rather than mind or reason oriented. They are predicatively realistic, materialistic or naturalistic in their manifesto and manifestation. They are common-sensical whereas the idealistic philosophies are intellectual.

Common sense is basically the consequential and the experiential rather than the antecedental and the analytical. It has existed since the dawn of man but only within the last two centuries has it become explicitly a philosophy. It has smoldered as a "world view" and a body of knowledge since Aristotle's time. Only recently, however, has it ostensively become a philosophy and one which stands in opposition to Intellectualism. It should be noted that common sense cannot stand in opposition to intellectual philosophy unless it is itself a philosophy. Thus, the common sense philosophers are committed to arguing that it is first of all a philosophy, whereby experience and practicality are made
the central principles, and second of all, that the antecedinal and
the analytical are argued to be meaningless, whereby an assault can be
made on intellectual philosophy in sustaining common sense. But by the
fact that the common-sense philosophers adhere to the experiential and
the consequential, they are unable to explain and interpret content but
simply to describe it. Obviously, this is a gross misconception of
philosophy in the first place since it must necessarily explain and
interpret. But the reader should note that this misconception of
"philosophy" by the common-sense philosophers does, however, result in
the impediment of intellectual philosophy. It is by way of this accepted
misconception that common sense is a philosophy which prevents philoso-
phical intellectualism. This is precisely the vicious dilemma in which
philosophy is to be found at this time.

It is strange that common sense has gained such a prominent status
in the twentieth century especially since intellectualism is a much more
competent and accountable field. This is especially true in light of
the fact that intellectualism is also the very means for common sense to
change and extend itself. How then could common sense become a philoso-
phy of such prominence at the expense of intellectualism? To answer this
question, a historical view must be presented. In this chapter it will
serve as "perspective of the problems" along with being an introduction
for its extended consideration and support in the following two chapters.

As shown on the following page, intellectualism had its high
points during the time of Plato and Hegel. This was made possible by
their reliance upon the triangle which is the basis of intellectualism.
There was, however, a marked difference in their reliance on the
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triangular configuration. Plato's philosophy is one derived from the triangle having its base at the bottom. Hegel, on the other hand, used a base-up triangle whereby everything was derived from a supposed "dual" universal principle, that of theme (thesis) and its negation (antithesis). In the final analysis the Hegelian universal principal is not dual at all, but rather a strange singular principle. Even so, and since the Hegelian philosophy was founded upon "negation" it contained its own abolition. When a philosophy has as its central principle negation, then it ultimately negates itself. Hegelianism, as representative of the most advanced state of intellectualism, ended up being self-destructive. Intellectualism plummeted to the point where today man is acceptably described as an animal with a brain but no mind (behaviorism and mechanism).

Hegel's major contribution was the realization that the conceptual structure is a triangular configuration, but not a triangle with its base down, as Plato concluded. The dialectical philosophies which followed Hegelianism, in part determined by it yet still unique to it, modified the Hegelian triangle. More than anything else, the rationale behind this was to abandon Idealism in hopes of furthering Materialism. The ultimate outcome of this changed the conceptual structure, the triangle, to predominantly the circle which had been the manifesto and the manifestation thousands of years ago. This marked the end of intellectual advancement and the dawn of common sense as philosophy—all summarized as an impression shown on the previous page.

The nature of intellect is even more problematically mixed today than in any other time. This is partly due to the fact that intelligence
is often equated with experience, information, data, flexibility, open-mindedness, or even IQ scores. But probably more than anything else, it has come to mean "common sense." At least within the last four decades, the thrust in the public schools and much of higher education has been a concern with experience and the development of common sense, deceivingly as intellect and intellectualism. In changing this direction, it is necessary to reveal the nature of experience and common sense as quite different from intellect. Furthermore, intellect itself must at least be delineated, if not defined, so that it may be instrumental. If this not be the trend then we are left with the problematic situation discussed in the first section of this chapter.

Misrepresentation of Philosophy: A Further Problem

Philosophy means not only "to love wisdom," but also a "world view." In this latter sense lies the uniqueness of philosophy and philosophizing. Herein one is able to consider the "general" without first considering the "specific." One is able to consider that which is not present to the senses nor even known to exist. One is able to investigate the "unknown." This is accomplished by the method of deduction, and presented in argumentative form, not only to establish a rigorous consistency, but a "coherency." In coherency all pertinent information is explained and shown to fit consistently and cohesively into a system as an integral part.

The aforementioned is a very orthodox view of philosophy and philosophizing. One could argue that in this day and age, given all the scientific means, it is a passe' approach. But it is also possible that
this approach is to be found in science. As such, to argue that it is passé would be to argue an integral part of science to be abandoned, limiting scientific advances. On the other hand, what is the rhyme and reason for predicating everything "science," as is so often done today? Everything is not science. To appeal to such a misconception is either to curtail non-scientific means or possibly science itself. In confusing the two, one is at least assured of having limited reasoning, intellect and world view.

There is a confusion and misrepresentation of philosophy in most all fields. Art education is no exception. Possibly for reasons of survival, many art educators in their desperation have misconceptions of philosophy in general and a naivety of problems of philosophy in specific. To suggest anything else would be to imply a cabal by some philosophers of art education of undoing philosophy itself, and thereby the very foundation of art education. Such a possibility will not be entertained in this dissertation.

A well-known problem of philosophy is the "is/ought" problem. It has been considered in various ways for well over two centuries. If one can argumentatively be assured of anything it is that an "ought cannot be derived from an is." This is why it has been noted as a formal fallacy. Yet, in much contemporary literature, especially educational literature, "ought" assertions are made without full comprehension of the "is" actuality. It is as though some educators believe that if we are naive or confused about what "is" then it is feasible to prescribe "oughts."

First, to say that we do not know what is, or that we are confused about it, is an epistemic shortcoming, not a metaphysical one. The
unchangelessness of "is" (essence) does not alter by the actuality of knowing or not knowing it. The actuality of \( E=mc^2 \) does not change by my knowing it or not; furthermore, the "ought \( E=mc^3 \)" cannot be derived from \( E=mc^2 \) nor will it change the actuality of \( E=mc^2 \). The same is explicitly true in considering the "is/ought" in the normative sense. For to say that it is wrong to perform B and at the same time assert that it ought to be right is either to talk non-sensically about existence or to be faulted by contradiction. Granted, it is possible to have the existence of A or B whereby A is possible without B, or vice versa. But to opt for A rather than B is simply to reaffirm existence, whereby "ought" has no meaning distinct from the "is."

Second there is an inherent deceptiveness in proposing that art educators "ought" to do this or that since it suggests non-art education activity. This is true because an "ought art education activity" cannot be derived from an "is art education"; therefore, it can only be a prescription to a possible alternative which is not and cannot be considered art education. This is obviously possible since a human can have more than one profession. All of this brings one about face with the question of what art education is? In other words, the problem is always with what "is," never with what "ought to be" since it results in a contradiction. A major weakness in the field of art education has been its obtuseness; art educators have been more concerned with science education than with art education. To realize this fully and to alter this fact, it is necessary for art educators to take a close look at their field metaphysically. This is the only way for art educators to overcome the major weakness of their field.
In regards to a different problem, the art educator has to get the "philosophical systems" or the "philosophical categories" straight in his mind. He cannot simply "dump" philosophy together in one bag or separate it out as he so sees fit without rhyme or reason. Specifically, he cannot do what Robert Newton Barger and Gregg S. Helgesen do. They state that "[t]here are three basic philosophical systems: idealism, realism and environmentalism."15 Throughout the centuries the rationale for considering Idealism and Realism basic or major philosophical systems has been primarily in their being metaphysical philosophies in both origin and concern. Furthermore, this has also been the reason for considering Phenomenalism as the third and major philosophical system since it too addresses metaphysics, but differently from that of Idealism and Realism. Without Robert Barger and Gregg Helgesen showing on the one hand that Idealism and Realism are not metaphysical philosophies, or on the other hand, that Environmentalism is a metaphysical philosophy, the three cannot be grouped together as basic or major philosophical systems as these authors do. Philosophically, Environmentalism is usually not even considered a philosophy in the strict sense. But if it is shown to be one then possibly it could be categorized as a tertiary philosophy, or as a common-sense philosophy.

From the point of this dissertation, it would have to be classified as a common-sense philosophy.

In conclusion, the aforementioned illustrates the complexity, ambiguity, vagueness and misrepresentation of philosophy and philosophical problems. This is not only typical of art education in trying to be more philosophical, but as well characteristic of general education
and even philosophy itself. Many problems stem from the fact that critics and so-called philosophical writers are attempting to make philosophy into something it is not.

**The Need for a Philosophy of Art Education that is Metaphysical in Nature**

Since certain metaphysical principles and/or laws have either been incorrect or misapplied to the world of art, it has not been possible in the past to fully comprehend art, the artist or art education. Ultimately, the shortcomings must lie with our view of the world in general. Philosophically or scientifically in the past there has been no truthful or coherent accounting of the nature of art, and not surprisingly, therefore none of art education. Furthermore, the educational aspect of art education, as it has stemmed in the past from general education, is extremely suspect in its objectives. One should hardly expect to understand, much less to facilitate art education by turning to general education for answers. Philosophically and intellectually it is deprived mainly because it is science-oriented. To a large extent this is why students and teachers are divested of intellectualism, at least in the public schools. However, to fault general education on its philosophical weakness and its intellectual lack in being scientific, while at the same time proclaiming the existence of art education, is perhaps to establish art education as a philosophical-intellectual existence. Such will be the theme in this dissertation. Its instrumentality will undoubtedly place a great burden and responsibility on the art educator’s shoulders in his or her having to be more philosophical in approach to teaching and research. In a special sense it is
simply to say that the art educator needs to be more scholarly. Yet, it is also to say that the art educator has to be familiar with philosophy and philosophizing. In the absence of a metaphysical philosophy central to art education such a task would likely be impossible, given the confusion of philosophy itself in this day and age. Furthermore, without art education being established metaphysically it runs the risk of either being argued "out-of-existence" or repressed by its own inability to justify itself.

Before considering the metaphysics of art education it is first necessary to delineate our present educational situation which will be the thrust of Chapter II. In Chapter III the major concern is with philosophy itself, and how it has been part of the problem in encumbering intellectualism. Furthermore, in that chapter the reader will be introduced to the metaphysics of the major philosophies so that a comparison can be made between them and Confrontationalism. The reason that art and art education are not explicitly and exclusively discussed in Chapters II, III and IV (but rather towards the end of the dissertation) is so that their existence is not presupposed either materially or conceptually. Even so, art education is in fact being described and delineated throughout the dissertation; therefore, it is not derived, deduced or inferred from Confrontationalism; it is, in fact, Confrontationalism.

It is impossible to make direct reference to every matter of importance. Even so one must make a start somewhere, and it has been thought by this writer that it would be best served by presenting a general overview—limited in depth but not so much breadth—rather than
concentrating on a specific metaphysical problem. In this way, others who might wish to further the study will at least have a general view of the problems whereby some of the specificity can be dealt with in proper perspective. With the aforementioned in mind, let us first take a look at a major philosophical problem--experience--it also being the major culprit responsible for our educational ills and the encumbrance of intellectualism. In education, experience epitomizes the "is/ought" fallacy whereby it is held that if one has experience one "ought" to have knowledge and/or intellect. This simply does not follow from the actuality of "is."
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CHAPTER II

MONISM

Experience and Common Sense:
An Educational Nightmare

The twentieth century will likely be referred to as "The Age of Experience." With some exceptions such as the sciences and technology, it has been plagued by the question, Has anything been done? In this light, our educational system has already been predicated "the imperfect panacea,"¹ with connotations of regression into the Dark Ages.

With the advent of Realism, Phenomenalism, Pragmatism, Phenomenological-Existentialism, Marxism, Linguistics, and/or other common-sense philosophies to combat Idealism, man has regressed intellectually to a "beast of circumstance." By way of this fall, he has been blinded to the truth that no matter what his circumstance, there is an essentiality. Educationally, he is hardly able to consider the question, What is essence? There are reasons for his inability, mainly the preponderance of the various so-called philosophies named above and the advocates of these philosophies who frown upon such inquiries and denounce any such given answers. Common to the above-named philosophies is the "principle of experience." It will be argued extensively throughout the dissertation that this principle obstructs intellectualism.

Since the advent of linguistic philosophy and the recent methodology of "conceptual analysis"² experience has been viewed in terms of
"linguistic phenomena." In linguistics, the concern is, What is meant by the term and/or the concept 'experience'? So much of linguistics, and most certainly the methodology of conceptual analysis, is made dependent upon "common usage" of the terms in question in assessing their meaning. If our concerns about the nature of experience were to be answered by common usage of that term, "... it would mean no more than familiarity with some matter of practical concern, based on repeated past acquaintance or performance." As a matter of fact, we would hardly even need to do what is called a "conceptual analysis" of this term, but merely consult a reference source such as The Encyclopedia of Philosophy. On the other hand, if we lived in a society where the "animal farm game" was practiced, where today four-legged creatures are called pigs but tomorrow they are predicated humans, then no reference source would be of avail since terms would change their meaning daily. But this is not the reality of language. Even the common meaning of experience has changed little since Aristotle's time, and yet as such, it explains little about existence.

First, it should be noted that the question, What is experience? is different from, What is meant by experience? or What are the criteria of experience? in that the former is a concern with the essence of experience; that is, the discovery of that which sets experience apart from all other "things." Other than etymologically, one could hardly talk intelligently about experience without such a distinction. The above confusion is precisely what was problematic for John Dewey and misunderstood by many of his critics and followers. It was Dewey's aspiration, not his accomplishment, to establish "criteria of
experience" and to develop a "theory of experience."^5 Dewey's concern and limited accomplishment was specifying what should be experienced rather than what experience is itself. The question, What should be experienced? is much easier to consider than the question, What is experience? As stated, the former was a concern of Dewey's, whereas the latter was problematic for such philosophers as Aristotle, Price, Moore, Ayer, and many others.

Dewey's central concern with experience was the way in which the individual re-constructs experience so that it would be funded with greater harmony, objectivity, imagination, aesthetics, intelligence, and most importantly, social understanding. Dewey's basic philosophical position was to increase humane experience in individuals, in their sharing and participating in the social structure whereby the democratic process would be furthered. This social partaking, as an educational endeavor, was largely the social understanding of the various consequences of one's behavior. In this context, means and ends or acts and consequences were argued to be inseparable. Every behavior or act was argued to carry with it a consequence; the behavior or act, according to Dewey, was to be viewed largely and primarily in that light.

The magic of experience and the confusion about the essence of experience have never been more prominent in the educational circles. They have pervasively dictated the educational scene in this century. The Deweyian philosophy and its advocates must bear the brunt of this nightmare. One needs but look at the various curricula as reviewed by George H. Willis in "The Concept of Experience in Major Curriculum Literature: 1918-1970" to see its implications. As Willis points
out, "... long-standing confusion has remained about the meaning of 'experience', and experience has been variously conceptualized."\textsuperscript{7}

This is indicative of the analyses of nineteen major works in the curriculum field.

The paper considers inconsistency in a large number of works over an extended period of time as evidence supporting the hypothesis that during the period 1918-1970 the professional field of curriculum theory has manifested a great degree of ambiguity about the meanings of "experience" and about educational practices recommended as consistent with these meanings.\textsuperscript{8}

Of the nineteen major works, Willis concludes that seven of them manifest a great degree of ambiguity, seven a moderate degree, and five a small or minimal degree.\textsuperscript{9}

It may in fact demonstrate that a very high proportion of the most influential works in curriculum theory during the last half-century manifest substantial internal inconsistency and conceptual confusion; perhaps, therefore, that curriculum theory as a professional field of study has failed to adequately conceptualize educational experience and that curriculum theorists as a group have been remarkably uncritical about some fundamental assumptions.\textsuperscript{10}

Furthermore, at one time or another almost all branches of curriculum theorizing, however diverse or inconsistent with one another, have claimed, in effect, to be consistent with Dewey's theories.\textsuperscript{11}

First, how is it possible for theorists to be inconsistent with one another yet consistent with Dewey's theories? It is possible on the basis that Dewey's theories are founded upon experience, which is ambiguous and vague in the Deweyian so-called philosophy. This enables various authors to be consistent with Dewey while being inconsistent with one another. Second, since Dewey does not concern himself with the nature of experience per se, but rather with its content, the common-sense world, reference is made to an array of parts within
a single whole. Given an array of experiential content of a whole it is possible for that content not only to inert itself but also to be contradicted, conclusively resulting in nothingness. This is, at least to some extent, descriptive of the common-sense world, and, hence, indicative of Dewey's philosophy itself. When the common-sense world is fully extended it is often contradicted, conclusively ending up being nothingness. The twentieth-century Deweyian educational system has to a large extent been descriptively nothingness—learning occurred inspite of the Deweyian provocations. Granted that the common sensical and practical content was learned, however, it bypassed the technical and academic. But the common sensical can be learned, and is learned, despite education and an educational system or philosophy.

The Deweyian common-sensical starting point necessitates the debunking of theoretic structures as Dewey well knew. Such theoretic structures the student was required to study and develop in the "traditional" educational system. The traditional was viewed by Dewey as a hinderance to social instrumentality and the opportunity to garner more insights into the complex construction of practical situations. It is granted that the traditional philosophizing during Hegel's age, as admired by Dewey in his enlightened years, may have become too technical and complex for many students and too inept to handle the various social ills. Nevertheless, the social ills were overcome, not because of the progressive ideas of common-sense philosophers such as Dewey, Wittgenstein and Pepper, but rather despite them. The social ills were to a large extent alleviated by science and its outgrowth into technology which owed little to the common-sense philosophers. The most
pertinent and revolutionary aspects of science have always been traditional in their method of inquiry. Science, in its instrumentality, has been ideological in approach and not practical in its origin as Dewey thought. However, technology as the offshoot of science has taken the impractical science and made it practical whereby some social problems and ills have been alleviated. Scientific advances and technology may well have flourished during the practically-educated generations; that is simply coincidental and not a result of practical education. It is an assumption, made by some, that the advances of science arose from the practically educated. This assumption, in turn, has been to the detriment of general education, which is evidenced in the diversity of both the elite-educated and the undereducated populous.

The twentieth century generations who have been educated in America are indebted to the Deweyian practicality, as the British are indebted to the Wittgenstein linguistic common sense. Both are justifiably imperfect panaceas and have little to do with the scientific advances in alleviating social ills. If anything, they can be credited with making the populous aware of the social situation.

The basis of the gap between the elite-educated and the undereducated is attributable to numerous factors which are intrinsic to the philosophical mistakes made by many common-sense philosophers. Two such mistakes are 1) Pluralism, and 2) the principle of experience. Granted the existence of the term and even the concept, there is however no plurality, at least not metaphysically. The realization of this is evident when considering the principle of parts/whole, and the principles of cancellation, equilibrium and inertia. The argument for this
claim will, however, have to await the chapter on Confrontationalism. For the time being, Pluralism is identical to Monism and thereby, when rooted in the common-sensical world, nothing other than experience and its content is attained. Aligned with the deception of Pluralism is the principle of experience which asserts that whatever is learned should be learned first and foremost experientially. Offhand there appears to be no fault with this. However, in understanding the essence of experience as "transitoriness," then at best one can attribute temporary sensation to the experiential act. Experience is merely awareness of something, as argued in the chapter on Confrontationalism. Cognition of something occurs when the transitoriness ceases; which is to say when experience is transformed. Thus there is nothing permanent about experience and therefore of little educational value, if by educational value we mean the development of the intellect. The Deweyian aspiration of an individual's experiences being funded with objectivity, imagination, intelligence, and most importantly, social understanding is wishful thinking. Ironically, and because of certain metaphysical principles, education, as Dewey argued, became a "re-construction" of experience; however, this occurred without his expectation that it could be intellectually funded, which requires a philosophical dualistic base. Furthermore, such a dualistic base must not be common-sensical nor experiential since these would encumber intellectualism. Experience and common sense are entrapments. A strict and pure application of the Deweyian stand results in nothing other than the "masturbation of experience" with some exposure and awareness of social obedience, ills and amenities. It is in such senses that the elite-educated are
distinct from the undereducated in that the undereducated are entrapped in re-constructing that which the elite-educated provide.

Dewey's philosophy is basically a "common sense philosophy," if one could call it a philosophy at all. It is the American past conceptualized as an educational foundation. It is the view that practicality, common sense, and non-intellectualism, if not anti-intellectualism are the cornerstone of progress. This worked well insofar that there were plenty of resources, cheap labor or slavery, and land to be taken from whosoever owned it in the first place. Furthermore, insofar that there were enough idealistically educated immigrants to facilitate the needed innovation in being competitive with other nations. It is the absence or decline of the above which ails the United States presently and most assuredly will be even more troublesome in the future relative to the status and expected progress of many competitive countries.

Pragmatism, by virtue of being an evolving movement, should be viewed as a group of associated, theoretical ideas and attitudes that are synonymous with empiricism. It is rather a method of philosophizing that does not imply any world-view conclusions or explanations—"it is not a philosophy according to Pierce." Likewise, as Dewey urged, philosophy should be dependent upon the specific culture from which it emerges, rather than making culture subservient to general principles, and as such, it then cannot rightfully be called a philosophy, at least in the strict sense of that term.

The line of argument, or if you will, "direction of interpretation," propounded by Stephen C. Pepper in World Hypotheses, is the same as Dewey's. Pepper, like Dewey, considers experience and its
inquiry derivative of the common-sense world, and furthermore, aligned with scientific investigation. In fact, Dewey sees the latter as but an extension and outgrowth of the former. Inquiry, for Dewey, was the development of instruments for inquiry (instrumentality) as educational and scientific goals. Similarly, Pepper sees the formation of world hypotheses as an extension and outgrowth of the common-sense world. This line of argument or direction of interpretation is formally known as the "inductive process."

Given the social context and its consequences, Dewey was, with good reason, constantly concerned with "habit" as the inhibitor of personal involvement in choosing ends, experiencing consequences, and developing alternatives. Inquiry into a field of study was not to be from the viewpoint of its idealized or even its individualized form and function, but rather from the viewpoint of its practical problems and operations.

Summary

Dewey aspired to develop "criteria of experience" and "theories of experience"; nevertheless, his proclamation was the re-constructing of experience, specifically the social, common sensical. The determining factors for re-constructing experience were measured in light of its consequences. As with Pepper, Wittgenstein, and other common-sense philosophers, the direction of interpretation originates in the practical and remains in the realm of common sense. Dewey's views had an extensive effect on curriculum development in the twentieth century which may have been acceptable for "general education" but not for art and art education.
Given the advances of science and the arts, re-constructing of experience might well suffice in a "general educational sense," primarily because the populous is satisfied to be socially wrought. But this, as will be shown in the dissertation, would be inappropriate when considering art and art education. As such, art education philosophy cannot assimilate general education philosophy, otherwise both are destined to failure.

As will be evidenced in the section on Marxism in the next chapter, motion rather than change plays the central role not only in the Deweyian philosophy but likewise in the Marxist philosophy, mainly because they are both monistic. The Deweyian objectives in initiating the individual into the social structure, the concern with motion rather than change, the importance placed on habits, the antecedinal concern with the practical (common sensical), the consequential dictating one's conduct, eminently places Deweyianism next to Marxism. Pragmatism is basically "coming through the back door on Marxism." Both are worthy educational philosophies in exposing individuals to social amenities insofar as disciplines, such as science and technology, provide these amenities. Otherwise, education merely becomes overexposure to the appreciation and final acceptance of social ills.

But before getting into how, and in what sense, Pragmatism might be considered an appropriate foundation for education, and the comparison of Pragmatism with Marxism, Phenomenology should be considered. Phenomenology, a method and methodology developed on the European continent which placed equal importance on experience, will be contrasted with American Pragmatism. This is not only to show that there is another side to experience than the common-sensical, but accordingly,
Experience and Phenomenology Proper

"Phenomenology," a term used by many philosophers including Kant and Hegel, was intended by Edmund Husserl to designate a new philosophy and a new philosophical method of inquiry. The period of Husserl's writing somewhat paralleled C. S. Pierce's, William James', and Dewey's writings on Pragmatism—that is, roughly during the late 1800s and early 1900s. Hegel was admired by both Husserl and Dewey in their earlier years. However, Husserl was concerned with developing a theory of knowledge, whereas Hegel was concerned with metaphysics in the traditional sense. Nevertheless, Husserl was metaphysically concerned in that he aspired to solve metaphysical problems utilizing a theory of knowledge founded in experience. Dewey, on the other hand, abandoned metaphysics in concerning himself with common experience and thereby became entrapped in the consequential and the common-sensical world.

At its inception, Phenomenology's most important feature was "that it was not an empirical science," which Pragmatism is. Another important aspect of Phenomenology, according to Husserl, was its criticism of psychology. Husserl was devoted to refuting every variety of psychologistic doctrine.¹⁵

Likewise, phenomenologists are generally opposed to causality; that is to say, they do not hold to the theory of causal relationships. Accordingly, phenomenologists deny that their statements are "analytic." Analysis, as often understood by and attributed to the sciences, psychology, philosophy, and other fields of inquiry, was severely criticized.
by the phenomenologists peaking with the criticism expressed by Maurice Merleau-Ponty. As indicative of Merleau-Ponty's Phenomenology, inquiry by division, subtraction, or isolation is criticized as an inappropriate method of inquiry. Merleau-Ponty's Phenomenology propounds additions or interrelationships as social, environmental or humanistic functions. It is a strict adherence to the principle that the whole is greater than the sum of its parts from which most phenomenologists, such as Merleau-Ponty, argue against analysis. Given the truth of this principle, it is incorrect, as the phenomenologists rightly argue, to utilize analysis in determining the nature of things since analysis necessitates the process of "atomism"; that is, dividing the whole into its basic parts wherefrom the whole is to be interpreted. If the whole is greater than the sum of its parts one would always be considering less than if one were considering the whole. The method of addition or interrelationship in Merleau-Ponty's sense is the comprehension of the whole within given contexts rather than discovering the nature of things by way of atomism.

In trying to get at the essence of things in Phenomenology Proper it is equally important how, and in what sense, one must consider the self in the investigative discourse. As a point of reference, the self usually does not dictate any of the investigative material in traditional philosophizing. This is accomplished by means of logic per se. On the other hand, Marxism, Pragmatism, Existentialism, and even Phenomenological-Existentialism, such as Merleau-Ponty's, adhere to the principle that the self should not be excluded from the investigative content. However, in Phenomenology Proper, especially the Husserlian, existence of the self should be "suspended"—not denied but rather and simply
placed in abeyance, usually referred to as "bracketing." This is made possible by essential intuition and pure experiences whereby essence is grasped without positing any existence.

Phenomenologists are interested exclusively in essential relations and structures, and not particularly in facts or events as such, or in factual accounts of origins. This point is made explicit in Merleau-Ponty's book, The Structure of Behavior. As elucidated in his book, the concern with "structure" is the concern with "human structure." Phenomenology, in this sense, means subjectivism. In the phenomenological method, an individual begins with his stream of experiences.

All things are viewed from the point of "pure consciousness" (Husserl)—the point of view of one's own experiencing of them. However, a note of caution must be made here in that Husserl and Merleau-Ponty differ slightly, but most crucially, on this matter of the individual's pre-existence as relevant content in the inquiry method. Husserl does not consider the whole of the human as relevant content in the inquiry method, but rather the capacity to experience and to have pure consciousness. In abiding by the principle of the whole being greater than the sum of its parts, Merleau-Ponty does not make any such exclusions.

In the sense of suspending or bracketing one's own existence and the existence of the investigative content in attaining essence, one is left with description per se as the Phenomenology Proper method and content. Hence the method and the objective in "phenomenological reduction" is to make "... possible the final elucidation of all elements of knowledge and experience by enabling us to get back of, and to the bottom of, all presuppositions." This is supposedly accomplished by
suspending existence, returning to things themselves in a subjective or immanent way, and relying on descriptive discourse in establishing the metaphysical essence of things in the world. All other things being equal, "[a] phenomenological description deals with what is given in experience as such, with experiences just as they are in themselves. The aim is to bring to evident consciousness the essence of that which is experienced."\textsuperscript{19}

What the aforementioned means is that the phenomenologists Proper start with phenomena rather than objects or events in order to minimize making assumptions and dealing with existence. Phenomena are those aspects of objects which are revealed by "associating" in an experiential way, with the object. Such phenomenal aspects of objects are not revealed by ordinary empirical observations but only by association with the objects as phenomena.\textsuperscript{20} It is for this reason that the phenomenologist does not formulate theories. He merely examines and describes phenomena in an unprejudiced way as they are revealed. However, this is by no means a simple and explicit task because it often ends up being circular, since no presuppositions can premise the investigative discourse.

The entire phenomenological enterprise is involved in a circle that can be called the "methodological circle" . . . . [The] . . . explications of "phenomenon" must result from using the phenomenological method and must be couched in phenomenological statements. But what these statements are cannot be made clear until it is clear what a phenomenon is, nor do we know what the phenomenological method is until we know what a phenomenon is.\textsuperscript{21}

Since Phenomenology Proper is basically a method and a methodology of inquiry which necessitates the suspension of the discourses of formal logic, scientific methods (empiricism) and, overall, anything that might
be designated existence, it strips itself of the very content necessary
to account for the existence and the justification of the world.

Phenomenology is neither a set of doctrines or theories nor a
philosophy, but rather a method—or even a methodology—when its own
investigative methods are applied to itself. However, Phenomenology
Proper never achieved Husserl's aspirations and he himself stated that
it remained problematic and elusive for him. It never became a philo­

sphy and therefore its intents and accomplishments remained obscure. It
seems that we know more about what it doesn't do than what it does. As
in the case of description, one of the important aspects of Phenomeno­
logy, the phenomenologists end up having few ideas as what to do with
this content once it has been accumulated.

Summary

When considering Phenomenology, one must be cautious of its refer­
ent. It is not simply adequate to distinguish Phenomenologies by predi­
cating one the "Husserlian kind" and another the "Merleau-Ponty kind."  
First, there are in fact two Husserlian Phenomenologies, the one that
has been predicated in this dissertation Phenomenology Proper, which is
so very difficult to comprehend and likewise acknowledged by Husserl to
be problematic. Second, there is also the Phenomenology, in part
developed by Husserl, which has become known as Existential Phenomeno­
logy evidenced in Merleau-Ponty's writings. And yet, Merleau-Ponty's
Phenomenology is a mixed bag of Phenomenology Proper and Existential
Phenomenology. As will be shown, this is also true of Roman Ingarden's
writings, but it is more so Existential Phenomenology rather than
Phenomenology Proper.
Nevertheless, in Phenomenology Proper, as in Pragmatism, the method of inquiry is experience. However, in Pragmatism, it is the experience of the common-sense world, whereas in Phenomenology Proper it is the experience of phenomena. This is made possible by bracketing the common-sensical world and that of existence in general resulting in the supposed ever-presence of essence—the essential aspects of the self and the world in general. The market success of this method would reveal the experiencing, rather than the "intellectualizing," of universal laws and principles—the metaphysics of the universe. According to Husserl, this would be "pure consciousness," and the content thereof would be metaphysical description experienced.

In Merleau-Ponty's sense, however, experience becomes "perceptual experience," notwithstanding physiological activities and sensory functions, sometimes known as "Scientism." More than anything else, Merleau-Ponty argues for the bracketing of such methods of inquiry found under Scientism and the very questionable knowledge of analysis, reductionism, and causality which is, according to him, so typical of the sciences, psychology, and traditional philosophy. Merleau-Ponty would not have us bracket or suspend our existence or even that of objects, but rather extend them contextually as a method of reaching essence. In this sense, Maurice Merleau-Ponty is existential in abiding by "existence prior to essence" rather than as in Phenomenology Proper where "essence remains prior to existence."
First, it should be noted that according to many experts on Husserl, "Ingarden's Phenomenology is a continuation, development, and restatement of the cognitive core of Husserl's Phenomenology, and perhaps is closer to its cognitive spirit than any other development of his doctrine by his numerous pupils." Likewise, Roman Ingarden's views on art are acclaimed as perhaps the best-known aspects of his own so-called philosophy.

According to Roman Ingarden in "Phenomenological Aesthetics: An Attempt at Defining its Range," an observer's experiences, specifically aesthetic experiences, can only come about insofar as they refer to a certain object—in this case, the work of art. The observer does not behave in a completely passive or receptive way. Since he is temporarily disposed to the reception and recreation of the work itself, he is not only active, but is in a certain sense at least, creative.

If this creation or recreation is psychological then it is obviously not Phenomenology Proper! Likewise, if it is creation rather than recreation, then how do we know whether it is representative of the phenomenological object? In both senses of Phenomenology, "subjectivism" is not distinctly different from "objectivism"—they must remain synonymous. The importance of Phenomenology is that we come to know the objective world by way of its immanence, as having no different essence from that found in either experience per se or perceptual experience. However, if we hold to Ingarden's proposition that the observer is not simply passive, we have implied a possible distinction.
Ingarden himself states that "[s]ometimes [significant qualities] are imposed by the observer without any suggestion, or without sufficient suggestion from the work itself." What Ingarden asserts is that certain crucial qualities, such as those referred to as significantly aesthetic, may at times be conjured up by the observer without ever having been embodied in the work itself. Inferentially, this means that when we view a work of art, we endow it with significant qualities or properties which are not qualitative of the work itself—whereby we cannot come to know the work for what it is. This is not only argued to be the reality of the observer but likewise of the artist since part of his role is that of an observer. The artist, then, is faced with the same precarious situation of not knowing his own work.

Furthermore, when Ingarden discusses the work of art as a collection of elements forming a single true whole of a higher order giving a unity to the field, which includes the work and the human being in communion with it, he is incorrect to conclude that we can assign it to a "uniform philosophical discipline," namely aesthetics. From the situation of the viewer and the reality of the work of art we cannot assign it to a uniform philosophical discipline named or not named aesthetics." First, it is not "uniform" by any means. For according to Ingarden himself, there are many different dispositions that are apparently imposed or projected onto the work. Second, it is not philosophical because in this very sense it is psychological. Third, how could we ever know and thereby consider it a discipline since we only "sometimes" impose our own dispositions? And, accordingly, how could we ever know whether or not what we are viewing is aesthetic?
If we are speaking philosophically, or in other words analyti-
cally, Ingarden cannot at one point state that the observer may "conjure
up qualities of the work of art," and then further state "that the var-
ious processes and changes in the artist or the observer are paralleled
by appropriate changes taking place in the object" without asserting a
contradiction. This is particularly true since Ingarden predicates at
least some significant qualities as imposed by the observer without any
sufficient suggestion from the work itself.

In a different line of argument, Ingarden also describes a work
of art as often "qualitatively incomplete." He states that incomple-
ness elicits or persuades the observer to seek other qualities that
would complement that first quality and would bring the whole pheno-
menon to a saturation or final completion, thereby removing an unpleasant
lack. In so many words, Ingarden states that incompleteness elicits a
restless search whereby creation turns into a wholly peaceful observa-
tion and contemplation. As stated, a situation of completeness is
valued because it is in itself complete and perfect. According to
Ingarden, this change in the work is accomplished because first, the
observer "allows himself to be drawn," and second, because "the per-
ceived painting now begins to work aesthetically upon the observer."
He even goes so far as to assert that a ". . . person presented in a
painting imposes itself upon us."27

These kinds of assertions and uses of language are similar to
those of the "attitude theorists" such as Eliseo Vivas. His article,
"A Definition of the Esthetic Experience,"28 asserts that "objects
determine subjective states," if not totally then at least in part.
Accordingly, Vivas further asserts that a "theme arrests our attention" or "attention is aesthetic when it is so controlled by the object."

Likewise, David W. Ecker and Eugene F. Kaelin, in "The Limits of Aesthetic Inquiry: A Guide to Educational Research," believe that "[w]hat makes it possible for communication to take place at all is the existence of a shareable public object whose very structures control all relevant response to it." It may well be true that as humans we have an inclination to project characteristics into things in the hope of making them more human. As a point, the world of the adult is often highly categorized, whereas, "[t]he world of the primitive or the child is presumed to be a fairly undifferentiated continuum, a blur of activity,. . . ." But all of this sounds strangely pseudo-phenomenological, if not echoing the fallacies of hypostatization. It is very similar to a child's assertions such as "I must put my truck in the garage because he is cold and he wants to rest." But then, many of the Husserlian phenomenologists are, in a sincere sense, in search of the "primitive experience" which seems, at times, synonymous with that of "child experience"!

This and the fact that the above content on the reality of "incompleteness" is descriptively "determinism," is hardly what Husserl had intended in the name of Phenomenology. But possibly, and very realistically, Husserl came to recognize the failure of his Phenomenology Proper in this very sense; phenomena viewed (experienced) as phenomena was a world of determinism whereby further reflection is curtailed. Ingarden's supposed and atypical extension of Husserl's Phenomenology does make the human organism a puppet of the object. The problem with
this, as in holding to strict determinism, is that the puppet cannot account for the essence of the puppeteer, but only exemplify his existence to a degree. In a speculative sense, such a realization might well have spurred Husserl to abandon the search for essence as prior to existence, for the search for essence as the result or totality of existence (the move made from Phenomenology Proper to Existential Phenomenology).

Summary

According to many phenomenologists, including Maurice Merleau-Ponty, Phenomenology was and is intended to be a specific method and methodology to investigate the realm of consciousness. Phenomenology, at its best, is an attempt to get at consciousness which lies beyond physics, chemistry, and the physiology of sense perception.

These schools of discourse (physics, chemistry, physiology, traditional philosophy), along with the realm of common sense, were in Husserl's view the "natural standpoint." He was opposed to the natural standpoint mainly because he thought it inappropriate to humanistic studies and particularly to the study of language which he felt to be "supremely constituted by consciousness." Husserl attempted to find a way out of the natural standpoint which he thought to be an "entrapment." The natural standpoint was for Dewey the basis of his philosophical arguments whereas Husserl saw it for what it is--an entrapment. According to Husserl, the natural standpoint is an intellectual deprivation--the very shortcomings depicted in the Deweyian educational system. For Husserl, "phenomenological reduction" was the attempt to release us from this entrapment. It was the reduction of existence to
essence which would leave Dewey's natural standpoint of experiencing the common sensical behind. Husserl wanted us to experience an object as a phenomena, whereas Dewey wanted us to experience an object as it is supposedly and common sensically experienced by people living in a social community.

In the extreme Husserlian sense we would have to require all suspension of presuppositions and predispositions which would invariably strip the human of all cognition. Taken at this extremity, we would have a "babbler" trying to describe the world.

It is not that Phenomenology Proper is hollow. It does offer us an explicit means of curtailing preconceptions and predispositions and thereby minimizing presuppositions. But more than that, it further offers us a fresh and possibly new view of the world. As in Husserl's rigorously exclusive concept of philosophizing, the result is to reduce the phenomenologist to a rather desperate search for his own legitimate philosophical beginnings; to cause him to question where he may locate his own proper subject matter. And, yet, since it is a direct and explicit concern with method and methodology, it often faults in extending method to content. This may, however, be more of a statement about the world in general than Phenomenology itself. Likewise, pure mathematics and strict logic, as counterparts of Phenomenology Proper, similarly fault. Pure mathematics, strict logic, and Phenomenology Proper are not meaningless methods of discourse but rather wanting of content or subject matter. This is not intended to be a criticism of the three, for it is, at times, a desirable fact. Without a strictness in scrutinizing method itself and reflecting upon that very method
(which Phenomenology does), the content as extended method would remain questionable at best or presupposed at worst.

This very strength of Phenomenology is the weakness of Pragmatism. In the Deweyian sense at least, we have an individual experience and re-experience, not phenomena which is presuppositionless, but objects and events in the world in accordance with social implications and consequences. Not only is it the case that when taken exclusively, we have the socialization of the individual with an array of natural standpoint experiences—intellectually wanting—but in accordance, this socialization is wrought with presuppositions.

Nevertheless, as stated earlier, Phenomenology Proper had its problems, which moved Husserl towards defining consciousness as having perception rather than exclusively experience as the initial basis and genetic origin. For Husserl, this was the move into Existential Phenomenology, which is similar to the common-sense philosopher's views—such as Dewey's—from the point of experience and perception. Existential Phenomenology addresses the problem concerning existence, rather than essence, as Husserl would have had it first and foremost in Phenomenology Proper. According to Paul Ricoeur, Husserlian Phenomenology becomes more and more existential when perception takes precedence over all other problems. Furthermore, as Ricoeur argues, it is the re-introduction of the Hegelian analysis of the "negative" experience, contradictions, struggles, and frustrations which paradoxically announces the end of Phenomenology so typical of the Existential mode.

Ingarden's use and reliance upon "sense perception," "receptive experience," and "perceiving" in his extension of Husserl's Phenomenology
makes it "Existential Empiricism" rather than Phenomenology, and much less Phenomenology Proper. Accordingly, Ingarden's description of incompleteness as a state of frustration aligns his Phenomenology with the existentialist's anxiety. His use of contradiction, struggles for completion, and frustration in viewing a work of art designates, not Phenomenology, but rather Existentialism or even Marxism.

**Common Sense and the Assaults on Metaphysics:**

*The Panorama of the Problem*

Those people who think that "metaphysics" has no bearing on their everyday lives are living with a grave misconception. More people on this earth have been conceived, sustained, or killed by way of metaphysical, pseudo-metaphysical, or anti-metaphysical principles than all other philosophical branches combined. For most people, this may be a difficult fact to realize since throughout their lives they are constantly confronted with the common-sense world. Basically, the common man is faced with the consequences of the metaphysical world rather than the antecedental—the metaphysical. Only incidentally does he concern himself with the antecedental, as when he is isolated from the external world or when he is confronted by a crisis such as death. The distinctions and ramifications of each are a most vital educational problem facing society and the individual today.

There are certain views about the nature of the universe, which are held by almost everyone and should rightfully be categorized and predicated common sense. On the other hand, there are the philosophers proper who either add to the common sense, or positively contradict common sense, or both—add and contradict. It might seem strange
that there are people who would deliberately advocate something that
contradicts our everyday experiences. But this again necessitates the
questions, What is experience? and What is the experiential content?
Nevertheless, there are two seemingly distinct ways of viewing the
world—from the point of common sense which is rooted in experience and
from the metaphysical point which is rooted in reasoning. Historically,
there has been a great deal of friction between the advocates of the
two methods and their contrary or contradictory results.

There were periods in history, such as Plato's time, when metaphysics
was held to be the highest form of knowledge. It was thought to be
the most fundamental and comprehensive of all the branches of study to
which man could devote himself.³⁶ According to its proponents, it was
said to be the only form of intellectual activity which left nothing
unquestioned and proceeded without assumption.³⁷ This was accomplished
by being concerned with "reality as opposed to 'mere appearance'."³⁸
As such, metaphysics is neither a priori nor empirical; it does however
make constant use of both deductive and probable reasoning.³⁹

At this point one need go no further in describing metaphysics for
the aforementioned has historically provided the anti-metaphysicians
with a plentitude of material for assult. As W. H. Walsh points out in
his book Metaphysics, the assault or violent reaction against metaphysics
has been so violent as to suggest that the issues involved in the
controversy must have been something more than academic.⁴⁰

The assult on metaphysics was carried out from various points.
Some, such as Voltaire, associated metaphysics with theology. It is
historically true that much work has been done in the area of theology
(religion) under the heading of metaphysics, i.e., St. Thomas Aquinas' work on the "ontological argument" (the existence of God). But more so than anyone else, it was the empiricists who spurred the greatest assault, as indicative of Hume's writing.

Hume wished to commit books of 'school metaphysics' to the flames, 'as containing nothing but sophistry and illusion', largely because of his antipathy to the claims metaphysicians like Descartes had made on behalf of human reason; to his way of thinking the reason of man was no more competent to reach ultimate truth than the reason of animals.41

It is not that the metaphysicians are, as such, anti-empirical, but rather that the empiricists are anti-metaphysical. The empiricists find such concepts as 'essential', 'reason', 'truth', and 'actuality' threatening to their area of inquiry, and justifiably so, since empiricism is in the awkward position of having to presuppose such concerns. However, the physical, biological, social and natural sciences do not escape metaphysical problems but simply presuppose their solution.42 As such empiricism is continuously at the mercy of metaphysics.

The same can be said about the linguistic philosophers who are presently having their day in court. Linguistic philosophy, spurred by Wittgenstein, parades under the banner of "ordinary language" and common sense. This recent philosophical movement, like empiricism, has little to fear from metaphysics other than being paranoid in having to presuppose it.

Along with this, linguistic philosophy has a further problem in that it is self-defeating. First, in respect to upholding ordinary language, it is not only that an "ordinary language" is presupposed but language is also analyzed to death. A case in point is the concept 'explanation'. When the linguists get ahold of this concept they soon
realize that there is no commonality to its usage. However, such findings are detrimental to their course of inquiry. The linguists must then turn their attention to what they call "locating the locus of inference" which is thought to be the common denominator of the term's usage. In so doing, they find reason to categorize and subcategorize the term in various ways. We soon discover that there are "relational" and "non-relational" usages of explanation. There is "descriptive explanation," "particular explanation," "scientific explanation," "reason explanation," "trivial explanation," "formal explanation," etc. What has happened is that language is being used to explain language rather than to take it simply as an instrument to communicate thought.

It must be remembered that the linguists hold to the principle that knowledge is found in the language rather than in empirical facts or metaphysical truths. In trying to explain language by way of language, the linguists chase their own tails.

There have been, and are, other philosophical movements that have made their assault on metaphysics. Phenomenology, as originated by Edmund Husserl, was antagonistic toward metaphysics. Even though the objectives of its founder were to get at presuppositions (which typifies metaphysical discourse), they were, however, anti-idealistic and anti-reason. Phenomenology was intended to be a solely epistemological philosophy. Had Phenomenology succeeded according to Husserl's aspirations it would have completely replaced metaphysics. Regrettably, the Husserlian Phenomenology failed in this objective and also in establishing itself as a philosophy, merely to remain today as a method and a methodology founded in Existentialism.
Søren Kierkegaard, the father of Existentialism, was likewise a critic of metaphysics, specifically so in opposing faith to reason. But he was never satisfied to describe his faith as 'purely rational'.43 Many of the contemporary existentialists have an adamant distrust of metaphysical rationalism. However, Existentialism is paradoxical. In this sense, the existentialists often end up constructing metaphysical systems which on the whole lend further weight to the metaphysical protest. The existentialists, like the linguists, end up chasing their own tails; but the existentialists take it one step further by having to bite their own tails.

The existentialists, phenomenologists and linguists have been merely quasi-antagonistic compared to the empiricists. They have never had the urgency to be anything else since the empiricists managed to cripple the metaphysicians. Accordingly, they have been very busy trying to be anti-empiricists.

It is not that metaphysics is dead; it is simply smoldering in obscurity. There has indeed been a revival of interest in metaphysical writers and writings by contemporary philosophers in the last few years.44 It is true that the enthusiasm for metaphysicians is somewhat greater than that for metaphysical theories.45 This is to say that there is a growing concern with the history of metaphysics rather than with metaphysical philosophizing.

Today metaphysical writings are about as rare as they have always been throughout history. There have been few metaphysical writers, mainly because the metaphysicians go into hiding whenever they are assaulted. It remains today to be discovered where they have been
hiding and their basic character, which will be a major objective of
the chapter on the nature of the artist.

Conclusion

The major reason the educational system of the twentieth century
has justifiably been predicated an imperfect panacea is due to the fact
that it has come to be identified with experience and its ambiguities.
Insofar as the content of experience is common sense and the natural
standpoint, rather than at least phenomena, education is little more than
social obedience incarnated with presuppositions. Phenomenology Proper
could have at least eliminated such presuppositions had it not been for
its own intrinsic shortcomings spurred by the premature abandonment of
its advocates. Roman Ingarden's extension of Phenomenology Proper is
indicative of this fact, by no means an exception. His Phenomenology
represents Existential Phenomenology which is no different than a common-
sensical approach. As such, intellectualism cannot be a reality.
Furthermore, the continuous assault on metaphysics inhibits even the
questioning itself of the presuppositions found in common sense and the
natural standpoint. Hence, metaphysicians are by and large unable to
effect social ills. Basically, science and technology remain the
prominent forces which effect society.

Society, as common sense and the natural standpoint, is essentially
monistic. The spokesmen for the social order and its monistic character
have been the common-sense philosophers, sometimes known as the
Homoousians. For centuries, "... to prevent division, the Homoousians
fought for the three-in-one concept and fanatically defended it as the
very substance of the [universe]..."^6 This fight has been and
always will be, the attempt to prevent the reality of Dualism; it is descriptively and essentially Confrontationalism. As will be argued, "metaphysics" gives rise to the actuality of Dualism. It is this that has been feared by the common-sense philosophers, as indicated by their assaults on metaphysics and the metaphysicians.

Education will always faulter until and unless confrontation is made its essential ingredient. Education must be Confrontationalism; otherwise, not only will its objectives be ambiguous and vague, but it will remain monistic which is only half the picture and thereby an untruth.

But before getting into Confrontationalism, Monism, from the point of metaphysics, must first be considered. This will reveal the full spectrum of Monism as it encumbers Dualism; and finally how, and to what extent, it is entailed by Confrontationalism.
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CHAPTER III

MONISTIC METAPHYSICAL PRINCIPLES

Introduction

In the previous chapter, the existence of a common sensical realm was characterized. It is a realm that necessitates obedience to already established perspectives, beliefs, and opinions if its existence is to be maintained. It is a place where a child's imagination is temporarily tolerated and his conformity rewarded. It is a world of existence, not essence; its substructure is nonsense terms, or linguistic utterances, founded as the object of, and yardstick for, social conformity. It is a world wherein one's major purpose is its perpetuation, whereby it is negligent to change. The "being" of this world is experience, as nonsensical as the origin of language itself. The two are valued on the basis of their social acknowledgment and acceptance.

In this realm, that which is known most often prevents or inhibits the acquisition and comprehension of the "yet-to-be-known." For instance, before the days of Christopher Columbus, people knew that the earth was flat. It was not simply a belief, but rather knowledge, because the facts or evidence supported the claim. One had but to look, see, and behold that "there was evidence of flatness." Obviously, today we know that their knowledge claim is not a truth claim even though there are facts to support it.
"Having knowledge" does not make claim to "having truth." Yet, since knowledge is evidential (if for no other reason than by definition), and likewise factual, it is difficult to comprehend that it would not also, by necessity, be truthful. It is for such reasons that knowledge often inhibits the acquisition and comprehension of contrary knowledge and/or the truth. It is knowledge of the experiential, as the evidential, which inhibits the "yet-to-be-known," i.e., the purported knowledge by man that the world is "experientially flat."

In the world of experience and common sense, knowledge of the kind previously discussed is used by society to perpetuate its suspiciously questionable facts. It is in this realm that what the common man knows he holds to be the obvious truth, not suspicious knowledge. This is because it is at any time experientially evident for him. As such then, there is little reason for him to suspect that he may be wrong, much less that there may be something that he does not know, at least in regard to that which he purports to have knowledge of. Insofar as the realm of common sense and experience are adhered to, inquiry and explanation are thought by the common man to be rather unwarranted. Predicatively it is the natural standpoint—the entrapment that Husserl recognized—the problem with Deweyian philosophy.

Hence, in considering the existence and the nature of "being," data, or even an object, one must take into consideration the realm wherein it is first predicated and likewise the projected direction of its transfer for verification into yet a different realm. Given this, it makes a tremendous difference if one begins an inquiry into the nature of an object from one's everyday acquaintance as opposed to a
conjectured existence. The difference is that of starting from the "known" as opposed to starting from the "unknown." Obviously it would seem strange to propose that one could begin such an inquiry exclusively in the "realm of the unknown." That would be, in its extremity, to request the nonexistence of oneself, the encountering of the problems founded in Husserl's Phenomenology Proper. However, simply bracketing or suspending the common-sense world should enable one to come face-to-face with the unknown without stripping one's existence. As such, one discards the known to get at the realm of the unknown wherein conjectures can be made freely, since in such a situation such conjectures would not be contingent upon already established perspectives, beliefs, or opinions. This necessitates two important principles: 1. that metaphysics has its reign in the "world of the unknown"; 2. that metaphysics, in all its aspects, is predicative of the human condition.

The first principle will be argued throughout the dissertation; the second, however, bears a special consideration at this time in comprehending the following section on metaphysics. The principle of metaphysics in man will be the underlying thesis in the chapter on Confrontationalism; here it will serve as a counter to "traditional metaphysics."

Once the principle of metaphysics in man is adhered to one is apt to fall into an existential entrapment of believing in subjective relativity whereby no universal application is possible. Truth becomes a specific, rather than a universal. Universality of knowledge is dispensed with for the sake of individual knowledge as argued by Merleau-Ponty in "The Metaphysical in Man." Argumentatively, this is possible from the standpoint of dispensing with traditional metaphysics which
holds to a systematic world existing apart from us, and thereby arguing
the objective to be the subjective, or simply that there is no distinc-
tion in the first place. As such, as Merleau-Ponty states, "... what
is objective must be completely redefined." It is in this sense that
"[m]etaphysics begins from the moment when, ceasing to live in the evi-
dence of the object—whether it is the sensory object or the object of
science—we apperceive the radical subjectivity of all our experience as
inseparable from its truth value." Metaphysical consciousness has no
other objects than those of experience: this world, other people, human
history, truth, culture." According to Merleau-Ponty, metaphysics is
the experience we have of paradoxes in all situations. Conclusively for
Merleau-Ponty, in expressing the existential mode, metaphysics is ex-
perience, and if anything universally descriptive could be said about
experience it would be that it is paradoxical. Accordingly then, meta-
physics is paradox and man is paradox. Metaphysics is not, in Merleau-
Ponty's terms, a construction of concepts to make paradoxes less notice-
able but rather an elucidation of them.

Traditional metaphysics can well be criticized from the point of
constructing concepts to make paradoxes and contraries less noticeable
as Merleau-Ponty asserts. But this may simply be a fault in expression,
or an inability to account for the metaphysical world rather than the
nature of metaphysics itself. As evident in the following brief discus-
sions of the three major metaphysical philosophies, they are not without
their contrary and paradoxical problems. For this reason they are
presented as monistic metaphysical philosophies specifically to be con-
trasted later on with the nature of the object in Confrontationalism.
The Object

It is fairly common in both science and philosophy to consider three different ways in which the same object is given. These ways are usually referred to as "to perceive," "to conceive," and "to imagine." That is, we can perceive a chair, conceive a chair, and imagine a chair and, in a sense, make claim to the fact that in each case the chair is the same object. Even so, and for various reasons, a distinction is often maintained in predicking the chair's existence as either a perceptual object, a physical object, or a metaphysical object. As to whether there is in fact a literal or essential distinction to be made among the three, and on what grounds, will have to be taken up later. But at this time let us consider how these objects have come about.

Phenomenalism (not to be confused with Phenomenology) often goes hand-in-hand with Empiricism, sometimes known as Logical Positivism. Hume did much to lay out the philosophy of Phenomenalism; however, I will not specifically address Hume but rather the metaphysics of the philosophy itself.

In Phenomenalism it is held that no physical objects exist other than as constructs of sensa. This is to say that when it is claimed that there are objects, these objects then exist as perceptual objects—as sensa. Material objects do not exist other than as groups or sequences of sensa, actual and possible.\(^5\) "The substance of the world, the matter of which it is composed, cannot be perceived; hence matter does not exist."\(^6\) In other words, whatever cannot be perceived by man cannot be known by man and therefore cannot be said to exist. Hence, in Phenomenalism, a construction of sensa "replaces" an entity that
does not exist with one that does.⁷ "Replacing what is not there" sounds paradoxical; it signals a problematic use, and thereby alerts us to the metaphysical character of Phenomenalism.⁸ Hence, according to the principles of Phenomenalism, there are objects in the world but these objects are perceptual objects that have replaced supposed given objects which we cannot come to know as such, and therefore we cannot speak of them as existing.

In an attempt to escape this problem, the linguistic phenomenalists have tried to overcome the paradox by dismissing or bracketing out all considerations of material objects and thereby the troublesome proposition of 'replacing what is not there'. In so doing, they concern themselves with the translating of sense data into language. Language in turn describes and analyzes the sensa. There is then a proposed interrelationship of sensa to language, bypassing any consideration of material objects. From this it is believed that one can grasp the perceptual object—not by comparing it to any purported material or physical object—but rather by translating the sensa into language, wherein it can be analyzed and comprehended.

Realism, as distinct from Phenomenalism, asserts that material objects exist external to us and independent of our sensa. Realism, then, gives way to the acknowledgement of the existence of physical objects. It not only makes claim to the existence of objects external to us but also to the fact that these objects somehow cause our sensation or representation of them which in turn corresponds to them. One might simply say that sense data is analogous to the external object. Offhand it seems a fine way of dealing with the supposed relationship of
the physical object and the perceptual object insofar as we do not be­come overly concerned with the concept 'analogous'. But invariably someone will inquire, What does 'analogous' mean? This would not be an easy question to answer since the whole metaphysics of Realism has, in this case, come to rest upon this single and most crucial concept. If we begin to unwrap the concept we will find the very problems that are central to this philosophy. In trying to accept both objects, the phy­sical and the perceptual, the realists have gotten themselves into a notorious bind when considering how we could ever discover that there are material objects that exist, or for that matter, what their charac­teristics might be. Realism seems to make material objects unintelli­gible causes of our perception. The realists reconstruct or replace physical objects, which do exist, but which we cannot know to exist in the same sense in which we know perceptual objects to exist. We are then left in an awkward position of having to "second guess" or "pre­suppose" a one-to-one correspondence of the physical and the perceptual. 'Replacing what is there' as in Realism and 'replacing what is not there' as in Phenomenalism brings forth intrinsic metaphysical problems, and most assuredly epistemological ones.

Idealism is contrary to Phenomenalism and Realism and holds that no physical objects or external realities exist apart from our knowledge of them. It upholds the view that nothing could be known to exist or to have existed except the ideas in the mind of the percipient. Idealists who are also solipsists believe that the "... thing and [the] knower are one, and the world or reality becomes a mere figment of the imagination." Many of the idealists are religious idealists, such as
George Berkeley, who is also known as an epistemological dualist. What is to be said about an object which is not experienced by a human, from Berkeley's point of view, "... is that if God perceives it, it exists;..." This is another way of saying that a thing or an object exists aside from man's experience of it, insofar as other beings, such as a god, experience it. However, if there is no being who experiences, then there is no existence of either things or objects. The ideal object or the imagined object, as will be argued in later chapters to be the metaphysical object, is then founded by way of Idealism.

If one took the religious idealist stand and supported the premise of the existence of God(s), then, and in accordance with such a definition of God(s), things, objects, and minds would all be the consequences of the existence of such a being. Hence, the religious idealist finds himself 'replacing what is there', as in Realism, but it is the replacing, not of physical objects as such, but rather the mind of the supposed god. As a further point, if one were a solipsistic idealist he would neither 'replace what is there' nor 'replace what is not there' but rather "construct." This is because the solipsist considers himself "the whole of reality" whereby the external world and other people are merely representations or constructions of the self having no independent or autonomous existence.

* * * *

In the previous discussion of Phenomenalism, Realism, and Idealism, as concerned with the existence of the object, it has not been proposed that all or any of these philosophies originated by a "Husserlian" method of bracketing. They may or may not have. Nevertheless, one can
be fairly assured that the philosophers responsible for the development of these three philosophical camps were not immune to a common sensing of the world. These authors experienced many of the common sounds, sights, and feelings that most everyone does. However, many of them did not choose to formulate their theories upon such experiential data. In this sense, they either bracketed the experiential data or denied its validity—which might be thought of as bracketing in its extremity. Even so, there is a distinction to be made between Husserl's methodology and that of most traditional metaphysicians, at least in the fact that Husserl did not bracket experience itself as did many of the metaphysicians. For Husserl, experience was the necessary umbilical cord in getting at the metaphysical realm and the means of getting back to the realm of common knowledge. This method, however, has its shortcomings as pointed out in the previous chapter.

To reach the metaphysical realm one must bracket the common-sense realm. This means that metaphysical conclusions are not derived or generated from the natural standpoint, but rather from the "unknown," a conjectured existence. This is because, as argued in the introduction, starting from the known curtails the acquisition of new knowledge and truth. However, metaphysical knowledge, if not transferable and applicable to the common-sense realm, remains meaningless at best and questionable at worst. It is questionable in the sense that we may have described a world that is not related to this universe and thereby asserted the existence of two universes without "transworld lines"—that is, existence in one universe unable to exist in the other. This is the very problem of the Hegelian philosophy in its application to
the common-sense world (known as Marxism) in that objects cease to exist. This point will be discussed in depth in the next section. But at this time, and in respect to the three metaphysics presented in this section, it is not that they are non-transferable to the common-sense realm, it is simply that they are not without paradox either generally or in respect to their transfer. Living in the common-sense world one would hardly think that objects in the environment are the creation of one's own mind, as in Idealism. Nor that they are sense construction, as in Phenomenalism. Or even that the experienced object is analogous rather than the thing itself, as in Realism. First, it is in this very respect that Idealism, Phenomenalism, and Realism are not common sense, and therefore stand paradoxically counter, but not contradictory, to our experiential upbringing. Secondly, it is also in this sense that knowledge, generated in the realm of the unknown, gives rise to and alters the common-sense world insofar as it is transferable across transworld lines.

Educationally, insofar as man, living in the common sense world, is obedient to the natural standpoint, he will have no reason to doubt its existence since he is always determinedly assimilated with it. Such a being is simply "riding the waves." It is only when he begins to question the matters of fact that the assimilation is disrupted; thus, requiring his own independent assertiveness and countering the natural standpoint, so as not to drown. This is the importance and value of metaphysics; not as blindness to the natural standpoint, but as a means of extending beyond it without destroying it or one's self. It is then the creation of a "possible world" that is dormantly inherent
in metaphysics. This is the reality of man and likewise his intellectual and educational goals.

Before getting into the body of knowledge called Confrontationalism and its metaphysics, Hegelianism and Marxism will be discussed from the point of nullification of the object. Likewise they will be presented as an example of what can happen to metaphysics when it is non-transferable across transworld lines—that one ends up with nothing but the common-sense world or better yet, the natural standpoint. Accordingly, parts of the metaphysics and their implications will be relevant to the presentation of Confrontationalism, not only in making distinctions, but likewise applying certain parts to that philosophy.

Nullification of the Object: The Reign and Problems of Dialectics

The term "dialectics" has meant many different things throughout history. The numerous denotations and connotations of this term will not however be discussed as such a discourse would be extremely encompassing and not at all to the point of this dissertation. However, it bears mentioning that 'dialectics' still means the "art of conversation." It originated as such during the time of Socrates and was in this sense of great importance to Plato. However, Aristotle, Plato's pupil, put an end to the importance placed on dialectics as the art of conversation in asserting that:

Deception occurs to a greater extent when we are investigating with others than by ourselves, for an investigation with someone else is carried on by means of words, but an investigation in one's own mind is carried on quite as much by means of the thing itself. The limited meaning of "dialectics," as in the time of Plato and Aristotle, fails to do justice to the uniqueness of this concept as found in
Hegelianism and Marxism. In these two philosophical camps the concept becomes a concern with 'contradiction'. For instance, Hegel made much of the "passing over into the opposite"—the necessary process of a "thing" turning into or becoming its own negation.\(^{15}\)

Hegel's commitment to his theory "of the necessity of a thing passing over into the opposite" bears mentioning. Basically, his theory constituted the necessity of 'contradiction'. Even Hegel's own work has often been charged with being self-contradictory.\(^{16}\) His doctrine was that contradictions occur as conceptual inadequacies in thought, nature and society.\(^{17}\) Contradiction, as a natural phenomena, was not exclusive to Hegel's philosophy. But, as he himself noted, it extends back to Heraclitus, Plato, Neoplatonist, Proclus, and others.\(^{18}\) Throughout history much has been written on dialectics, which simply and most often means a concern with contradictions, as well as the art of conversation.

What is not clear in respect to Hegel's concern with dialectics is whether he argued for discarding the law of contradiction or for its acceptance and extension into all facets of worldly existence.\(^{19}\) Not merely with Hegel, but in respect to all dialectics, one must be cautious not to attribute too much to the content, especially in thinking that it is always asserted that the thesis "produces" its antithesis, or that a synthesis is formulated from the thesis and the antithesis.\(^{20}\) Such caution likewise applies to Marxist dialectics.\(^{21}\)

Nonetheless, dialectics is based on the principle of contradiction. From a dialectical point of view, whenever something is asserted to exist, such as \(A\), one has made an instantaneous claim that not \(A\) \((\neg A)\) also exists. The reader should not think in terms of \(A\) as being over
here and A as being over there—that the two exist in different places at the same time or at different times. It is correct, according to the principle of contradiction, to think of A and A existing at the same time in the same place; which is to say, that A exists and does not exist. It would not be a contradiction to say A exists or does not exist; it is a contradiction to hold to the two existing conjunctively. Therefore, in dialectics as abiding by the principle of contradiction, it is necessary to assert that the two exist conjunctively as expressed by the term "and."

It is important to note that it is impossible to disprove the so-called "principles of contradiction." One would have to contradict the principle itself to adverse it, which at the same time would be to support it—to give credence to its actuality. It will be argued that even though the principle cannot be disproved, it is, however, empty. It asserts nothing other than the proposition 'contradiction'. To say that A exists and does not exist is not to make claim about the existence of K, Z, or Y. It is simply to say that the proposition 'contradiction' is under consideration. This can be paralleled with the concept 'nothingness'. We can consider the proposition 'nothing' in respect to 'something', but when it comes to describing, predicating, or demonstrating nothingness, one's discourse becomes hollow. Contradiction and nothingness are one and the same and, appropriately, designated as a "state of limbo."

As stated earlier, any attempt to contradict the principle of contradiction is to give credence to its actuality. Hence, such a line of argument will not be adhered to, but rather the characterizing of
dialectics (entailing the principles of contradiction) as a state of limbo, a state of indiscernability. In this sense, the principle itself is not being contradicted. Its ineffectiveness and its non-descriptiveness are merely being asserted. This is believed by the writer to be the proper means of criticizing and faulting the philosophy of dialectics.

There is, however, another viable means of criticizing and faulting this philosophy. Since dialectics is considered (by the dialecticians) to be a universal law, it is therefore argued and valued in its methodological application to be simplistically effective in substantiating the reality of change. As in Hegel's concept of 'dialectics', it is a process of "passing over into the opposite" which implies change. However, if it can be shown that change, despite contradiction, can and does occur, then the so-called principle of contradiction is not synonymous or reducible to the law of change. It would then be for the dialecticians to argue the validity of dialectics.

First, however, it is necessary to get at the essentialness of the philosophy, which is not an easy or explicit task for the very reasons of the nature of the philosophy itself. Nevertheless, a comparison of the "triad" with the "triangle" is offered as the means of getting at the essentialness of the philosophy. Furthermore, this matter will be indispensable in establishing and comprehending the next chapter on Confrontationalism.

The Triad

First of all, it is a commonly held misconception that Hegel's so-called triad constituted three aspects: thesis, antithesis, and
synthesis. Hegel never used these terms and he was mainly preoccupied with contradictions, often exclusive of any synthesis.\textsuperscript{22} Such mistaken attribution has been perpetuated by both followers and critics of Hegelianism. Marxists play the role of both follower and critic, and their work has been indicative of the misrepresentation to which Hegel's triad is subject. If any philosophy is characteristically thesis, antithesis, and synthesis in \textit{format} it would probably be Marxism. However, neither philosophical camp relied on the concepts, 'thesis', 'antithesis', and 'synthesis'. These concepts were used by a Kantian follower, Johann Gottlieb Fichte, who, by the way, "believed that the antithesis could not be deduced from the thesis."\textsuperscript{23}

Hegel was no doubt obsessed with the structure "three." One need but look at his format for discussing various topics to realize his concern with categorizing almost everything into threes—i.e., into a triad.

How Marxist or Hegelian triads may be properly visualized is not altogether clear. This is not only because Hegel was inconsistent in his application of the triad but because he did not always follow through in negating the thesis.\textsuperscript{24} Likewise, there are various plausible interpretations of what Hegel intended by his concept 'contradiction'.\textsuperscript{25} Marxists who reservedly relied upon the Hegelian triad perpetuated Hegel's ambiguous use of it.\textsuperscript{26} Marxists, as critics of Hegelian Idealism, are more apt to break ties with Hegel than to establish new ones. In so doing, as Lenin pointed out, the most appropriate break with Hegel would be to claim that the Marxist triad had little similarity to the Hegelian.\textsuperscript{27} Aside from the fact that the Marxists argued that the dialectical laws exist first and foremost in nature, rather than in the
mind of man as Hegel argued, they did little to elucidate the dialectical triad. As evidenced by their writings, however, the Marxists did apply the triad to social phenomena as a necessary, determining occurrence. But they abandoned the metaphysical explanations of the dialectical triad. Basically, Marx dropped Hegel's Idealism, yet retained the doctrine that the dynamic forces are dialectical contradictions, "negation" and "negation of negation." Hegel's Idealism (spirit) was substituted with Materialism (matter) by Marx and Engels.

As stated earlier it is difficult to visualize what this triad should look like. Because of the absence of visuals in philosophical literature, ambiguity can arise by way of interpreting the text. Terms can conjure up a diversity of images in the reader's mind. If such imagery is not consistent with the text then the basic structure of the theme could well be misinterpreted. This point will be taken up again in depth. First, let me illustrate what is commonly represented when the dialectical triad is under consideration.

![Dialectical Triad Diagram](image)

Fig. 1—The Dialectical Triad
What is meant here by "commonly represented" is that scholars, both critics and those sympathetic to dialectics, have in fact drawn the triad in this way. It has also been drawn as a "triangle" which will be considered in the next section.

First of all, the reader should recall from a previous discussion that the terms in parentheses were not used by Hegel; they are post-Kantian. Second, it has been argued that the existence of \( A \) and \( \bar{A} \) at the same time in the same place is essential for the existence of a contradiction. There is an obvious difficulty in representing such a reality because one given "mark" must depict two distinct realities. Nevertheless, a line comes closest to fulfilling this requirement, notwithstanding the use of additional predication, such as linguistic specifications, that a given mark is both \( A \) and \( \bar{A} \). In Figure 1 above, it is the line itself, and not the two dots, which represents the principle of contradiction, since the two dots are not in the same place. A line can be viewed in the same place at the same time, yet it can also entail more than one specific place, or if you will, point. A line, then, is constituted by more than one place, yet it itself is a single entity. In this sense it can best account for the supposed reality of contradiction in respect to representation. It is not argued that a line itself is a contradiction, simply that it best represents a contradiction. (As to whether a line is or is not itself a contradiction goes beyond this dissertation.)

Furthermore, the lines in Figure 1 represent process rather than product. Process is the major thrust of the dialectical philosophies. In Marxism, process takes on its importance as change which is its
major basis. Two dots connected by a line are not part of the line itself, yet they give contrastively further description to the line as process, since they depict monistic states. A line with dots at both ends represents that which transpires between the two dots (products). Hence, theme, negation, and negation of the negation are in a sense "things" or products in dialectics, and that which bridges them, their interrelationship, is the process. But as made paramount in dialectics, process and product are not separable, rather they are one and the same. Common sensically viewed, this should cause no dilemma since in Marxism product is descriptively theme, negation, and negation of the negation. In other words, since product has such a specific meaning, it is in the first place difficult to distinguish it from what is ordinarily considered process; therefore, no dilemma should arise, in process and product being inseparable, given the sense in which product is defined.

Nevertheless, let us consider the whole format or configuration of Figure 1. In dialectics the theme and its negation are simultaneously present. It is not that the theme, its negation, and the negation of the negation are given simultaneously. The latter is derived by and from the theme and its negation. It is in this sense that the three cannot occur on the same latitude if by latitude we mean that time is an important factor. For instance, if we drew the three aspects on a single latitude, as below, then either all three are given at the same time or if the time factor is from left to right, then the
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theme would occur first and not conjunctively with its negation. In either case it would be an alteration of the dialectical philosophy. To be consistent with the philosophy, the negation of the negation must occur below the theme and its negation, as shown below. However, what

about the absence of a line from the theme to the negation of the negation? It will be argued in the section "The Triad Compared to the Triangle" that no line must occur between the two, given the importance placed on the so-called "leap theory" found in Marxism. But first, let us consider the importance of the negation of the negation being placed below rather than above the theme and its negation.

Many scholars who compare and contrast the Hegelian and Marxist triads make a distinction without a difference. It is often asserted that the Marxists turned the Hegelian triad upside down. This is a misunderstanding of one or both of these triads. Historically, it is the Marxists (specifically Marx and Engels) who first proclaimed this distinction between the two. Their rationale may have been founded in their desperation to rid themselves of the ties with Hegelian metaphysics; however, this is merely speculation. What is surprising is that at least Engels knew that this was not the fact. As Engels noted in 1888, ". . . the dialectic of Hegel was placed upon its head; or rather, turned off its head, on which it was standing before, and placed upon its feet again." What Engels is saying here is that the Hegelian triad, ideological as it is (constituted first and foremost by ideas: "ideological"
here means the science of ideas), had its content altered first and foremost to material substance. Hegel argued that an idea is material substance whereas Marx and Engels argued that an idea is a reflection of material substance. What Engels means by Hegel's dialectics being "placed upon its feet again" is simply the altering of the dialectical content; that is, the movement of the triad is from the "head" to the "ground" giving precedence to material substance rather than to ideas of the head. This is a correct conclusion drawn by Engels as to the difference between the two triads. However, in later publications he contradicts himself by reaffirming that the triad was indeed turned upside down.

This seemingly minor distinction has severe metaphysical implications which are the key to understanding both philosophies. Why it is impossible for the Marxist triad to exist upside down (compared to the Hegelian triad) will be discussed by comparing the triad and the triangle.

The Triad Compared to the Triangle

In a fundamental sense, a triangle might not be contrary to either Hegelianism or Marxism. But since it is difficult to comprehend the triad it will not be assumed that it is synonymous with the triangle. Rather, throughout this dissertation it will be argued that the two have little similarity. However, in this section, some similarities between the two will be discussed and how the triangle might well remedy some ambiguities intrinsic to the triad will be shown.

The dialectical triad is a never-ending relationship of threes. According to the two philosophical camps, the theme is negated and then this negation is negated forming a new and greater theme, which is likewise negated, and that negation is also negated and so on. The basic
structure then is the relationship, or more precisely, the interrelationship of the three aspects: 1. theme, 2. negation, 3. negation of the negation. No injustice has been done in considering it in this simplistic way, insofar as the reader keeps in mind that this triadic relationship continues indefinitely, never attaining a final resolution.

Likewise no injustice is done if we rotate the triad 90 degrees to either side as shown below. Were the triad to be turned 180 degrees either direction, it would likewise make little difference, insofar as we interpret it from bottom to top, as shown below, rather than commonly from top to bottom. In such a case, we have obviously not turned anything upside down at all, because we have at the same time altered our "direction of interpretation." The only way we could turn the dialectical triad upside down and get a different interpretation would be if, and necessarily if, we maintained a latitudinal consistency.

As stated earlier, most authorities, including the Marxists, have misrepresented the Hegelian and the Marxist triads by purporting that
the Hegelian triad was turned upside down by the Marxists. With the principle of "direction of interpretation" in mind, let us turn it upside down and see what difference it would make.

In the case of the above figure we would end with the so-called principle of contradiction rather than starting with it. In consideration of its extension it should be obvious to the reader that we cannot add further steps above B because that would indicate that our "direction of interpretation" was likewise turned upside down, which results in the triad not being turned upside down. Accordingly, we cannot add further steps below the interrelationship of A and \( A \) because that would mean that the triad was not turned upside down. But more than anything else, when the triad is turned upside down there exists a theme independent of its negation which arrests dialectics and introduces Monism. Monism, the principle of only one ultimate reality or one single entity wherefrom everything evolves (such as founded in the doctrines of the existence of God), is contrary to the dialectical philosophy which abides by, not a single universal entity, but a dual entity. The duality of Hegelianism and Marxism is of course the existence of A and \( A \). If the Hegelian triad was turned upside down, as many authorities claim, Monism would not only be the basic antecedinal principle but the whole dialectical philosophy
could not be extended; it would merely remain a singular, finite triad. It is not beneficial to the Marxist philosophy to purport that the Hegelian triad was turned upside down; nor is it, in a comparative sense, helpful in comprehending the Hegelian triad.

A further criticism to be made about the Marxist triad is that it cannot explicate "essentiality." What this means is that when relying solely on the Marxist triad one cannot come to understand what is essential for an object to be an object or, for a particular object to be distinct from other particular objects. That is, in using the Marxist triad we cannot demonstrate "why" or "how" A is different from B. We cannot show that A has an essential quality which sets it apart from B. There are two reasons for this: first, Marxism is not a philosophy that is concerned with essence; second, and in accordance with the first point, Marxism abides by the "leap theory."

In respect to the first point, the Marxists obviously hold that Marxism (the philosophy of dialectical materialism as a philosophy of science) is an essential philosophy; it is the essentiality of all things in the universe, which includes the universe itself. To say this in a different way, Marxism is equal to essentiality (Marxism = essence). However, essence, in a Marxist sense, purportedly means change. "It [Marxism] reveals the transitory character of everything and in everything; . . . ." Dialectical philosophy itself is nothing more than the mere reflection of this process. But in a traditional sense, 'essence' means that which does not change. What the Marxists did was take the traditional understanding of 'essence' (that which does not qualitatively

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional</th>
<th>Marxist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'essence' = no change</td>
<td>'essence' = change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
change) and altered it to mean change. According to the Marxists, the only essence in the universe is that of change. Marxism is essentially thought of as the philosophy of change. If we hold to this principle then we must also acknowledge that Marxism changes. (This very fact is admitted by the Marxists.) However, to argue that Marxism will or has changed is simply to give credence to the existence and perpetuation of Marxism, since it is considered essentially a philosophy of change. (Though Existentialism is also thought of as a philosophy of change there are obvious differences between the two. Marxism is a philosophy of social change whereas Existentialism is rather a philosophy of individual change. Further contrast on this point and others will be taken up in the following section.)

In respect to the second point, the "leap theory," well-known philosophies or so-called philosophies founded on the principle of change share this theory as a commonality. For example, Hegelianism (Idealism), Marxism (sociology), Existentialism (individualism), and Gestalt (psychology) all presuppose the leap theory. They not only acknowledge that there are materialistically and/or conceptually leaps in respect to a thing becoming or transcending into something different, but they accept this leap as a natural phenomenon. It is one thing to acknowledge that there may presently appear to be leaps or jumps from one ascending state to another because of man's present limited knowledge and quite another thing to accept such a doctrine as a given natural phenomenon. A great deal of consideration will be given to the leap theory throughout this dissertation, basically to avert it, but for the time being let us first consider it from the point of the Marxist triad.
According to the Marxists, history often proceeds by jumps and zigzags. One of Hegel's famous examples of all-of-a-sudden change, which Engels and Marx often repeated, was that of water turning into steam or ice. Engels often talked in terms of leaps occurring in the transformation of one quality to another. In respect to the triad where could one expect to find the so-called leap?

Fig. 3--The Leap in the Dialectical Triad

The reason for considering the area designated as a "leap" is two-fold, because it is often drawn as such, and because the Marxists themselves, along with Hegel, abide by the leap theory. That is, the leap theory is of paramount importance to the dialectical philosophy.

The rationale for the leap not being designated in the interrelation of A and $\phi$ or $\phi$ and B is the dialectician's meaning of "negation." It is argued extensively by the Marxists that the process of negation is a fluidly, continuous occurrence. Rather, it is the by-product (the so-called synthesis) that appears to have come about by a leap or jump, such as in the ice example stated earlier. In fact, it is the process and its comprehension of A ascending or transforming to B that is missing in the dialectical philosophy. The Marxists admit this, as Engels makes explicit in the following:
It is obvious that in describing any evolutionary process as the negation of the negation I do not say anything concerning the particular process of development, for example, of the grain of barley from germination to the death of the fruit-bearing plant. The dialectical process of negation, and negation of the negation, is argued by the dialecticians as a general process of development. And yet, as Engels states above, there is also a particular process of development which by the way, according to Engels and other Marxists, is an unknown given process—of no concern to them. It is of no concern in the sense that as Engels states: "So far it has not been found possible to convert motion from one form to another inside a single isolated body." In this sense, the general process of development is not reducible to the particular process of development. The so-called leap is then synonymous with the particular process of development and supposedly not at all with the general process of development. The process of A ascending to B is, for example, the evolutionary process, or the maturational process, of a seed becoming a fruit-bearing plant; it is accepted by the Marxists as an unknown given process. It is the law of the transformation of quantity into quality and vice versa which has been predicated an unknown factor or the leap in nature, as shown below by a broken line.

The Law of the Interpenetration of Opposites

The Law of the Transformation of Quantity into Quality and Vice Versa

Fig. 4—The Dialectical Triad as a Triangle
Hegel not only originally developed the laws of interpenetration of opposites and negation of the negation, but also the law of transformation. These were formulated in an idealistic fashion as laws of thought, whereas the Marxists hold to them as laws of nature (materialistic laws). Nevertheless, if the Marxists hold to the law of negation as central to sides 1 and 2, and this law is characteristic of all things (general process), then it is also central to side 3. Given this truth, it would mean that 1 and 2 are redundant in the sense that if we were to concern ourselves with 3, the specific process, we would be simultaneously considering the process common to 1 and 2. But as argued earlier and asserted by the Marxists, sides 1 and 2 do not equal side 3 because the Marxists claim that side 3 cannot be understood whereas sides 1 and 2 can. Side 3 is greater than sides 1 and 2 combined, even according to Marxist philosophy. This is not only an epistemic problem but also one of content/process recognized by the Marxists, yet unaccountable in Marxism. That is, there is something about the particular process, the evolutionary process, or the maturational process, predicated as the law of transformation, that cannot be considered or explained by way of Marxism. And yet, it is centrally crucial to the transformation or ascending of A to B. Even if we removed sides 1 and 2 (that is, the reality of Marxism), we would somehow still expect the transformation of A to B, because everything that is essential to this transformation is found, or to be found, along side 3. In this sense, and in support of the Marxist philosophy not being totally hollow, the best that can be credited to it is that it serves as a "boosting force." That is, the Marxist philosophy results in speeding up the already existing phenomenon
of transformation such as by "revolution" or more precisely Nihilism. But revolution and annihilation of what? It is this very question that will be taken up next.

Marxism, as a sociological philosophy, speeds up the evolutionary processes by having man congregate in force to facilitate the phenomenon of change. As such, one is specifically considering a part of, or a branch of, Marxism which has come to be known as Nihilism. Nihilism is also a branch of Existentialism, yet it appeals to individual action rather than communal action. In Nihilism, man becomes a nihilist or annihilist, contrary to, but not necessarily in opposition to, a constructionist—one who builds.

As pointed out in Ivan Turgenev's *Fathers and Sons*, the Latin meaning of nihil is 'nothing'. It can also mean one who believes in nothing or nothingness. A nihilist is one who does not look up to authority; one who negates everything. He is one who clears the ground for the builders; it is not the affair of the nihilist to build, only to negate or destroy. Both Marxism and Existentialism have often been described as nihilistic philosophies.

It would appear obvious that if we negated New York City to a heap of rubble, removed that rubble to a different location and began construction at the old site, then a Neo-New York would be in the process of becoming. Such a case in transformation would be more obvious than if nature were slowly eroding away the city while some construction or reconstruction was being performed from within. In this case, it might take years before one realized that a transformation took place. Likewise, it would necessitate some records or memory of how it used to
be, contrasted to how it is now, in establishing that a transformation had taken place.

But it is not as simple as that. For instance, if a suburb of New York City was suddenly considered as part of New York City, we would likewise have to acknowledge that the city had been transformed. And yet, what was negated? It was surely not the materialism of the suburb because it would still remain under the rubric of New York City. Was it then the concept or the name that formally predicated the existence of the suburb that was negated? Either may be so, but only in a Hegelian sense would this have much importance. The Marxists hold to the importance of materialism rather than Idealism. In the above case, no materialism was negated but still there was a transformation.

Let us briefly consider the case of a child becoming an adult. Is the child negated whereby he transforms into an adult? Why would the childlike characteristics not simply ascend into adult characteristics without any negation of the former? Or why is an adult not a being who entails childlike characteristics which never change or alter but simply remain as they have always been?

The point of this inquiry is simply to indicate the complexity of change and the ambiguity of negation. Likewise, there may be other possible metaphysical reasons that account for the existence of motion and change without abiding by the so-called law of negation. In this sense, dialectics as a purported philosophy of accounting for change may itself falter or even be metaphysically unfounded. As such it is possible that the dialecticians have presupposed the law of negation making it questionable as to whether there is even such a process. This
would obviously be detrimental to the dialectical philosophies. On the other hand, if it were shown that negation only occurs in the case of man, and not in nature, this would give credence to Hegelianism, but would be unfavorable to Marxism. A detailed discussion of change will be taken up in the next chapter but it is worth mentioning here that motion is characteristically the movement of an object in space that does not entail change in a strict sense. Change is the alteration of quality. Change entails motion but not vice versa. In respect to Marxism, the essence of change is supposedly to be found under the law of transformation whereby quantity becomes quality and vice versa. But the Marxists refuse to consider the essentiality of the law of transformation by their merely dismissing it as a leap. Hence, Marxism is descriptively a philosophy of motion rather than of change, in the sense of speeding up the already existing phenomenon of transformation.

Yet, since the reality of negation has not to this point in the dissertation been refuted (thereby still holding) the question of content negated in Marxism is still necessitated. The Marxists have obviously argued for the negation of Idealism, such as Hegel's philosophy. Even though Marxism is founded upon Hegelianism, this does not lead to contradicting dialectics itself, but rather in accordance with it, since its basis is negation of opposites. However, since Idealism is counter to Materialism this makes Marxism a natural standpoint or a natural view as considered earlier under Pragmatism and Husserl's view of it as an entrapment. From this point, Marxism basically negates philosophy, even itself as a philosophy (in that Marxism itself changes). If we consider philosophy an attribute of man, then Marxism negates that part of man,
possibly for the reasons, as the Marxists might well argue, of giving
greater facilitation to the natural processes in that man's philosophi-
sizing is curtailed, since it could well be counted as a hinderance to
the natural process.

Even so, it differs from the common-sensical view found in Prag­
matism in that the object is viewed as changeable rather than as static.
In this sense, Marxism nullifies not only the philosophical object but
likewise the common-sensical object. Furthermore, it not only corro­
borates the natural standpoint views and processes but facilitates these
in curtailing man's possible hinderance of them.

* * * *

An important distinguishing feature of dialectics is the so-
called principle of contradiction, which is central to Hegelianism and
Marxism. The principle of contradiction is characteristically a law of
negation, a principle of nothingness. Dialectics, especially Marxism,
is not unique in abiding by negation but rather the content negated and
the results thereof. It is unique in utilizing a metaphysics to negate
philosophy and philosophizing and thereby gives rise to the natural
standpoint. Accordingly, it is unique in nullifying the object, the
idealistic object and the common-sense object, in asserting that the
object is changeable rather than static. Yet, Marxism, as a discourse
on process, does not concern itself with change per se, but rather mo­
tion and its facilitation of change as a given. As such, it is correct
to represent Marxism as a triad rather than as a triangle since the
essentialness of change is found under the law of transformation, which
is asserted to be unexplainable and thereby purported as a leap.
The metaphysical problems found in the Hegelian triad were not resolved or elucidated by the Marxists; on the contrary, these problems were perpetuated and even extended by the misconception that the Marxists turned the Hegelian triad upside down. If one takes into consideration the principle of "direction of interpretation," it is impossible, considering the Marxist philosophy itself, for the triad to have been turned upside down. The Hegelian triad remained structurally the same for the Marxists. It was merely the Hegelian idealistic content that was changed to materialism. That is, conceptualism became secondary to natural phenomena. Likewise, the individualism in Hegelianism was superceded by socialism to generate motion and in turn facilitate the given reality of change.

**Dialectic Aesthetics: A Revival of Marxism and Existentialism**

Even though Existentialism and Marxism recognize dialectical conflict as a given they differ however on the meaning and reality of "specificity" and "generality." For instance, in Existentialism the individual is destined to remain an individual, not so much an isolated being, but rather a being who cannot be part of a higher or greater order. In Marxism, the individual is defined as a social being, one who attains individualism by being part of a unity with others.

"... [C]ommunism, therefore, is the complete return of man to himself as a social (i.e., human) being—a return become conscious, and accomplished within the entire wealth of previous development. This communism, as fully-developed naturalism, equals humanism, and as fully-developed humanism, equals naturalism; it is the genuine resolution of
the conflict between man and nature and between man and man. . . ."39

In Marxist aesthetics, realism holds an important position.40
Truth of detail was an important thesis for both Marx and Engels.41
However, realism and truth of detail should be viewed from the point of
a social situation. It is realism and truth of social conditions that
are valued in Marxism. The degree of social influence a work of art
has on society is the criteria for social evaluation. For example:
"The brilliant contemporary school (1845) of novelists in England, whose
elloquent and graphic portrayals of the world have revealed more politi-
cal and social truths than all the professional politicians, publicists,
and moralists put together. . . ."42 
". . . [T]he object of art, as well
as any other product, creates an artistic and beauty-enjoying public.
Production thus produces not only an object for the individual, but also
an individual for the object."43

The Marxist principle is that art, like all higher activities,
belongs to the cultural "superstructure" and is determined by sociohis-
torical conditions, especially economic conditions.44 For a full un-
derstanding of art, a connection between a work of art and its sociohistori-
cal matrix must be traced. In a sense, art is a "reflection of social
reality," but Marxists have had difficulty in assessing its exact nature
and limits—it still remains a rather persistent problem of Marxist
aesthetics.45 Marx himself, in his Contribution to the Critique of
Political Economy (1859), pointed out that there is no simple one-to-one
correspondence between the character of a society and its art.

This very problem was recognized by the Marxist William Morris,
as in his lectures and pamphlets, where he argued that radical changes
were needed in the social and economic order to make art what it should be: ". . . the expression of man's happiness in his labor . . . made by the people, and for the people, as a happiness to the maker and the user." 46 "It is the province of art to set the true ideal of a full and reasonable life before him, a life to which the perception and creation of beauty, the enjoyment of real pleasure. . . ." 47 Morris was concerned with the "crystallization of a Marxist aesthetic approach to nature and the labor process," as variety, hope of creation, and the self-respect which comes of a sense of usefulness.

For George Plekhanov, ". . . art is the solution of a set of problems which arise from the historical development of the mode of production; for Marx, art is a means by which mankind sets tasks for itself to aid it in its progress towards freedom." 48

In Existentialism, "For each [Nietzsche and Camus] material existence exhausts reality [actuality]; there is no other real form of existence." 49 This view is very consistent with the Marxists's view that historical materialism is the context in which the aesthetic thought is cradled and in which it functions. As with Marx and Engels, Nietzsche accordingly was in opposition to Idealism (Hegelianism) which to him represented rather a false and deceiving "escapism." As with Marx and Engels and the Marxists Karl Kautsky and George Plekhanov so too was Nietzsche influenced by Darwin's theory of evolution which belittled man to nothing more than a determined animal. The theory of evolution was the kindling for Existentialism. The term "existential" means "exit," and the existencialists were looking for a way out of the theory of evolution. In Marxism, the ultimate would be to "get out of" the reality of
determinism but this, according to the Marxists, can only be accomplished by society as a whole, not by individuals as in Existentialism.

The problem for Nietzsche was "... emancipating oneself from one's chains [evolution]; and, ultimately, one has to emancipate oneself from his emancipation, too." Nihilism [Nietzsche believed] has come into existence through man's retreat into a realm of ideas which he can take for granted, into a realm from which he can look upon the world and rob it of its significance. To overcome this nihilism, is the main purpose of Nietzsche's thought. Man must realize that it was he who invented this realm of ideas, and that it is also he who must escape this realm in order to make way for 'the actual world' in which and through which we exist.

The above quote is a direct attack on Idealism (Hegelianism), in fact, a Nietzschean Nihilism. Because of this eternal dilemma Nietzsche saw the future as nihilistic. Nietzsche could not believe in the future or that any progress could be made in it. This is affirmed in a letter that he wrote in 1888 wherein he states, "... that one of life's most basic concepts has been blotted out of my consciousness: that of the future." Because of his inability to deal with the future both psychologically and philosophically he became, however, more aware of his role in the present. According to Rolf-Dieter Herrmann's analysis, Nietzsche believed that "there [was] only the present, and something removed from us, something that we cannot approach in terms of ideas but only experiences, i.e., the world that recurs eternally as the same." He came to the conclusion of "reoccurrence" by way of the philosophical problem: that if matter is finite and time is infinite, then everything must re-occur. Since the future holds nothing but eternal reoccurrences we are
therefore, according to Nietzsche, left only with present experience, in
and for itself. This is very much like Phenomenology, especially Hus­
serl's Phenomenology proper. Nietzsche has taken man into the realm of
direct and immediate experience as the only meaningful existence; which
is a phenomenological existence.

Nietzschian art, however, is not identical to the world. Art
creates an aura of unreality; it generates an unworldly state as ex-
pressed by the term "illusion." Aesthetics is synonymous with illusion.
Art is not an imitation of nature but its metaphysical supplement,
raised up beside it in order to overcome it. Art functions as a mo-
mentary obliteration of reality; it supplants earthly existence to make
life bearable. "For Nietzsche, art functions as an assuagement of man's
sufferings . . . it makes him forgetful of his existential situation." Aesthetics,
according to Nietzsche, is the exit or escape in Existen-
tialism, whereby man can face the actual world and attempt to move be-
yond it. This is all made possible because the artist cannot tolerate
reality, whereby he creates unity by rejecting the world. He creates
an illusion, an "ivory tower" wherein reality, the absurd, can be ig-
nored. The artist presents a "fake" world because he is able to lie.

Nietzsche states in The Will to Power that man is a liar and that
there is a need for him to be one, since it is so difficult to face the
truth of reality, or in other words, the existential situation. He goes
on to say that the artist is the biggest or greatest liar of them all
because he eludes the world with a veil of unreal beauty. To some ex-
tent this view of the artist is compatible with Plato's, as expressed
in the Republic—namely that the artist is a liar, or that the artist
is farthest removed from the truth. However, in Nietzsche's view the artist attempts to escape from the truth whereas according to Plato he strives for the truth. In either case, he ends up being the liar, but much more so commending in Nietzsche's view.

Camus believed that there is but a small distinction to be made between the view of art and life itself. He believed that art and artistic creation are constituted by interrelatedness which gives a partial continuity. A work of art possesses a coherence and a unity which cannot, as such, exist in reality. An art work represents a loose cohesion not found within life. Art has some structure whereas life does not.

Even so, Camus' aesthetics, as shown in The Myth of Sisyphus, is constituted by life's absurdity—art is absurd like life. A work of art represents incongruous states, as a symptom of worldly ills, preserving and renewing them in an act of spiteful rebellion. To Camus, creation in art is the great mime, it is nothing more. Art, like life, confronts man anew with contradictory tensions; and any interpretation of either is relative to one's presuppositions and therefore fails to attain truth. "In Camus' world, art aggravates man's worldly tensions; it does not soothe them."57 Art for Nietzsche is a retreat to one's ivory tower wherein reality, the absurd, can be ignored. Art in Camus' terms is not a consolation for life, yet for Nietzsche it is to some extent.

According to Sartre the aesthetic act is dialectical, in the sense of either artist/object or viewer/object. However, there is a distinction to be made between the two possible dialectical relationships. In the case of the creative act (dialogue between artist and object), the work remains incomplete and abstract. In the case of the
aesthetic act (dialogue between viewer and object) the work is recreated into a "wholeness." However, wholeness in the Sartreian philosophy is an illusion, but nonetheless, a desirable, human action. It is therefore that Sartre describes aesthetics as "a choice of the unreal in order to possess (or avoid) some aspect of the real." "Sartre refers to aesthetic awareness as an 'induced dream'."58

Both Camus and Sartre were influenced by Nietzsche's views. Nietzsche set the stage for viewing aesthetics as "unreal." Sartre's aesthetic philosophy as "a choice of the unreal in order to possess (or avoid) some aspect of the real" as an illusion or induced dream is very compatible with Nietzsche's nihilism. Camus is distinct from Nietzsche and Sartre in that he believes that aesthetics is nothing more than a mime of life. That is, there is no escaping the existential situation by way of aesthetics. However, according to Nietzsche and Sartre, there is some degree of escape, but that simply says that art or aesthetics is a lie. But it is also the case that art or aesthetics is the truth; it is the truth in the sense that it represents man's aspirations to escape reality. This is obviously a "paradox," so very typical of Existentialism. Nevertheless, aesthetics does provide an alternative means of viewing and assessing the world situation. It is therefore that aesthetics provides an alternative consciousness according to most existentialists (Camus being an exception).

Summary and Conclusion

Whether or not Existentialism is rooted in Phenomenology proper, Realism, Phenomenalism, Marxism or some other method or world view, depends largely upon the existentialist under consideration. For
instance, much of Merleau-Ponty's Existentialism is rooted in both Phenomenology proper and Phenomenalism. In Merleau-Ponty's case, Existentialism is a "philosophy" without an object, which justifies the continued existence of both experience and perception. His philosophy assumes consciousness as being perceptual. According to Merleau-Ponty, perception is paradoxical. "The perceived thing itself is paradoxical; it exists only in so far as someone can perceive it [Phenomenalism]."

"... [T]here is a paradox of immanence and transcendence in perception. Immanence, because the perceived object cannot be foreign to him who perceives; transcendence, because it always contains something more than what is actually given. And these two elements of perception are not, properly speaking, contradictory."

With Sartre and Martin Heidegger, Existentialism is relative to objects and therefore their Existentialism is heavily indebted to Realism. Sartre speaks of "sens" as the affective meaning correlative to our affective analogue and not really distinct from the object which the analogue constitutes (Realism).

For Heidegger, "the truth of what is" comes about in the art work by means of a struggle—the struggle of world and earth. In Heidegger's terms, we can never entirely reveal the "earth"; it, as paint of the painting, the stone of the sculpture, the words of the poem, remains "hidden." The "world," as being of existing reality of the work of art—the context of higher relationships which gives meaning to the art work, makes earth "apparent" and "open" by uplifting the hiddenness of the earth as the earth. This is to say that the world enables us to see and understand the earth as paint, stone, and words.
But likewise, as the world facilitates the earth, so does the earth facilitate the world. The earth "... serves to ground and protect the transcendent, intangible realm of the world." Together, these two elements make up the unity called the work of art; together the world and the earth serve to set forth "the truth of what is" in the art work. All of this is very compatible to Realism. It is also very similar to Marxist aesthetics.

Marxist aesthetics, however, is not Marxism per se; it is rather Realism, specifically, the natural standpoint emerging, which has been argued to at least be the manifestation, if not the manifesto, of Marxism. Of those considered in this chapter, Camus and Nietzsche come closer to Marxism per se than the Marxists themselves, in regards to the nature of aesthetics. Part of the reason for this is that Marxism does not recognize aesthetics as a metaphysical principle but rather, and simply, as a "worldly attribution" or a "worldly facilitation" of the natural standpoint. Furthermore, it is difficult to conceive that aesthetics, as an artistic discourse, is negation. Throughout the centuries, aesthetics has at least consistently been viewed as "construction" rather than negation, even when it has been predicated a lie as in Nietzsche's sense. Art might well have caused or facilitated nihilism, but that is different from arguing that art or aesthetics itself is the actuality of negation. Furthermore, as will be shown in the chapter on art, art cannot (as necessarily an objectification) entail contradiction and therefore negation cannot be considered its property.

Nevertheless, existential and Marxist aesthetics are rather paradoxical whether or not they are argued to be atypical or simply
reducible to either Realism, Phenomenology proper or Phenomenalism.

What this means is that even though there are aspirations to "exit" from the natural standpoint—it being an entrapment—they fail however in their manifestation mainly because, as with Pragmatism, the failure lies in the manifesto. Paradox is the "vicious-circle principle." It is granted that formal logical paradoxes do not always have the necessary and sufficient conditions for circularity and vice versa. "It is impossible to characterize a circular argument in such a way that every circular argument leads to a [logical] paradox and every [logical] paradox is the result of a circular argument." Even so, a paradox is "a statement whose truth leads to a contradiction and the truth of whose denial leads to a contradiction," such as: "A man says that he is lying. Is what he says true or false?" Even though it may be the case that every logical paradox is not the result of a circular argument and vice versa, nevertheless, it is however a closed system whereby there is supposedly no exit, not even by way of negation. This is what troubled Nietzsche, Camus and Merleau-Ponty in their assertions that paradoxes should be unveiled rather than obscured. On the other hand, the Marxists believe that negation, given its actuality, is the means of exiting; but this is a gross presupposition in light of the fact that the "denial or 'negation' of the conclusion of a paradox simply furthers the existence of the paradox."

But more than anything else Realism, Phenomenalism, Pragmatism, Phenomenology proper, Existential Phenomenology, Existentialism, Marxism, Linguistics and other common-sense philosophies or methodologies are monistic manifestos and, as such, typify circularity and/or paradox
which conclusively results in no exit. These camps either directly or indirectly give rise to common sense and/or the natural standpoint whose origin is that of experience. Problematically, experience as a given—notwithstanding at this point whether experience itself is misunderstood or non-understood—determines the realm and content thereof for educational discourse. Furthermore, since the above camps of discourse are essentially similar—that is, members of the same monistic family, they cannot be found to comparatively falter; basically, they are distinct without an essential difference.

No argument has or will be given for their abolition, even in light of their proponents' assault on metaphysics. They are in fact (along with other so-called philosophies not presented in this dissertation) necessary "general education philosophies," not simply because they have historical value but because they, as monistic, represent in part the metaphysical actuality. That is, Monism is one of two metaphysical antecedents—Dualism being the other. Or in different words, the ontology of metaphysics is Monism and Dualism—presented as Confrontationalism in the following chapters. Nevertheless, in the fact and the nature of these monistic camps and their claim to universality, they represent "half truths" which is obviously no truth. On the other hand, to argue for an ideal Dualism, inspite of Monism, would be to falter by similar criticism. Hence, the following task is to present the two conjunctively as a given metaphysical actuality.
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CHAPTER IV

CONFRONTATIONALISM

Fields of Forces

The topic "force" has been considered in various ways throughout history. There were times when it was attributed solely to supernatural beings such as gods or demons. These gods were basically enigmatic to man and therefore force itself was enigmatic. The mystery of force was further compounded by the view that it was either good or evil. The concern with force itself eventually became secondary to the understanding of its ethical nature. For instance, in the Scriptures Cain and Abel either personify or incarnate the universal forces of good and evil, dictating the status and structure of the universe. It is difficult to reason how something is intrinsically either good or evil, much less that these are forces with ethical natures which must be contended with.

In more recent times, force has been considered aside from ethical implications under the predicate "determinism." At times it is subcategorized into environmental, social, political, historical, or evolutionary factors whereby all events are caused. Furthermore, we have even come to speak of specific forces within these subcategories, such as the force of the volcano or the force of the tides. We sometimes believe that humans have a force—individually or collectively—and
even that people are constituted by a force, whereby they can determine their own becoming. On the one hand, we have force as determinism whereby the world, including man, is destined to be in obedience to a given design and on the other we have the possibility of self-determinism whereby an individual is a force which might well supercede all other forces, enabling freedom.

It is strange that we have even come to talk in such terms, much less that we may even believe that it is descriptively true. It is as though we believe that there are forces in the environment that are operating about and fusing with the energies of the organism. And yet, in their common sensing of the world most people experience themselves pushed and pulled, not only by other people but by inanimate objects as well. They sense themselves yearning for, or drawn to, some things in the world and repulsed by other things. As such, their environments are best described in terms of "fields of forces."

However, it is the way in which one explains or accounts for the world of fields of forces that makes the world either reasonable, sound, or even irrational. To say that "someone or something is acting upon me" without further elaboration is simply too mystical for most people. At times it is even considered psychopathic to say "they are forcing me to do it." To speak of the world as fields of forces from the point of common sense and ordinary language, as they exist even today in their developmental state, would most likely not only be to misrepresent the truth but probably an invitation to the psychiatric ward.

It is not that force is exclusive to any one field of discourse or any one worldly realm but rather universal. Both the concept and
the reality of force are of concern, if not problematic, to any field of discourse. Assuredly so is the situation with the arts and education as pointed out in the previous chapter on the section on aesthetics, exemplified by the writings of Roman Ingarden, Eliseo Vivas, David Ecker, and Eugene Kaelin. Furthermore, it is problematic in the arts and education in the sense that the nature of force itself is not fully comprehended. This point is very evident in David Ecker's and Eugene Kaelin's article, "The Limits of Aesthetic Inquiry: A Guide to Educational Research," in which they exclude metaphysics as "only confounding the issues at hand," and yet, they make a metaphysical presupposition wherefrom all arguments are developed viz., "objects can control relevant responses to it." It is one thing to argue against "traditional" metaphysics, but is one also to exclude a Merleau-Ponty metaphysics (metaphysics in man) as simply confounding the issues at hand? Hopefully in an educational sense the answer would be "no." Artistically, the answer has to be "no" since, as will be argued, the artist is a metaphysician. However, and the point being, art and education are not only indebted to the reality and actuality of force, but problematically so, mainly because the nature of force itself is not fully comprehended. This is indicative of many of the claims made by David Ecker and Eugene Kaelin in their article.

To deal exclusively with the world of fields of forces by way of common sense and ordinary language as they are today is to make such absurd expressions as those in the above authors' writings. But even worse than that it is to misrepresent truth. Possibly in the far future that which is today considered linguistically academic will be
viewed as common sensical if for no other reason than that has historically always been the "direction of flow."

But somewhere between common sense (including ordinary language) and the normative or traditional if you will, lies the realm of visual expression as the "transworld line" bridging the two. It is a realm wherein the actuality of the world of fields of forces might well be expressed by the metaphysician and comprehended by the viewer as represented in Figure 5. This is mainly because the artist is able to bracket and suspend the common sensical and because he is metaphysically oriented. However, all of this too is dependent upon the artist's own reasoning and his ability to express himself. Nevertheless, the world might appear somewhat like that in Figure 5, wherein we would be
confronted with some given distinctions, but generally speaking, most of the field would appear intransitive. There would be continuous interaction and indifferent reconstruction. If the visual was put to music, it would have some rhythm, mixed with sounds of dissonance. It would be a world, not of objects, but of things—a world constituted by nothingness and somethingness, descriptively in a state of confrontation.

The universe obeys, or rather is governed by, certain laws or principles. The most prominent principle is that of "association." All things in the universe are in a constant state of association mainly because their basic essence is either monistic or dualistic. They are associative, not in the sense of relativity, but rather as "counter-ness." For instance, the universe, constituted by wholes and parts, obeys a given counter relationship or interrelationship of whole and whole or part and part, but not whole and part. In this sense, parts alter their status to wholes and vice versa. Furthermore, and partly because of this very fact, the whole is not greater than the sum of its parts but rather they are equivalent.

In the universe, and including the universe itself, there exist monistic states and dualistic states which are explicitly counter to one another. The universe itself is then, as will be argued, dualistic. Simplistically, there are "two of everything"—two of nothingness and two of somethingness. There are regrettably, or as will be argued, non-regrettably, two kinds of animate existences (also human existences)—monistic and dualistic. This is the basis of social, political and educational manifesto and manifestation. But even more than that, it is the very thing that enables man to transcend nature itself because, as will be argued, it is the second sense and the most explicit
sense of the actuality of change. Without the relationship and/or interrelationship of the monistic state and the dualistic state the social, political, and educational would not change but merely remain in motion. The arts and art education are vital ingredients to the duality of the universe, or rather the confrontation of it, for they constitute not the monistic world but rather the dualistic one. But before getting into these matters, the universe as a whole and its basic structure must be argued to give at least some credence to their rational acceptance and thereby their comprehensibility.

Two, Not One, Antecedents

Most people simply live in a world of consequences. The common man has little concern for the antecedents of these consequences and those that do concern him are often pre-packaged and distributed by institutions such as the church, or in a broader sense, theology or heir-ology. Likewise, ethnic heritage, culture, government and basic social orders provide ready-made antecedents to account for the common man's consequences and the rationale for his ability to accept them. In a broader sense, philosophers have often been noted for the explicating of universal antecedents, facilitating the work of the sociologists, anthropologists, psychologists, historians, politicians, educators, and others.

As philosophers, especially the metaphysicians, have often found, there is a point in dealing with antecedents where one confronts a supposedly impenetrable antecedent. This point occurs when one ends up with a single antecedent to account for the basic actuality of all other things. In philosophy this is often noted as a "primitive." A
primitive may be a concept, symbol, or rule that is either absolutely undefinable or undefinable within the system in which it appears. In the latter sense, it is referentially axiomatic. Even though an antecedent is considered axiomatic, that is, "undefinable within the system, but definable within an alternative system," metaphysically one is still at a supposed impasse since all things have been considered in reaching the axiomatic antecedent. The universe has been exhausted or reduced to a basic common denominator whereby no alternative system exists to make the axiomatic antecedent non-axiomatic. For instance, if everything in the universe is reducible to the basic common denominator "A" then there is no "B" in the universe ("B," an alternative system). This has been the very problem the theologians have faced in trying to account for or even describe the existence of a god.

It is an impossibility to describe, explain, comprehend, or account for A by means of or by way of A. That is, whatever is to be explained must not be used as part of the explaining. For instance, we cannot rely upon any statements pertaining to the existence of a painting to explain the existence of that painting. However, if the painting's existence is presupposed or known, then any such statements to that fact can be used in accomplishing other ends; such as, specifically the function of the painting insofar as the function is not equated to the existence. Accordingly, we can use qualities or properties of A to explain, describe, comprehend, or account for other, and necessarily different, A qualities or properties. In other words, we can use A_1 to account for A_2, but we cannot in any sense use A_1 to account for A_1. The ideal objective is of course to locate B in describing, explaining, comprehending, or accounting for A. This would be the case
where the existence of an illustration is utilized to substantiate the existence of a painting. (There are certain laws and principles that directly apply to the utilizing of B to explain A which will be considered throughout the dissertation, especially in the section on "counterness.")

A point of reference to the above method and the perpetual misunderstanding of it is most evident in the arts and even art education. When the artist is questioned about his work he either has nothing to say or he states that it (the work) speaks for itself. Part of the problem is that he is not educated in alternative systems whereby he could utilize B to explain A without, according to him, doing injustice to his work as it exists in itself. As such, and therefore, the artist often remains silent about his work and its relation to the scheme of things, which is of concern not only to his critics but likewise to his patrons. Accordingly, he remains needlessly ignorant about his specific works and how they fit into his own investigative discourse. His philosophy is piecemealed, often realized only by him in his later years by viewing his own life-long project as a single whole.

In art education there are many educators who pride themselves in being so-called phenomenologists without a basic understanding of its various methods and their consequences. Hence, there is a lot of talk about art and education from a purely descriptive approach whereby A is dealt with in, of, and for itself. The result of this is the cry by students, "I don't understand and I'm not learning anything!"

When a single antecedent is dealt with there are epistemological problems, and when metaphysically this is made the reality there is an existence problem. The universe does not abide by, or exist as, a
single antecedent but rather as dual. In this sense, whenever A is considered there is always, and necessarily so, B present. When considering the antecedent of a consequence it is always dualistic.

**Dual Antecedent as the Given and the Corroboration of Magnetism**

There are two major reasons for presenting this section. One, in dealing with metaphysics, especially ideologically, the descriptive content often seems alien to the everyday world, if for no other reason than the metaphysical world is one of antecedents whereas the everyday world is primarily a world of their consequences. A bridge must be either discovered or created between these two **apparently** distinct worlds. Otherwise, the metaphysical content could either be considered not of this world or simply meaningless to this world. There must be a transworld line between the two worlds or simply the realized fact that the metaphysical content already exists in, and as, the everyday world. Magnetism therefore functions in this very sense, as that which corroborates the given metaphysical world. It functions to explicate the metaphysical content, but not to substantiate its truthfulness. To some extent, it makes the metaphysical content empirically evident and meaningful, but not necessarily truthful.

Two, magnetism is translated into symbols so that it may be comprehended simplistically, and further, so that it fully corroborates the metaphysical content. In this sense, an injustice may well be made in regards to our **supposed** knowledge about magnetism, which is shaky, if not extremely limited. Nevertheless, magnetism exists in this dissertation as the B which enables one to comprehend the A—the metaphysical content. This section is not directly about magnetism but simply its
corroboration of Confrontationalism. It is to utilize one universal particular to identify and comprehend another universal particular.

Some may argue, as in the past, that metaphysicians should not construct symbols but rather explain them away. This may be true. Nevertheless, the constructing of symbols is crucial in our perpetuating of knowledge, if for no other reason than symbols incarnate a limited amount of knowledge and therefore are the least contaminated and ambiguous of all the systems of communication. They are the most precise way of communicating and the most effective means of extending common knowledge and ordinary language. It is not that symbols should be translated into ordinary language, but rather made the content of ordinary language and common sense. It is this very thing that education accomplishes when it is at its best.

To begin with, much has been said historically in the name of "the given." This can easily be evidenced in a well-written article by Virgil Hinshaw, Jr., "The Given," wherein he lays out its various usages and implications, along with criteria for its identification. But the core problem with the various philosophical arguments about "givenness" is the failure in specifying the formal characteristics of "givenness" itself. It is this task that will be taken up first.

All givens are either dualistic or monistic, and inclusively, both are present. Depending upon which field of study is of concern, the terminology changes somewhat respectively: biological sciences--polygenistic, monogenistic; communication--dialogical, monological; economics--competitive, monopolistic; physics--dipolar, monopolar. Philosophical terms are generally "dualistic" and "monistic," and since physics
is of concern in this section, the terms "dipolar" and "monopolar" will be used, having respective and equivalent meanings with the philosophical terms.

First of all, it should be noted that in the eighteenth century, Charles Augustin de Coulomb tried to prove the existence of a single magnetic pole. He believed in the existence of an individual pole as the basic unit of magnetic charge.

He did not realize then that such a single pole (now called a magnetic monopole) did not exist, and that it was, in fact, the infinitesimal molecular north-south pole combination (now called a magnetic dipole) that was the basic and indivisible unit of magnetism.

Coulomb's belief in the existence of an individual pole has come full circle today. It may be that few, if any, so-called physicists believe that a magnetic monopole exists, as somewhat evident by the above quote. However, there is much speculation about monopoles in the areas of elementary particles and quark research. (This can easily be evidenced in articles on these subjects in Scientific American.) Accordingly, physicists recognize four basic or fundamental forces, one being "electro-magnetic." Depending upon how "electro-magnetic" is defined, it is possible to combine the monopole theories with the electro-magnetic theories and end up with Coulomb's magnetic monopole theory. An important theory about quarks (quarks are thought to be the basic building blocks of all things in the universe) is made dependent upon "the hypothetical carriers of magnetic charge, the magnetic monopoles."6

All of the theorizing and research about elementary particles and/or quarks should not be dismissed lightly. Russia, Europe, and the United States are spending millions on accelerator laboratories. Most of the funds have been accrued simply in the name of a notion, a
speculation, or a well-developed theory. It may be that those who fund such projects have ulterior motives; nevertheless, there is obviously a great deal of trust in a fruitful outcome. This huge research enterprise can basically be summed up as "researching the ultimate given."

Offhand, the one thing that can be said about the "ultimate given" as viewed by many physicists, is that it is "forces." This is quite a break with the phenomenalistic doctrines spearheaded by David Hume, who believed that all knowledge is reducible to perception. That is, anything that is not an object of perception does not exist. This is explicitly the case with forces such as gravity, since they cannot be perceived. Today the basic principles of physics (elementary particles and quarks) are founded upon fundamental forces, such as electromagnetic, strong, weak, and gravitational. Physicists today are hardly phenomenalists, pragmatists, or empiricists. They might well be called philosophical metaphysicians, since their physics, in its origination, is much more philosophical than traditionally scientific.

Notwithstanding the physicists' belief that the universe is constituted by four forces, it will be argued, rather, that it is constituted solely by—what amounts to—magnetic forces having two distinct properties (essences). This means that it must hold true that electromagnetic force is reducible to the attractive force so characteristic of magnetism. The other forces, the strong and the weak, are already as descriptive of magnetism as anything else.

The two distinct essences, as ultimate givens, will be referred to as "monopole" and "dipole." A particular monopole is a "non-reducible" + (plus) or — (minus). The term "or" is often used in two senses: "exclusive disjunction" and "inclusive disjunction." (It
should be noted that the two senses of "or" in this dissertation do not have the same meaning as in the truth tables used in formal logic, since they are being used here to predicate existence rather than method in establishing truths.) In respect to a monopole, "or" will be used in the "exclusive disjunctive" sense, which will mean that if the $+$ is present, then the $-$ is not present when considering a specific given force. This can possibly be best expressed by the symbol $\lor$ whereby the "$\lor$" means "or" in the exclusive disjunctive sense. The term "non-reducible" means that there is no substructure or antecedent to it. In other words, it is as elementary or primitive a state as can exist, notwithstanding nothingness.

A dipole is different from a monopole in that it is not either $+ \lor -$ , but rather both. This can possibly be best expressed by the symbol $\pm$ (plus and minus). Similar to the monopole, it too is non-reducible. That is, it is not a composite of two monopoles, when considered as a given. A dipole is likewise as primitive a state as can exist (again, notwithstanding nothingness). It is then proposed that there are two primitive states of existence, not just one as often purported. This is not totally counter to the physicists' conjectured model of the universe. (An appeal has been made by some physicists to think in terms of fermions as composites made of bosons. Which would be considered a monopole or a dipole is still being disputed by the physicists since they are having trouble describing, let alone accounting for, the nature of monopoles.)

In summary, "a given" is a force that is either $\lor$ or $\pm$. "The given" or "givenness" is $+$ and $-$ and $\pm$. It is not that these are the only givens, simply that all things must be considered as the
above if they are to be considered in their most primitive state. From the actuality of monopoles and dipoles there are certain universal laws and principles that exist, not consequently because monopoles and dipoles exist, but rather as their existence.

Counterness as an Ultimate Given: Relationship and Interrelationship of Forces

The term "counter" is not at all alien to the arts and art education. But more than that, the concept 'counter' is very imminent and most important to the metaphysic and the epistemic of art and art education whether or not the term "counter" has been used or not. It is hypothesized by this writer that counterness will become one of the most important concerns in the future, not only because it is apt to replace the vague concept 'relativity', but primarily, and at the outset, to enable us to comprehend relativity.

The use of the term "counterness" either predicates the existence of monopoles and/or dipoles in a dyadic state or the actuality of counter per se without specific reference to the dyadic givens. Counterness is a general term entailing three descriptive states: 1) counterpoise, 2) counterpart, 3) counterwhole. Counterpoise simply means forces that are considered exclusively as counter and as forces, + , − , ⊕ ⊖ . A single + in and of itself is obviously not a counterpoise for the reasons that it is monadic rather than dyadic and therefore not in a state of being counter at all. Counterpart means all the above stated under counterpoise, but the forces so considered exist as parts of a whole. Counterwhole is also a counterpoise which may or may not have parts. If it has no parts then it is simply a counterpoise, but given the presence of parts, then it is more complex than a counterpoise, for
the reasons that a counterpoise has no parts. (+, −, ⊗ have been argued to be non-reducible—that there is no substructure or antecedent to them.) Depending upon one's direction of interpretation it is possible to mispurport a counterpart as a counterwhole, but this will be taken up under the actuality of parts/wholes and therein be shown the importance of utilizing the concepts 'counterpoise', 'counterpart', and 'counterwhole'.

Furthermore, counters must be of the same realm and they must have one essential property in common. All else must be different. For instance, + and − are essentially similar in that they are basic forces, yet all other things considered they are different. The same is true with − and ⊗; but it is not the case with + and ⊗ or − and −. Accordingly, general education and art education are counters if and necessarily if they are both wholes or parts (thereby of the same realm), but not if one is a whole and the other is a part, whether or not one is a part of the former or some other whole. They are essentially similar in that they are both "education" but all else considered they must be different. If one is dyadic and the other monadic, then they are likewise counter; but in such a case they are also, and explicitly so, confrontational.

As an additive point, counterness abides by the "either/or principle." The either/or principle means that whatever is considered in terms of black or white, tall or short, for or against, south or north, is respectively different from talking in terms of gray, medium light, indifference, and thirty degrees latitude. The former is the road towards truth whereas the latter is the road towards ambiguity and vagueness. This is the very problem with "relativity."
One sense of "relative" and the importance of it as a concept is that it denotes relation(s). "Thus the word short or the notion of shortness may be called relative because as a monadic propositional function it is vague, while as a relation (shorter than) it is not vague." However, and notwithstanding the value of propositional functions, "A shorter than B" says nothing about the height of either A or B. It simply gives us a sense of A and/or B. As such we abandon the road of truth, or if you will "absolute knowledge," for the sake of supposed communication. But more importantly than that, "relative" or "relativity" asserts that A can be considered in respect not only to B but K, L, Z, . . . n. That is, A has a supposed or possible relation to whatever may exist or however it may exist. This is where counterness differs from relativity. Counterness denotes a given relation or interrelation that makes A associative but not associative or relative to all that exists. For instance, A cannot, be relational if it is interrelational, and A, as a part of one whole, cannot be associative with a part of a different whole. All of this will be argued to be so, not because it is propositional, but rather an actuality, and hence comparatively a weakness in the concept 'relative' for the reasons that it, as propositional, does not abide by the metaphysical.

A relationship and an interrelationship differ in many respects; however, they do have one factor in common, that being the "Law of Association." The concept 'association' has been considered by numerous philosophers since Plato and has about as many usages. It has been used to predicate natural phenomena and psychological phenomena. It has meant a "natural connection" and an "acquired connection." There are also various subvarieties, such as "free association" and "controlled
There is a general Associative Law, at least two arithmetic laws, and four propositional calculus laws.\textsuperscript{15}

Basically, and explicitly in this dissertation, association as a law means that all things in the universe are "dependent" in the sense that no given or formulated can exist without a counter. Were this not true, we could not credit the universe with having a structure. The implications of this would be the inability to identify both universal and particular things. This very fact is brought to bear by P. F. Strawson in \textit{Individuals: An Essay in Descriptive Metaphysics}. Accordingly, physicists today in their theorizing about the confinement of quarks (specifically in consideration of the so-called "string model"), account for this confinement by the existence of a vacuum between the quarks.\textsuperscript{16} This is to say that even nothingness plays an important part. However, it is not associatively a counterpoise, because counterpoise denotes a force and nothingness is not a force. Nothingness, as previously defined in the section on dialectics, is somethingness in a state of contradiction. It likewise follows that it is a contradictory force in itself, conclusively, not a force. Nevertheless, because of its strangeness it \textit{does} count as part of the whole universe. It cannot be excluded because in a general sense that would be to exclude part of the total spectrum of somethingness.

When considering somethingness in respect to nothingness, there exists a relationship, rather than an interrelationship. The distinction to be made between the two is the quantity of forces present. An interrelationship necessitates the presence of two forces rather than simply one. Accordingly, there are only two basic kinds of interrelationships: repulsion and attraction.
The consideration of an interrelationship would most likely be enhanced by illustrating its various facets. With this in mind, let us consider repulsion and attraction as the essentiality of magnetism. Repulsion occurs when two similar forces are coordinated, as illustrated in the figure below.

![Fig. 6—Repulsion](image)

As shown by the arrows (lines of force), similar monopoles repel one another. All of this is a well-known fact and can easily be evidenced by using two common magnets. When two magnets are brought into what is often called "proximity," it is evidential that each asserts a force against the other. However, the commonly used concept 'proximity' is misleading because there is no contrary reason to suspect that the two will not repel one another at any given distance. This is mainly because, in an ideal situation, they would be in a space of nothingness and nothingness, not being a force, would not counteract, or in a sense inhibit, the forces. It is therefore that the term "coordination" was used (prior to Figure 6) and will be used throughout.

There is a further point that should be made in respect to Figure 6. The reader should note that what is true of "a" is likewise true of
"b," except of course in the former case we have $\frac{1}{2}$, and in the latter case $-$. Nevertheless, and the point being, $-\frac{1}{2}$ is a force in its own right just as $\frac{1}{2}$ is. This excludes it from being considered nothingness in any sense. Accordingly, and as will be further shown, it should likewise not be considered "negation" in any sense. It is neither nothingness, negation of itself, nor negation of a $\frac{1}{2}$.

What is true of repulsion is conversely true of attraction (however, notwithstanding that they are interrelated in both cases).

![Fig. 7--Attraction](image)

In the case of attraction, the monopoles must be different. When two such monopoles are coordinated, they assert a pulling force upon one another, decreasing the distance between them. Theoretically there are two possible states to be obtained from an ultimate attraction. First, the two monopoles remain "connected," or "bound," to one another, as illustratively $\begin{array}{c}+ \atop - \end{array}$ (two wholes), or $\begin{array}{c}+ \atop + \end{array}$ (two parts of a whole).

Second, the two become "bilaterally inclusive" of one another. That is to say, $+$ in $-$ and $-$ in $+$, meaning that both exist but only one is present at a given time. This is a situation where $+$ changes to the state of $-$ and $-$ changes to the state of $+$. Possibly, "bilateral inclusion" would come closest to the common education concept 'overlap'. However, there are serious problems with this common concept, which will be discussed later. But for the time being, bilateral inclusion will be
expressed symbolically as ±. In the former case of attraction, the connected or the bound state, the important concept is 'with' and in the latter case of bilateral inclusion it is 'in'. The reader should likewise note that both cases are reducible to their former monopolar states.

What has been said in terms of repulsion and attraction is equally true of the ‒ (dipole).

An ultimate attraction of two dipoles would yield a bound state, illustratively, 】. Furthermore, the two can likewise be in a bilateral inclusive state which would yield, illustratively, ± and ‒. However, in the case of the given, this would be a contradiction because ± is reducible to the two monopoles ‒ and ‒. In other words, bilateral inclusion, in respect to two ‒, would assert that two such dipoles are reducible to four monopoles which is contradictory to the statement made earlier that a dipole is not reducible to two monopoles. However, in later sections, specifically those pertaining to the "formulated" as a concern with reasoning and conceptualization, it will be argued that it is not a contradiction on the basis that the ‒ is likewise a formulated and not just simply a given. In the case of it being formulated, it is possible to have bilateral inclusion, hence reduction. This is an actuality when considering the formulation, but not when it is a given. As such, this will be argued to be the major distinction between
the given and the formulated, or if you will, "nature" and "man." But this matter must be dealt with in later sections since it is precisely therein that the counterness of the two can be exemplified.

In summary, a relationship occurs when a force is associative with nothingness. An interrelationship occurs when two forces are associative either in the repulsive or attractive sense. Relationships and interrelationships, per se, are rightfully counterpoises. This is mainly because they are both directly and explicitly dependent upon association. They have association as their commonality; and yet, they are diversely different. As an additive point, the sense in which the term "association" is employed reveals little about existence, mainly because there is no case of no or non-association. Whatever is claimed has an inherently associative status. It is therefore redundant and comparatively similar (as will be argued) to the concept 'experience'.

What has been argued to this point is that all primitives and/or givens are either monopolar or dipolar, and that the universe is constituted by both. Accordingly, because of the law of universal association, these givens have either a relation or an interrelation of either repulsion or attraction. If it is a relationship then only a single force is in question, and if it is an interrelationship then two forces are necessitated. Hence, according to these principles, the only way a relationship can occur is when a force is associative with nothingness, or "what would amount to as much" which will be taken up in the following section.
Counterness of Experience and Confronting as a Metaphysical and an Epistemological Concern

Experience

To begin with, what continues to be problematic about the nature of experience is that which is so often purported as its counterness. It is problematic that "something else" has been predicated "nonexperience" as vice versa. That is, reasoning, analyzing and other so-called intellectual processes have been designated "a priori." Without such counterness, as previously argued, we would be hard pressed to comprehend any specific or universal. It would be like trying to comprehend darkness without considering light. Granted this necessity, it is however a prevailing problem, and hardly a matter of fact, as to what should be considered a counter of a specific or a universal.

Experience is often discussed in terms of "immediacy," "pervasiveness," and "sensuousness." An experience is believed to be an immediate or pervasive quality which can be directly felt or had. This alone, however, does not distinguish it from intellect. A thought has immediacy or pervasiveness. There is nothing less direct about a thought than an experience. The thought or the reasoning that the moon is round is as immediate as any supposed distinct experiential state. Such a thought of the moon can likewise have as much pervasiveness since it alters my view of myself and in turn changes my social behavior. Accordingly, the thought of a beautiful woman, or idealistic justice, has, if not greater, then assuredly equal sensuousness. One could most likely construct a good argument that God's existence might always be a state of thought or reasoning since, hypothetically, the given presence of such a being is always less idealistic than the thought itself.
Nevertheless, the reader might have detected something strange about the discussion of thought and experience, as immediacy, perverseness, and sensuousness in its logical extension. That is, whatever is considered in the name of thought, reasoning, or any other so-called intellectual discourse carries with it experiential description. Whatever is true of experience (the actuality of experience) is also true of any intellectual discourse. Whenever one thinks or reasons about something, such as the moon, he is accordingly experiencing. This means that we cannot have intellect without experience. Whenever intellect, always experience. This, however, is not the situation when considering experience itself.

"If all species of animals have experiences, and only one species of animal uses language or predicative thought, then it is quite clear that experience can exist independently of thought."18 This is simply to say that if there is a case of experience that is independent of thought then there is experience without thought; but this is obviously not to say that there is thought without experience. All of this is logically known as "A without B, but not B without A," or specifically in this case, E without I, but not I without E.

As a point of reference, had Dewey wanted us to experience for the sake of experience, then he need not have concerned himself with experiential content. However, he was, as pointed out earlier, very much concerned with experiential content. Likewise, he was concerned with experience being intellectually funded. But in arguing first and foremost for experience, his aspiration would never be assured since experience can exist apart from intellect. However, had he argued for intellect, then experience would always be a matter of fact, and further,
the experiential content could as well have been specified. (There is a further point to be considered here, which will be discussed in depth later on. Most people prefer experiencing with minimal intellect mainly because it is the least free state with self-identity. Accordingly, intellect is comparatively painful for most people, if for no other reason than it is the freest state of existence. This whole argument is based on the law of association as it applies to the human monistic and dualistic states of existence.) Nevertheless, and returning to the problem at hand of counterness of experience, the previous discussion does not solely answer the question posed earlier as to whether experience and intellect are proper counters of one another and if they are, in what sense.

As argued, intellect cannot be considered nonexperience. If by intellect we mean that which is nonexperience, and that it is an a priori to experience, then a metaphysical mistake has been made. But if intellect is not nonexperience, then what is? First of all, there is obviously such a state as nonexperience, that being nothingness. But there is also a second type of nonexperience, that being "limbo" which does not fit directly into the concept "nothingness" leading one to assert the existence of two types of nothingness. The rationale for designating an appropriate referent to predicate such a state of nullified experience, other than as simply nothingness, could manifest itself in several ways, such as the presentation of social, historical or political criterion. Nevertheless, the underlying rationale for choosing the designator "limbo" to predicate this second state of nothingness is based upon the prevalence of the concept throughout history and is thought, by this writer, to be descriptive of the situation.
Since in either case nothingness is experience nullified, it is not soundly possible to argue that one could experience nothingness. However, much of Existentialism stands in opposition to this fact as in Camus' The Stranger, Tolstoy's The Death of Ivan Illich, Kafka's Metamorphosis, Sartre's The Age of Reason, and other works. Accordingly, in Michael Novak's The Experience of Nothingness he states that: "'The experience of nothingness' is an experience, not a concept." He further adds, "The experience of nothingness arises when we consciously become aware of—and appropriate—our own actual horizons." As to whether such assertions are sound or not will be left up to the reader's judgment. But one point bears mentioning in respect to the above quote. Michael Novak's usage of "experience" and its purported equivalency with "consciousness" is most unusual, since consciousness is often considered a very sophisticated intellectual process, whereas experience commonly denotes a state of primitiveness. Such equivocations are problematic throughout Phenomenological-Existentialism, and as shall be shown later, have extensive ramifications in the area of education.

Along the same lines, there are authors who assume that it is possible to have experience of experience. Often it is not stated so explicitly but the logical extension of the content amounts to as much. The reader should be cautious of such uttered proclivity mainly because it is widely recognized, and justifiably so, as either redundancy, circularity, ambiguity, or for that matter, all of these combined. This obviously also applies to such other concepts as consciousness of consciousness and awareness of awareness. Furthermore, such arguments uphold one, not two antecedents, and thereby the authors are forced to argue that explaining, describing, comprehending, or accounting for A
must be accomplished by way of A rather than by means of B. This was argued to be fallacious in the section "Two, Not One, Antecedents."

Nevertheless, limbo as nonexperience is different from a strict traditional understanding of nothingness. That is, nothingness in a traditional sense is a nothingness which is in fact "nothing" and is better left undisputed since it does not even have descriptive content much less properties to be considered. Limbo, however, has properties which, as forces, nullify themselves giving rise to "no-force," considered in this dissertation the second type of nothingness that can be described and thereby considered in depth. This will be done later on, in considering epistemology per se.

Since it is possible to have experience without intellect it is then argued that experience has no counter. Experience has limbo (or an equivalent concept) as its ultimate spectrum. An analogy of this would be the consideration of light and darkness. When considering experience in its primitive state it is in a compatible realm with that of light. The problem is then whether "experience is to limbo" as "light is to darkness." Further, and if so, to what extent do experience and limbo correspond to light and darkness?

It is believed by this writer that darkness is "the absence of light"; which is by the way, not an unusual belief. "'The' implies existence as well as universality." And 'absence' implies the condition of no entity. 'The absence' is then the universal existence of no entity. As such, darkness is the nullified state of light in the following way: if light = L, then L and \( \overline{L} \) = darkness. Darkness is therefore not an entity in itself; it is merely the absence of the entity L,
which occurs when entity L is in a state of contradiction. As discussed earlier, this is likewise the definition of nothingness. Darkness is one of the two senses of nothingness.

The total spectrum of each, experience and light, is their existence per se to that of their own nullified existence, not as traditional nothingness, but rather their own "inert" or limbo state. Furthermore, because light-darkness is one entity similar to experience-limbo, they are at least to this extent analogous. They are also both universals and therefore in the same realm, which is necessary if they are to be unquestionably analogous. Furthermore, they are both relations rather than interrelations, and they are both different from association per se since there is no case of no-association or non-association.

In summary, experience is a given force whose full spectrum is limbo, a non-force, rather than intellect as often purported. As such, everything is descriptively an experience except for nothingness. Furthermore, since experience is a force that has limbo as its complete spectrum, it cannot be considered dipolar but rather monopolar. As will be argued in the following section, experience is necessarily a relationship—descriptively a bound state whereby induction occurs giving rise to an opposite force, while all along perpetuating the associative state. Experience will be shown to be a confrontive state, descriptively meaning "to face."

Confronting: A Further Concern with Experience

If the term "confrontation" predicates a situation of being "face to face" then "confront" predicates "to face." There should be little doubt as to whether confrontation does in fact designate a "face to
face" situation. In this matter, there is wide consensus. The same, however, is not the case with the term "confront" and its meaning. As a matter of fact, it is not a widely used term at all. Notwithstanding this fact, what is important here is to have a term that does predicate a monistic situation, so that the counterpoise of confrontation can be accounted for. With this in mind, the term "confront" will serve this purpose most adequately.

"Face to face" is a situation that accounts for two forces and would therefore be an interrelationship. On the other hand, "to face" would then be a relationship since only one force is in question. Experience is then "to face" since it is considered a relationship rather than an interrelationship.

In consideration of objects or things, how is it possible to have a situation of "to face"? To talk in terms of objects or things is to talk in terms of somethingness. How then can we account for the reality of nothingness?

First of all, the concept 'object' entails the concept 'thing'. An object is a thing. That is, when we consider an object we are at the same time considering it as a thing. Even so it is still possible to bracket out a concern with the thingness. To consider an object aside from confronting it as a thing is to presuppose its thingness. Insofar as it were true that thingness is but a single universal entity, no mistake could be made by way of such a presupposition. But since the given is argued to be dualistic, thingness amounts to either + or − and +− and any presupposition as to its nature would therefore be totally unwarranted.
The same however is not true in considering thingness per se. There is a common criticism of this, that being "truth as meaningless." Unless thingness is explicitly extended to its objectness, it lacks apparent praxis for most people. With this in mind, let us first consider experience as a thing and then consider it in its objectness.

A thing, such as a painting, can be said to "not exist," "exist," or "exist qualitatively." If we say that there is no painting, other than the concept 'painting', then we will have no problems with the thing—painting. We may have some problems with the concept, but obviously not with the thing itself. In a similar sense, people do not find the thing "unicorn" problematic, mainly because it appears to exist conceptually. If it is problematic, then it is conceptually problematic. If a thing is claimed not to exist then, conceptual existence notwithstanding, there is no need for further ado.

To the other extreme is the claim that something exists qualitatively. In this situation, demonstrability is problematic in showing that there are in fact certain qualities and that these qualities belong, or make up, the object in question. The identity of each of the qualities is also in question, which compounds the problem in assessing the overall identity of the object. Quality, in this very sense, will be taken up in later chapters, but at this point we are concerned with the given, mainly existence per se, or if you will, essence. Comparatively, the properties of existence are then problematic.

If a painting is claimed to exist, then it has at least necessarily the property of being a force. If this were not the case, then it would be nothingness in either of the two senses. On the other hand, it makes little difference if one were to claim that the painting is
constituted by parts and that each of these parts is in and of itself a different given force. This principle can likewise be corroborated by magnetism. As shown below, a magnet is in fact made up of numerous little magnets.23
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Fig. 9--Parts and Whole

Even though the whole is constituted by parts, the essence of the whole is not altered solely because of that fact. In other words, 1 is still the same integer whether it is claimed to be constituted by 1/2 and 1/2, or 1/4, 1/4, 1/4, 1/4, which is similar to the integer 1 not being a composite of parts. This is to say that the quantity of parts does not determine the quality of the whole. The rationale for this truth is founded by way of "cancellation" and "confronting." This is also to say, as will be argued, that the whole is not greater than the sum of its parts. As shown in the above figure, each of the little magnets (parts) cancels another. This holds true whether it is considered horizontally and/or vertically.24 Cancellation, in this sense, is a form of "inclusion." The parts are inclusive of the whole, amounting to numerical reduction.

The reason for using an arrow between "a," "b," and "c," as opposed to using an equal sign, is that the arrow denotes an "if then" proposition, whereas an equal sign would denote all three to be equal. They are obviously not equal at least on the basis that a whole
with parts is not equal to a whole without parts given the actuality that parts not only cancel one another but that they can exist in a state of equilibrium which results in "inertia" or limbo. Further, a whole with or without parts is not necessarily dyadic. These considerations will have to be taken up later, but for the time being, it is simply best to consider them in the "if then" form to keep the matter as simple as possible.

In respect to confronting, it is impossible to confront more than one thing at a time. It is obviously not impossible for one thing to associate with more than one thing at a time.

In Figure 10, "b," the octagon, is in a state of association with six other octagons. If, at a single instance, numerous associations were not possible, then we could not have cancellation of the parts. But the case of "b" is obviously true and therefore an inclusion of the parts can occur, giving rise to a whole.

In the case of "a," we are either confronted with a "ground," "figure," "figure-ground," or "figure-figure." The terminology and various principles of figure/ground are derived, in part, from the field of Gestalt. The ground would be the aggregation of the pluses and minuses. A figure could either be a single plus or minus, or a series
of them, such as depicted by the octagon shape. However, in all cases we end up only confronting a single entity at a time.

It may seem contrary to say that we can confront a figure-ground or a figure-figure and claim to be only confronting a single entity. Nevertheless, what is confronted in such cases is the interaction or the interrelationship of the two, resulting in a single entity as shown below. Now, it is obviously true that we are in an associative state with the various figures and/or grounds in question. But that is not to say that we are confronting them. What we are confronting is their interaction. Empirically, there are problems in testing this principle, mainly because it is possible to shift back and forth with great rapidity. However, if the reader feels compelled to test this for himself, there are numerous figure/ground illustrations that have a similarity to Figure 10, "a" which can be found in books on Gestalt.

Confronting is different from relation in the sense that it is descriptively a state of "being," such as "animal being" or "human being." Whereas relation and interrelation are universals in the general sense (applicable to all existence), confronting is a universal in the specific sense, mainly the realm of "being."

Along with this, it has been argued that a thing is a single force, whether it has parts or not. Therefore, and in respect to other principles set forth earlier, experience amounts to a thing, as a force,
relating to a "non-force." If an animal, or for that matter a human, is in question, it must then be considered the "non-force." The next concern becomes "how so" and "in what sense" can a human be considered as nothingness.

Construction: An Epistemic Process

If nothingness amounts to a state of contradiction, then there are various ways in which a human could so exist. In the case of $H$ and $\forall$ the whole human would be nothingness. Accordingly, if the human is $-$ and $-$ or $+$ and $+$ in the strict conjunctive-sense, illustratively $\rightarrow$ and $\rightarrow$ then likewise he would be nothingness. A $\rightarrow$ is not simply a conceptual contradiction but likewise a physical contradiction since it is contrary to the principles of existence.

On the other hand, there is an obvious difference between claiming that the total sum of a human is nothingness, and claiming that a human, in part, is constituted by nothingness. Simply because a human is constituted by nothingness does not make the whole of the human nothingness. To argue the contrary would be a "fallacy of composition"; that is, "a fallacious argument in which one assumes that a whole has a property solely because its various parts have that property."25 Conversely, the "fallacy of division" is when "one assumes that various parts have a property solely because the whole has that property."26 On the other hand, one should likewise be cautious of the various arguments purporting that it is always fallacious "that what is true of a part is true of the whole," mainly because it may have been incorrect in the first instance to have supposed a specific part as a part of a whole, thereby making it possible "that what is true of the parts is accordingly
true of the whole." This is why counterpoise, counterpart, and counterwhole are imperative considerations in curtailing a parts/whole fallacy.

With the parts/whole principle in mind, the human can justifiably be viewed as constituted, in part, by nothingness. This nothingness will be considered in regards to a somethingness that is external or outside the human, such as a painting hanging on the wall. As a matter of fact, it could be any external thing. What occurs in such a confrontive situation will be referred to as "construction."

Construction is the "emerging" of somethingness from a contradictory state. Constructing, as emerging, is the alteration of a strict conjunctive state to that of a repulsive state, whereby $\neg\neg$ and $\neg\neg$ become $\neg\neg$ and $\neg\neg$. If the thing painting is predicated a $\neg\neg$ and in a confrontive situation with nothingness, as part of the overall condition of the human, it would seem feasible that two minuses would emerge within the human. One of the minuses can be accounted for by way of induction in a special sense. Induction, again, is the situation whereby $\neg$ is acquired by the presence of $\neg$. Furthermore, in molecular theory a molecule can acquire what is called a "fixed dipole moment" when associating with a molecule already having a fixed dipole moment. Theoretically, the same should likewise hold true with the monopolar state. Given the "fixed dipole moment" and induction, construction in the sense of emerging would seem probable. However, what might be under suspicion here is a monopole giving rise to two similar monopoles when in a confrontive state with nothingness. That is, does it make sense that nothingness, as a state of contradiction, can be brought out of its contradictory state giving rise to two monopoles? The question is really one of whether it is in fact possible to
construct! Now, it should be noted that construction, and not "creation," is under question. If construction is defined in this strict sense, then creation, according to this writer, would not be possible, for creation, if it be thought of as greater, would imply the emerging of somethingness, not out of a contradictory state, but rather a state even wanting of a contradiction. Notwithstanding creation and possible weaknesses in arguing the existence of construction, the "construction principle" is however an ideal means of accounting for phenomena.

One such phenomenon is that of maintaining the attractive situation while enabling change to take place. In consideration of this, let us return to the painting example whereby a given relationship exists between it and a human. This means that the painting is a force and the human is, in part, nothingness. First, this is an attractive situation, descriptively a bound state. Secondly, and since induction and inclusion are given actualities, the human, in regards to his nothingness, can be brought out of his contradictory state giving rise to two similar forces within him. At this stage, the former relation has now become an interrelation because there is the necessary "two force" requirement (the painting and the human). However, since they are different (the painting, a ⊕ and the human, a − − ), they [the painting and the human] do remain attracted to one another. Thirdly, there is also the situation of two similar forces within the human, specifically the minuses, that repel one another. The one − remains attracted to the ⊕ (the painting) while the other must find an associate. There is then a further relation and/or interrelation to be accounted for within the human. Accounting for this second − is rather conjectural but hopefully, as will be shown, not totally unwarranted. This second
— might well account for the qualities so often attributed to expe-
rience—those being "imagining," "pervasiveness," and "sensuousness," among others. Such a consideration will be taken up later but for the
time being the reader should note that the human remains in a bound
state with the painting. Even so, there has been a drastic change, not
only within the human, but likewise in the fact that the relation be-
tween the painting and the human has become an interrelation. Before
extending this case, there is, however, a second possible confrontive
situation of the painting and the human.

The painting could as well be in a confrontive situation with,
not nothingness, but rather somethingness. But since somethingness is
a force, how then could it still be a confrontive situation since it
descriptively necessitates a relationship? If the human is constitu-
ted by numerous forces and these forces are not coordinated in respect
to one another, then the total sum is that of "inertia." He is exter-
nally "inert" in respect to the painting. To illustrate this point, let
us again turn to magneticism.
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Fig. 11--Inertia

If "A" above is somethingness and it will associate with both + and
−, then the various forces within the whole must curtail the whole
from being either — or + or —. The explanation given in magnetism for this phenomenon is the "random orientation" of the various forces within the magnet, resulting in a state of "equilibrium."^28 "The dipoles are all in a state of equilibrium due to the action of their magnetic forces on each other."^29

![Equilibrium and Coordination](image)

Fig. 12—Equilibrium and Coordination

What takes place in Figure 12 "a" is quite different from that of "cancellation" discussed earlier. Cancellation occurs when dipoles are placed adjacent to one another, either side by side or one above the other, giving rise to one long extended dipole. In the case of equilibrium, the various little magnets are randomly distributed nullifying one another. Descriptively, Figure 12 "a" would be an aggregation of numerous forces, or in other words, simply a ground. (It should be noted here that we can have a whole without parts but we cannot have parts without a whole. Parts without a whole are rather not parts at all, but merely numerous wholes. Numerous wholes that are in a state of equilibrium are descriptively a ground. In Figure 12 "b" the various parts cancel one another giving rise to an external force, or in other words, descriptively a figure. When there is coordination, and not equilibrium then rightfully parts and wholes are under consideration. However, when there is equilibrium, and not coordination, then there are no parts and rightfully no wholes but rather an inert ground.)
This second confrontive situation of the painting and the human is rather different from the first. To begin with, in this latter situation we have an explicit case of induction as is prevalent in molecular theory and magnetism. Either way that it is considered, when a magnet is brought close or coordinated with an inert substance (such as in the case of Figure 12 "a") there is a realignment of the various random forces resulting in the curtailment of the state of equilibrium. In other words, the ground becomes a parts/whole existence as depicted in Figure 12 "b". This is to say that when the painting (\( \top \)) is coordinated with the human (inertia), there is a realignment of the forces that constitute the human, resulting in a similar left to right orientation to that of the painting. Accordingly, this is also to say that the whole of the human is coordinated \( \top \), whereas the painting is \( \bot \). Because they have a similar left to right orientation, they are nevertheless associatively different, because in the above case we have horizontally \( a \top \) interrelationship. Even if this is not considered in the dipolar state we still end up with an interrelation of \( a \top \) or as possible in other cases, \( \top a \). All of this, as different from the first confronting, amounts to no internal repulsion in the human, and no construction, because all aspects considered were present to begin with. In a loose sense we might say that there was construction in that a parts/whole was derived from the ground; however, such an occurrence will be argued in later sections to be an aspect of "formulation" rather than construction.

In this latter case of confronting we would have to earnestly ask ourselves how it is that a human can ever become anything more than what he is. Along with this, education, as learning, would be primarily, if
not exclusively, orientation and reorientation as is so prevalent in the therapist/patient, counsellor/student, or even the general educator/student relationship.

Summary

There is little new in having said that the given world is a deterministic world. This however is not the thrust of the thesis but rather the definition of experience as the deterministic. Accordingly, since it is possible to have experience per se as the deterministic, man can live a life simply constituted by experience. Even though it might be argued that experience is the antecedent of intellect, intellect does not automatically follow from a state of experience, at least for one reason that experience is a bound state, whereas intellect (as will be shown) is not. It is therefore that experience per se curtails or prevents, intellect. Furthermore, it does not seem to follow, as many of the phenomenological and existential advocates would have us believe, that experience of the world per se yields truths about the world, or as often phrased, "that which is overwhelmingly experienced need not be questioned." The reasons for this is that when a force is external it is first and foremost a plus whereas when it is internal it is first and foremost a minus. As discussed in the case of the painting and the man, the painting being considered as a single entity is thereby considered externally whereas the man is considered internally. This means that when we are confronted with a thing, such as a painting, we are confronted with the truth in reverse. That is, what we experience is the converse of what is. Therefore, and in standing counter to much of Phenomenology and Existentialism in respect to this
fact, it is true that the subjective world is "the truth," if and necessarily if the subjective is reversed as in reversing a mirror image.

In further consideration of this point let us briefly consider a typical Phenomenological, Gestalt and Existential view of the world expressed by both Matthew Lipman and Kurt Koffka.

But why, when we hear music, do we move to it, and why should we feel ourselves stretched upward when we stand before some magnificent column or tower? Koffka answers that we do so because the music itself sways and the column itself rises. Matthew Lipman and Kurt Koffka claim that the reasons that we move toward music and the reasons we feel ourselves stretched upward when we stand before some magnificent column or tower is because the music itself sways and the column itself rises. Given the fact that the music does sway and the column does rise it does not follow, according to the principles set forth in this chapter, that it is therefore that we experience and thereby come to know. We do not have a similar empathic or isomorphic condition but rather we have the converse inductive condition. We could not even be bound by the music or the column unless the properties, so considered, are opposite. As such, a person bound by a column that rises is in a dual world—a world that rises and his inductive world that recedes—which accounts for the occurrence of experience and the means whereby one can distinguish the truth of the subjective realm from that of the objective realm by conversion.

But in turning our attention away from the specific to the general world view presented, it is possibly the predication of thingness and objectness that might appear strange in light of most contemporary philosophy, such as the common-sense philosophies. However, if by "thingness" we mean simply that which is "given," or if you will,
"givenness," then it might not appear so perplexing. This is mainly because many who would deny such a distinction are quite ready to admit that an object might not at all be as we would purport it to be, as in experience, perception, or conception. If we argue at all, that there is such a possible duality, then the predication of thingness and objectness is hardly an unwarranted one. In a sense, it is simply to bring back the traditional distinction of essence and existence.

As discussed in this section, objects have the essentiality of being fields of forces and as such are predicated things rather than objects. When we bracket out or suspend our predispositions and presuppositions about the world of objects then these objects become things—not at all passive things, but things to be reckoned with. It is not that man can remove himself from such a world but rather that he comprises it or constitutes that very world. However, and since man can only confront one thing at a time, there are obviously many specifics which he is not at any given time bound to.

The world view presented in these sections is one of "inductive construction" rather than simply replacing and/or constructing. The thing does not disappear even if there are no minds to experience it, as in Phenomenalism and Idealism. The thing is not a group or sequence of perceptual sensa, as in Phenomenalism, or ideas as in Idealism, but rather forces. Furthermore, the thing is not an external thing or object which is analogous to a subjective thing or object, as in Realism. It is not analogous on two accounts: first, because the inductive construct is the converse of the external thing; and, secondly, as will be argued, the object, as different from the thing, is not to be found as a given but rather as a mind formulation. Objects are
of the external world if and necessarily if there are minds to construct such objects, which then makes the objects the things extended by mind(s).

Pre-Intuition

Since it will be argued that "objects are things extended by mind(s)," metaphysics has no meaning without the conjunctive consideration of the nature of man. Not only would metaphysics per se be meaningless but likewise the consideration of man himself since, as will be shown, mind is counter to matter and man is constituted by mind. Furthermore, the consideration of man necessitates that man not be viewed as a single entity but rather dualistically, otherwise he is the consequential result of metaphysics rather than consubstantiating it. Hence, at this point it is crucial to consider the metaphysics, explicitly as it exists and manifests itself in the animal world (lower animals and the pre-intuitive state of man).

To begin with, a monistic child finds himself in a dualistic world; however, since it is only possible to confront one thing at a time, the world for him is monadic. Accordingly, and as will be shown, a dualistic child, because of his primordial state—the absence of self-consciousness due to the lack of "boundaries" within him—has the same direction of interpretation as the monistic child. All be it that the dualistic child is born essentially different, nevertheless he exists similarly because he has neither discovered nor developed his differences. For these reasons, and the socially practical reasons in treating all alike to maintain the monadic direction of interpretation whereby the monistic philosophies or so-called philosophies are proliferated, the dualistic child is consequentially in a compromising
situation. But before getting into this and the descriptive content of intuition itself as a boundary, it is first necessary to consider pre-intuition in regards to the human child as a member of the animal kingdom, for at this point, at least, there is no distinction to be made between lower animals and the human, given the reality of the dualistic child mentioned above.

First of all, an organism is always in a state of readiness to confront its environment long before specific features of the environment have been apprehended. Furthermore, the Gestalt principle that organisms always confront first the whole and then possibly its parts is adhered to in this dissertation. However, it is adhered to on the basis not of Gestalt arguments, but rather metaphysical ones. That is, we confront the whole first and foremost because it is only possible to confront one thing at a time. Conjunctively, since the existence of a whole having parts is not a whole without the actuality of cancellation of its parts, then if a whole exists there has been cancellation of its parts. In a related sense, it is also to say that two inorganic substances, when in a state of association, have the status of two wholes. Conclusively, wholeness is not an organismic or organoleptic actuality first and foremost, but rather a metaphysical one. It is not something done exclusively by an organism but rather something that exists prior to the organism's encounter of it.

If an organism does not confront some external situation at an early age, then it will cease to exist. This must be true for the reasons that in a primordial state self-confronting is impossible since it is monadic. Furthermore, for an organism to remain an organism or to be extended to something more, confronting is necessitated.
Confronting is an organismic necessity. If it is not an extreme case of isolation, then what most often happens in a later development is an inadequacy to respond to external stimulation. However, it may be an overstatement, or an ambiguous statement to say that "without confronting some external situation at an early age, then the organism will cease to exist." If it is asserted that the organism will cease to exist in every sense of the term then it is false, because to say that no confronting occurs is not to say that no associating occurs.

If the organism is denied association, then it ceases to exist on the grounds that metaphysically a contradiction exists resulting in nothingness. If confronting is denied, then it is correct to state that the organism, as a developing being ceases to exist or even ceases to exist as an organism, but not that total existence has ceased. For this, again, would necessitate the state of no association which is, in a strict sense, an impossibility as argued in earlier sections for the reasons that nothingness has a special associative status.

Even though an organism might not confront things in the world, it nevertheless associates continuously. This is not only an analytic given but supposedly empirically verifiable. Such research and findings have come to be known as "hypermnesia under hypnosis." This is an experiment whereby a subject is brought into a strange room for a few minutes. When asked subsequently to list every item that he has seen, he will reproduce twenty or thirty items. However, under hypnosis he will go on to reproduce another two hundred items. As is evident, association, in and of itself, is not consciousness, or even awareness. It is simply a limited process of becoming or maintaining one's existence which can result in inductive construction.
On the other hand, in cases where confronting has been greatly reduced, such as under experimental conditions for a period of several hours, there appears to be a measure of disorganization in the individual's thought processes. Typically there is some measure of disorientation, impairment of problem-solving ability, and other symptoms of lowered integration. In certain cases, there is the presence of delusions and hallucinations. And yet, such individuals also become more receptive to information that is received. Further studies have also shown that brains in rats increase in weight and thickness of tissue when they are exposed to an enriched environment relative to those rats with a dull environment. Other studies have shown that maturational development in baby pigtailed monkeys is severely retarded when they are deprived of an enriched environment.

The reliability of these studies is not under consideration in this dissertation. On the contrary, they are accepted at face value for the purpose of corroborating the metaphysical content herein. But since these studies over the years have had a direct and extensive influence on education, they deem special consideration. The findings of these studies apply only to the "primordial" state of being, yet, extensively so. To assume anything else is to be guilty of the fallacy of generalization. This is because some species of animals develop beyond the primordial state and hence are thereby able to "self-confront." It is believed by this writer that all humans are eventually able to self-confront. This is a prominent reason for predicating them as such. In such a situation of self-confronting, external confronting is no longer a vital necessity as one would think and be led to believe by the studies stated above. A marked and measured distinction between
a primitive animal and a human is precisely the degree to which external confronting is necessitated if at all. Since confronting, and most assuredly external confronting, is not "intellect," then any perpetuation of such a state—for the reasons that it is a bound state—becomes a curtailment of intellectual growth.

At least in the last twenty years, the educational scene has been predominantly geared towards confronting in and of itself, and mainly so external confronting. There have been admirable exceptions; however, throughout the elementary level all the way into higher education, it has been the teacher's and educator's major pasttime as his or her misinterpretation or misapplication of the Deweyian philosophy.

It has also been the rationale and the means for the student to "enjoy himself" wherefrom learning would supposedly become an actuality. On these accounts, the educational system has obviously not been guilty of letting the child "waste away." On the other hand, and in the same regard, the educational system has also not been responsible for extending the child beyond the "baby pigtailed monkey state." Part of the problem is that when one finds new research, such as these studies cited and many more which give explicit and direct credence to development, they are often applied extensively. Hence, their argued acceptance as educational practice and their educational credibility results in "experience," "awareness," "intellect," and "consciousness" being redefined. As evident over the last twenty years, "consciousness" has come to mean "being with one's environment," or to put it in different terms, consciousness has become synonymous with the term "imprinting." As indicative in transcendental meditation, consciousness has become a non-analytic, non-reflective state of existence, no different from
basically a baby pigtailed monkey who bends and sways with the bars of its cage.

Along the same line has been the widely accepted and integrated Gestalt principle of "no boundary." Gestalt is to the Western part of the world as transcendental meditation has been to the East. The Gestalt principle that awareness cannot be a reality unless and until boundaries have either been removed or at least penetrated is fully accepted by this writer. However, to argue in the same light that consciousness cannot be a reality given boundaries is again to misunderstand consciousness. Boundaries may well be problematic for some, such as those who have erected them resulting in unwanted alienation from society, descriptive of neurotic or psychopathic conditions. But to argue that these people should abandon the constructing of boundaries, as different from arguing that they should not construct specific boundaries, is to argue for a non-human condition. That they should exist as merely an organism bound by the wishes and desires of society or the enslavement of nature is to argue for such a non-human condition. The negation of boundaries may well reintroduce the alienated human into society but not as a conscious member, since consciousness necessitates—as will be argued—boundaries. The educational scene has ill-advisedly capitalized on these findings. It has adopted the Gestalt arguments that since a child has no, or at least few, boundaries and as such is socially healthy, flexible, quick to respond and learn, then the same prevailing conditions in an adult should likewise follow. This, however, is simply to bracket the adult to the child state. It is not the increasing of the capacity to learn but rather the removing of learned content for the purposes of the individual becoming more
receptive to incoming information. Ironically, this very method is one of the best means of perpetuating and accounting for incidental educational success. Obviously, however, in the long run there is no intellectual growth or maturity.

Furthermore, this educational method is also suspect, not only in its own perpetuation and accountability, but in regards to its argued rationale that an intellect—a well-educated person—is one who is open, flexible, and accepting, to given conditions. Since an intellect is one who knows, and knows some truths, then he cannot be open, flexible and accepting of whatever exists. Truth and/or "knowledge" is not relative. He cannot be tolerant or even appreciative of certain ideas and concepts, especially if they undermine his own knowledge. Such a person will undoubtedly exhibit boundaries and must, in his own mind, have boundaries whereby he can expound either/or(s). For without such an ability, or capacity, his knowledge would become contaminated.

In the American educational scene, at least within the last twenty years, such a person has been ridiculed as an "idiot" rather than commended as an intellectual for the reasons under suspect here—that for education to do its job and to do it well it must define an intellect as one who is open and flexible. All of this adds further weight to the educational arguments that consciousness should be viewed as simply a state of awareness and that consciousness occurs when boundaries are removed. Paradoxically, this maintains the primitive state or on the other hand, deems bracketing of oneself necessary so that the primitive state is adhered to. All of this become the perpetuation of the monistic state of being, the acceptance and furthering of common sense and ordinary language. It makes man a practical
creature, obedient to social expectations and fearful of consequences. Stated in its general sense, it makes man "god fearing." In such a context, he is only "free" to the extent of being free to choose from the monistic smorgasbord. He is not able to choose or not choose the monistic way of life for the very reasons that the alternative, Dualism, is predicated idiocy, and conjunctively, the consequences of being ostracized from society. Pluralism is of course offered as the alternative to Monism, but it is not an alternative since it simply reduces to the monistic smorgasbord. But before getting further into all of this, let us again return to the roots of metaphysics in man for it is here, ultimately, that the nature of the problem lies.

Associating and confronting are worlds of no boundaries. It is precisely therefore that they are bound states. Descriptively, it is like the situation where a chicken is put in a detour situation, yet, is unable to discover the roundabout path for the reasons that food has been placed behind a transparent fence. The "chicken will be captured" or bound by the food. Lower animals are often bound by external stimulation to the point that if making a detour was necessary in reaching food they would starve to death right in front of it. The key problem here is making a "detour" for it implies departing from an object of attachment to get closer to that very object. This can be carried further by stating that often in everyday living we must discover means to depart from a desired attachment if we are to attain a more direct relation with a given situation.

But how is it possible to explain the change from a bound state to that of a non-bound state whereby, for instance, the chicken gets to the other side of the fence or for that matter, a human departing from
a painting's attraction. This is the very problem in understanding "change," "freedom," and "choice making." In their limited sense (later to be discussed in their extended sense), change, freedom, and choice making are all made possible, and necessarily so, by the actuality of association itself—a bound state. Off hand, this may seem like a strange assertion, if not a contradictory one. Nevertheless, it will be shown not to be contradictory and argued to be feasible in three different ways.

If the reader will recall in the section on construction, it was argued that given a painting, force plus, and a human, constituted in part by nothingness, two minuses would arise under the inductive construction principle. One minus remained attached to the plus of the painting whereas, hypothetically, the other minus was simply considered as possibly accounting for "imagination," "pervasiveness," and "sensuousness," so often attributed to experience. Furthermore, this second minus was in need of an attachment (all things must associate). In consideration of how one becomes unbound from a thing, let us extend this case of the painting and the human.

First, every force that alters from a part to a whole or vice versa, changes its identity (from — to +, or + to —). In the case of the painting and the human the plus of the painting changes to a minus when constructed within the human since it exists in the human as a part where formerly it existed as a whole. Under the principle of conversion, a force can be converted to its opposite state or in this case its former state. However, this necessitates either the transfer of a force across a boundary or the transfer of a force from the status of a part to a whole which in some situations is different from simply
moving across a boundary. Even so, and in this present case of the human, considered in a primitive state or pre-intuitive state of no boundaries, the transfer could only be that of part to whole. Thus, the former minus attained from the presence of the plus (painting), when transferred from the status of part to whole, is transferred from an internal state to an external one, whereby two pluses exist externally. In such a situation, the human will be repelled in regards to the painting since similarities oppose each other. In a sense, this is descriptive of a person "becoming the thing confronted" resulting in the change of a bound association to an unbound association, and as we shall see, finally no association with the specific in question, like the painting.

The discussion and use of the term "transfer" in the previous paragraph is very indicative of 'projection'. Furthermore, the term "projection" is often used by non-art people to describe the activities of the artist. It is also used as criticism of art and art education as fields that project characteristics onto the world. Such criticism of art and art education as endeavors and discourses of projection must be viewed in light of scholars in other fields who are familiar with, if not abiding by, either Phenomenalism, Realism, or Idealism. None of these philosophical camps and their advocates would place much value or meaning on discourses of projection since it does not, as they see it, address actuality. Even though "transfer" is held to be "projection," as projection it is as factual, truthful as any epistemological endeavor since analytically the projected force is essentially identical to the external thing. Accordingly, it accounts for our ability to separate ourselves from any specific bound state without altering the thing in question. And yet, the human, in having separated himself from such
a particular, finds himself confronting yet another thing since association is continuous. Hence, he remains but changing, free, and choosing within a given system, to this point a very limited sense of the three. But let us now look at a second possible means of attaining an unbound state from the bound state.

Second, all things can be in more than one associative state at a time. Thus, it is possible for the human not only to be associating with the painting, but with, let us say a tree, as well. Accordingly, it is possible to switch from the painting to that of confronting the tree while being in a state of association with both. Such alteration of back and forth confronting might well be what has come to be known in Existentialism as angst (anguish) or even dissonance argued by many existentialists to be descriptive of the existential mode.

As obvious from the above, it is also possible to have a ternary or even a quarternary situation. But in any case, confronting remains singular. In consideration of motion and change, which is dependent upon a bound state becoming a non-bound state, it would seem feasible that the shift from confronting the painting to confronting the tree, along with being associative with let us say a chair, would "override" or on the other hand "undermine" the associative state with the painting, enabling disengagement from it. This can be further strengthened by the principles that things are attracted towards that which is opposite, or the very thing one is not, and repelled by similarities, in this case that which has already been encountered.

Were we to consider all of this in light of choice making and preference in confronting a specific from an array of associational states it might fall under the topic "curiosity." Curiosity seems to
exist in situations where diversity is the main factor. For instance, a monkey will repeatedly open a window to watch from his cage as long as something is happening outside. Strongest desire is glimpses of another monkey, a moving train is a close second, and a non-moving object is last. It is fairly easy to account for the fact that motion is a confrontive preference on the basis that it is the interrelation of the thing in regards to its setting which is confronted, and not the thing in and of itself. Hence, in such a situation the monkey is in fact confronting a multitude of associational states, and that choice is rather unintentional on his part. But what about the desire to see another monkey, whether or not it is in motion? The fact that species prefer to confront their own kind first and foremost seems to dispute the principle that opposites attract. However, it does not. Its full consideration must await the section on intersubjectivity and its counter intra-subjectivity. For the time being, the thrust of the argument will be that epistemologically or inductive constructively, a member of one's own species remains most mysterious.

In this second possibility, as distinct from the first, there is no conversion and therefore no projection. Associating with numerous things at one time and thereby switching one's specific confronting results in anguish and in dissonance. The individual moves and changes in accordance with the associative status of the external field of forces. Descriptively, he is totally at the mercy of his environment like a puppet pulled and shoved by the puppeteer. He is entrapped in the natural standpoint, the monistic world.

Even if we considered all of the above in regards to a human who is not constituted in part by nothingness, the result would be
identical. As discussed under the topic "inertia," in the section "Construction: An Epistemic Process," an individual can be in a state of equilibrium whereby he does not constitute an external force. In either case, internal equilibrium or associating with numerous things while switching specific confronting, the result is that of no conversion and no projection, and therefore, situations of anguish and dissonance. Anguish and dissonance are descriptively states of equilibrium. But let us now briefly indicate the third possible means of attaining an unbound state from the bound state which is, by the way, the most explicit.

Third, since, and as will be argued in the next sections, it is possible to construct boundaries or be constituted by boundaries, as with the dualist, it is therefore possible not only to associate but to confront, converse, and project as well in regards to oneself. Association, as a bound state, therefore, becomes associating with oneself, the freest and most changing of all states possible. This third possibility will be a long and extended discussion, mainly because there are two senses of the "other" and accordingly two senses of the "self." Before considering explicitly motion, change, freedom, choice making and self-development again in regard to this third possibility, intersubjectivity and intra-subjectivity must be considered.

Intersubjectivity

The descriptiveness by many psychologists on child behavior is most confusing. Some argue that the child is alienated, if not simply selfish. Others argue that the child exists in a communal state of no differentiation. To add further confusion to all this, there are
stages or steps of development that seem to have no quantitative end. In this section on intersubjectivity, psychological data will not be used, but rather the metaphysical laws and principles already set forth along with their extension. Much of the basis of intersubjectivity will be existential, not simply because it is non-psychological, but more so because, to some extent, it corroborates Confrontationalism.

The child exists within a society of monads whereby his own ego cannot (by him) be distinguished from others. He exists in a community of egos. The child exists in a world where there is not one individual over against another, but rather an anonymous collectivity, an undifferentiated group life. The child is unaware of himself in his absolute difference; for he is unaware of others in their own separateness and is no more conscious of them than of himself. The world of the primitive, or if you will the child, is a fairly undifferentiated continuum, a blur of activity. It is a world of no boundaries.

At first, the child imitates not persons but conducts. (Conduct is different from behavior in that it is humanized, or if you will, individualized. It is humanly systematic.) This process of imitation can simply be referred to as "role adoption." The process of adopting roles continues throughout an individual's life but it becomes less explicit since the added role is relatively small compared to what has already been acquired. As such, mimicking, imitating, or role adopting do not per se result in consciousness; they do, however, exemplify consciousness since its source is "conscious behavior"—conduct. For instance, a child of four or five years has a tendency to exclaim "I know" in response to almost everything that he is told; or further, an
adult who claims and behaves according to an intuitive thought or feeling of knowing without being able to objectify, analyze or apply that which is being purported to be known. The expression of knowing would be ambiguous as to what is being claimed as consciousness, the statement itself ("I know"), or that which the statement predicates. Consciousness of the statement "I know how to tie my shoes or express my feelings in paint" may only exemplify consciousness of the statement itself and not what it predicates. The 'proof of the pudding' is being able to eat and taste the pudding similar to being able to tie one's shoes or express one's feelings in paint and not simply the statement itself of knowing. We may say, then, that an individual can broaden his ego by merely adopting roles that imply consciousness, but it is, if at all consciousness, solely limited to statements.43

It is like a cat watching another cat who is responding to signals and pressing levers at the correct time. As noted by Dr. E. Roy John and his colleagues at the brain research laboratory of New York Medical College, that if a cat was given the chance to watch another cat perform, it would learn to perform correctly on almost the first try.44 The cat, like a young child, discovers (unconsciously) his own existence assimilated in another place in time and space. The cat does not see another cat as such; he merely senses his own existence, his own determined potential as an object of reflection. It is similar to a child who might see himself in a mirror, not knowing that the reflection is himself nor that it is something different from himself. Because the cat exists and behaves differently in two places, and yet is not totally separate, this would imply that the learning taking place is of an assimilative association. The behavior belongs to both cats
since neither distinguishes itself from the other. As Merleau-Ponty argues, there are basically two modes of being, and only two: being in itself, which implies objects arrayed in space, and being for itself, which implies consciousness. In the case of animals or very young children who cannot or who do not distinguish themselves as different from their own kind, their existence is not that of consciousness and should merely be envisioned as an existence of in itself. Furthermore, it should not be envisioned as intersubjectivity since basically the parties concerned exist as a single entity.

But more than that the descriptiveness of in itself, as that of a cat adopting the role of another cat by simply confronting its behavior, seems rather limited, if not to miss the point. To say that the one is with the other would be more predictive, as Gabriel Marcel makes clear in the following.

... one might say that it is the relationship expressed by the proposition with that is eminently intersubjective. The relationship that with expresses, here, does not for instance really apply to the world of objects, which, taken as a whole, is a world merely of juxtaposition. A chair is alongside a table, or beside it, or we put the chair by the table, but the chair is never really with the table in this sense.

In the situation of the cat being with the other cat, it is a state of "bilateral inclusion" (±), as was briefly discussed in the section on counterness. Obviously, bilateral inclusion makes no claim to boundaries existing which is important not to assert at this primitive state. The cat or the child is simply in a community of no differentiation whereby confronting the "other" is simply confronting the "self." As such then, the other is the self-as-an-assimilation.

But to say that with is descriptively a state of the self-as-an assimilation is basically to say what was asserted under in itself.
If they are merely "differences without a distinction," then, why should one be anymore descriptive of intersubjectivity than the other? In light of what will be argued, with is more intersubjective than in itself, but, and very importantly, with is a consequential state of intersubjectivity. The state of in itself is antecedinal, but it is not directly antecedinal to with. In itself is antecedentially descriptive of the monistic world whereas with is consequentially descriptive of the dualistic world. For "and" against are the antecedinal state of with, thus, the antecedinal of the dualistic world.

First of all, the "and" of for and against should be understood in the inclusive disjunctive sense, for were it to be viewed in the conjunctive sense then it would simply be with. The question might arise, "Why not simply use an 'or'—for or against?" In doing this, the ambiguity has not been resolved, for there are two senses of "or," exclusive disjunctive and inclusive disjunctive. Likewise, if for exists, then against also exists; that is, never one without the other, which is best expressed by the conjunctive "and." Furthermore, there is an already-established tradition of using "and" in the case of for and against to be understood in the inclusive disjunctive sense, specifically that of Jean Paul Sartre's writings. Therefore, let us briefly turn to some of the views on this topic expressed by Sartre.

Conflict, in Sartre's terminology, is the other thinking and willing "for and against me." Being for and against the other is the perpetuating of intersubjectivity whereby one can come to decide and comprehend what one is and conjunctively what others are. As Sartre states, ". . . descriptions of concrete behavior must . . . be envisaged within the perspective of conflict. Conflict is the original
meaning of being-for-others." The For-others involves a perpetual conflict as each For-itself seeks to recover its own Being by directly or indirectly making an object out of the other." In conflict, one recovers the self as a "project of absorbing the other," as a concern with the other. Conflict can be described as an absorbing of one another's reflections of the other, in the sense that I see what he sees and thereby I can choose by what he has chosen in perpetuating the interrelationship of similarities and differences.

The discovery of the world of intersubjectivity, according to Sartre, is a simultaneous discovery of the self and the other. The one is a necessary constitution of the other. This is to say that I cannot claim to exist prior to, or inspite of, other's existing. If I'm able to say anything about myself it is because others exist. The term "because" is not intended to imply a causal relationship here. Sartre does not say that one causes the existence of another, nor that because I exist, others exist (it is non-solipsistic). On the contrary as Sartre states, both emerge at the same time if they emerge at all.

Intersubjectivity is, then, the affirmation of "... each Other finding his being in the Other." This is made possible in that the other is "given to us" by a direct apprehension or the encountering of its character as one's own characteristic. In other words, it is the "seeing" and "being seen" that exemplifies apprehending the other and the self, according to Sartre.

However, as with all specific confronting, intersubjectivity can likewise terminate. The other revealing himself to me can put me in an awkward or threatening situation. For instance, if I recognize his actions, I have seen or understood them as mine, which would then lead
to my suspicions that in fact I have revealed myself. An example of such a case where the "tables are turned" might be something like: a child tells me that he has masturbated, and I acknowledge what he has told me by some sort of reflection. He is then in a position to re-reflect upon me by way of saying, "Oh, then you have also masturbated."

If, on the other hand, I can somehow ignore or degrade the other in his revealing himself to me "... I have (then) transformed the Other's possibilities into dead possibilities by affecting them all with the character of 'not-lived-by-me' ... ." I have then put the other out of play. I have removed him from the world of intersubjectivity. This would be an action of pride— or vanity— as Sartre uses the terms; it would be a feeling 'without equilibrium' and would be in bad faith. "In vanity I attempt in my capacity as Object to act upon the other."51

When an individual sees the other from the point of vanity, he becomes alienated from that other, which is to say that the process of intersubjectivity has ceased. In such a situation there is no longer a state of reflecting upon the other and the self. But since intersubjectivity is a two-way relationship—an interrelationship—it is possible that the other, who is not in bad faith, might recover the intersubjective process for both. If the one who has been put out of play acts momentarily independent of my actions, he will be in a situation of reinstating intersubjectivity—which is to say, that he opposes my actions. As such, conflict is re-introduced and the situation of being-for-the-other.

All of this is by no means easy to follow. One needs but read Sartre's Being and Nothingness to realize this fact. But hopefully in
considering the laws and principles already laid down in this dissertation, it will be easier to comprehend, whether or not it explicitly coincides with Sartre's views or even those of other existentialists.

To begin with, we are drawn to the other not only because there seems to be more of him, or her, than meets the eye, but because what meets the eye seems to be a property of oneself as well. In this sense, we are drawn to a different self, discussed previously under in itself. We are attracted to the other because he is different, either as a different I (self) or as a different human being or simply a particular human being as depicted in Figure 13 by the + and the −. In confronting the other as a plus, there emerges within the self two minuses. Inductive construction has occurred. If I project my conceived state, then I reveal to the other that I am in possession of his character (the +). This will be evident to him at the point where
repelling occurs in Figure 13 by the two pluses. When we are repelled, the other cannot but conclude that his character is possessed by me and/or that I do not value it since we are in a state of separation or aversion. In a sense, he would be saying, "Why have you taken my character?" and/or "Why don't you value it?" At such a point I am viewed as against him. Furthermore, I must oppose this very view of his for the interrelation to continue. Given this, conflict is then re-introduced and the whole thing occurs again but in respect to different content and possibly reversability of self and other.

There is a fear in confronting the other not because he or she is different, but rather the consequences that must necessarily follow from the other acquiring one's own attributes. It may well be troublesome for many at least to share or have their character possessed by another, but even more than that, it is the result of all of this—the terminating of the interrelationship—that fosters the greatest trauma for most people. (It is different depending upon whether monists or dualists are considered, which will be taken up in the discussion of intra-subjectivity.) The curtailment of intersubjectivity leaves one in an associative state with the natural standpoint and, as possible, momentarily in a non-confrontive situation. It is like the fall of Icarus. As Jose Ortega Gasset argues, man is purely and simply danger—danger in the sense of being beside the self which is the falling back to the environment becoming again determined by it and more so dehumanized. Man is continuously living with the danger of ceasing to be man; not like the tiger who cannot stop being a tiger, but like a culture that can decay from within or be ruled by history, as Gasset argues. But as with the question, Is it better to have loved and lost
than never to have loved at all? so is the dilemma with a fallen human-
ist of whether he should have remained a naturalist. The risk seems
worthwhile; yet, more than that, it is not completely a matter of an
individual's choice since it is not just he who provokes the intersub-
jective state, but as well "the other." Like an environmental thing,
such as a rock, the other pulls the self into an intersubjective state.
It is in this sense that Sartre states that "Hell is other people" for
the reasons that one cannot escape the other if one is to remain human.
Accordingly, it is also in this very regard that Gasset argues that the
tiger cannot but remain a tiger, whereas a human can fall from his ex-
estence. There is, however, an alternative for some, which will be
discussed under intra-subjectivity. But before intra-subjectivity is
taken up, it is necessary to make a few extended remarks about the in-
dividual who is not constituted in part by nothingness.

As considered earlier, it is possible for an individual to exist
in a state of equilibrium whereby he is inert, evidenced by his capac-
ity to associate with both plus and minus. In this regard, the
"other" is not a force. He is no threat to the self. He asks many
questions and finds many things interesting. He is very open minded,
flexible and always wanting of companionship and dialogue. He is by
all means a good student! Yet, because of his condition there is no
interrelationship but rather a relationship. Hence, there is no inter-
subjectivity either. The other of an intersubjective state is counter,
not to the inert person of a relationship, but rather the other of an
intra-subjective state when considering interrelationships.
Intra-Subjectivity

Where confronting the environment is simply a relationship, confronting the other can be an interrelationship. If it is not, however, then it is as detrimental as relating with the environment. The content is obviously different in that in confronting the other, one does not simply confront a natural and limited schema but rather human conduct. When it is an interrelationship, it can either be a situation of for and against (the antecedinal) or with (the consequential). If it is with, there is little difference between it and in itself or, for that matter, a relationship with the natural standpoint and common sense. Only in the sense of being for and against can it be an interrelationship.

But even so, and for the reasons discussed, this is a limited state of motion, change, freedom, choice making, self-development and social development in regards to what can be accomplished in the state of intrasubjectivity as will be argued. Obviously, the inability to recognize or accept the situation of for and against in an interrelationship leads one to conclude that it cannot, or does not, exist intrasubjectively. The consequences of such a possibility are detrimental, not only to the individual, but likewise to the social system for it curtails motion, change, freedom, choice making, self-development and social development in their most explicit and maximum states. Furthermore, and as will be argued, it not only prevents the "art process" but aligned with this, "intellect."

In the situation of in itself, one is assimilated with the other whereby the other is the self. This is not a state of intersubjectivity. In intersubjectivity, the other must exist separate from the self such that he remains the other and not the self. Contrary to this, in
intra-subjectivity the other, as the self, must not only exist separate from the self but necessarily so by way of a boundary. Neither inter-subjectivity nor intra-subjectivity are states of being beside the self as discussed by Gasset, since being beside the self is a deprivation of oneself. Intra-subjectivity is a state of being face-to-face with oneself whereby "to" means for and against. Furthermore, intra-subjectivity is a humanly dualistic state, characteristic of an interrelationship. If the intra-subjective state is interrelated with a monistic state, then it is also a confrontational state since a relation is counter to an interrelation.

Since both subjects of an intra-subjective state are oneself as shown in Figure 14 above, self A can be for self B, and self B can be against self A and vice versa. In this regard, for and against must be
considered in the conjunctive sense for the reasons that it is con-
sidered only as the self and in no respect to another. Conclusively, this
is to say that the self can be both for and against the self at the same
time. It is to say that the self is (dualistic). This is not a con-
tradiction in existence. But again, why does all of this not simply end
up being in itself or rather with the self? This is precisely what
would happen were it not for the fact that a boundary prevents the two
from such a final conjunctive state. Without a boundary, there would be
no dualistic being since the separateness of oneself would "collapse."
This is precisely what happens to parts of a whole in their giving rise
to the whole as a single force, noted previously as cancellation. The
parts cancel one another for the reason that no boundaries exist. In
an intra-subjective state the two selves cannot cancel one another;
therefore, it also follows that when one is in an intra-subjective state
he or she is not an external force, to something else. (This is also
ture on the grounds that one can only confront one thing at a time. In
the above situation one is already face-to-face with oneself.)

Relevant to this, the Gestalt argument for no boundaries has no
praxis in a dualistic actuality. It is, however, threatening to an intra-
subjective state given the reality of bracketing or suspending of one-
self. Furthermore, given today's technological advances in therapy,
psychology and psychoanalytic treatment such as shock therapy or chemical
therapy, it is hypothetically possible to curtail one's given or created
boundaries. One must be cautious in not purporting intra-subjectivity
as "dual personality" or "schizophrenia" as they are psychologically
understood. It might well be that either psychological condition
necessitates a state of intra-subjectivity; however, that is not to say that they are one and the same. Likewise, one should not think in terms of dual or split brain. Intra, as with inter, is argued from the point of mind—mind as force—not at all from the point of brain. Furthermore, the Cartesian mind/body dualism has little to do with this chapter. Later on, under the topic "intellect," the relation of the two will be briefly considered, but for the time being, let us consider some implications of the actuality of intra-subjectivity.

It is possible in intra-subjectivity for double projection to occur, hence, also double conversion. After an inductive construct has emerged in the first self it is possible for it to be projected to the second self, and outwardly projected from there. This is obviously not possible in an intersubjective process. This double projection and conversion of intra-subjectivity makes Nietzschian aesthetics possible as discussed in Chapter III in the section on Dialectic Aesthetics. As stated earlier, aesthetics, according to Nietzsche, is the exit or escape in Existentialism, whereby man can face the actual world and attempt to move beyond it. As Nietzsche states, this is all made possible because the artist cannot tolerate reality, whereby he creates unity by rejecting the world. He creates an illusion, an "ivory tower" wherein reality, the absurd, can be ignored. The artist presents a "fake" world because he is able to "lie."

It is, however, misleading to say, as Nietzsche does, that the artist presents an "illusion," "fake world," and a "lie." In double projection, that which is finally projected is the human state, the human interpretation of the world. It is the converse of the outward world given expression. It is the counter to the outward world. Counterness
is a given actuality, it is not a "fake," "illusion," or a "lie." However, if we expect, as Camus' and Marxists' aesthetics unjustifiably expect, the human situation, exemplified by art, to be identical with the outward world, then it does become a "lie." But that is in itself a "lie" because it denies counterness as an actuality. One might expect "illustrations" to be assimilated with their sources, but as will be argued later on in the chapter on art and the artist, illustration is counter to art.

Even so, and notwithstanding Nietzsche's misleading terms and his argument that it is based on Nihilism, Nietzsche was at least able to see how an individual could transcend—exit—the existential dilemma. He understood that at least some are able to escape the natural standpoint and common sense. This is true for those who are dualists; who can have an intra-subjective actuality. They do not need, by necessity, to confront nor associate with anything outside themselves which is the strongest sense of freedom. In this regard they are also able to change the world for others who are tied to the natural standpoint—the entrapment.

From all of this, let us turn to a more extended comparison of the monist and the dualist and the consequences of their worlds. Once this has been accomplished, it will be easier to see and comprehend specifically the nature of intra-subjectivity as it applies to intellectualism, and finally the creative process.
Developmental Extension of the Monist and the Dualist

The monist is a social and/or environmental creature. He craves companionship, and if not, confronts natural design. If he can have neither, then he prays to imaginary gods. If he confronts himself, it is usually through the eyes of others; yet, it is also possible for him to directly confront himself once he realizes that he is both different and similar to others. Confronting the self, for the monist, is, however, transitory for the reasons that categories and not boundaries exist mostly within him. The momentary confronting of the self terminates quickly whereby he must return to the social or environmental situation.

As with the monist, the dualist can likewise confront himself. But there is a marked difference between the monist's and the dualist's capacity to confront the self. The former cannot be face-to-face with himself. Being face-to-face requires a dualistic state, which necessitates a state of boundaries.

Because of his nature, the dualist finds himself dehumanized as a social creature. To be aggregated into a social system necessitates bracketing or suspending of the second self so that the whole of the self will have a similar "direction of movement" and "direction of interpretation" as that of the social system, as shown below in "a." This is a
situation of being entailed, not only by others, but as well by the self in giving rise to the movement and the character of the social system itself. In such a situation, a dualist would be part of a whole. Were a dualist to relate or interrelate with a social system, without bracketing or suspending the other or second self, he would have to remain outside the system as a whole (shown in "b"), and not part of the system as depicted in "a." However, as obvious in "b," this results in a counter movement to that of the whole social system.

As discussed before, Sartre's concept of "Hell is other people" is most apropos to the above, but in two different senses. Hell is the "other" for the monist, who he must confront to be human. Hell is the "self" for the dualist, who he must confront to be human or at least not to become dehumanized. But it is more so hell for the monist in a situation where he is alienated from others.

The reality discussed above is made quite explicit in Samuel Beckett's play, "Waiting for Godot," in which neither Estragon nor Vladimir like one another's company. Yet, they can appreciate one another to the extent that if one were gone, the other would be in total misery. Their differences as monists lie in the fact that Vladimir views the world mostly from a naturalistic or environmentalistic standpoint, whereas, Estragon's view is socially oriented. It can be interpreted from the play that their similarity is that they are monists, and both are waiting for Godot, a dualist. They must confront each other or Godot (notwithstanding a brief association with two other characters, Pozzo and Lucky). However, Godot, the dualist, need not—and prefers not to—confront the monists. Therefore, Estragon and Vladimir wait and wait
for Godot out of fear of being punished if they do not wait, and out of their need to confront something essentially different from each other. The dualist, in such a case, can exploit monists in their associative and confrontive shortcomings as Godot does. It is ideal for the dualist to not have to confront others. Yet, having to confront the self eternally—depending upon what the second self is like—can be as miserable as the monist not having anyone to confront. All of this leads to a confrontation between the two and a mental "incompleteness" in both.

Confrontation and the Mind

The psychological environment of both the dualist and the monist is always incomplete. This is because even though the mind attains a temporary state of completeness it must, however, further associate. This is different from saying, as most existentialists proclaim, that the mind is incomplete per se, that the human does not reach his essential status other than possibly at death (in existentialism man is existence prior to essence). Man, as with all other things, is incomplete for the reasons that a counter is always present and in such a sense "disruptive." Even though the dualist can be his own counter, it nevertheless follows that he, no more than the monist, cannot remain in a state of completeness. This is mainly because the second self must be different from the first self; otherwise, he will lose his duality for the reasons that the two selves would completely repel one another.

This is the very rationale for "expression" or "creation." In the chapter on art and the artist, we shall see that since the dualist is in a constant situation of duplicating content within the two selves by way of inductive construction, he resorts to the confronting of the "unknown"
to minimize this occurrence. Hence, the antecedinal of creation is the unknown and the content thereof as will be argued. Furthermore, the unknown content made known to the dualist can as well be duplicated, whereby it is possessed by both selves. As such, there is then an urgency to convert the content by projection so as to, first, minimize repulsion of selves and, second, to put it in a new juxtaposition whereby this content is further altered. The confronting of the content in a new juxtaposition will enable the dualist to be repelled by it, resulting in motion away from that which is known, towards that which is again unknown. In this very respect the dualist, or if you will the artist, is fleeing himself. In every possible way, he must shed himself of his own essence; otherwise, his dualistic state will repel itself resulting in either bracketing, suspending, or destruction of one or both of the selves, conclusively ending in either a monistic state or the death of the total being.

Where the dualist must flee himself because he is essence, the monist is always in search of essence. (The monistic state is always counter to the dualistic state.) The monist seeks the dualist, or if you will, the dualistic actuality. In a general sense, it is the reality of Estragon and Vladimir who wait for Godot or even seek them out. It is in this regard that the dualist becomes socially oriented and further attains leadership in patronizing the monist. Also, it is in this sense that social change occurs. It is a state of explicit confrontation—a relation existing for and against an interrelation. All of this will become very crucial in the chapter on art and the artist wherein it will be made demonstrable by case studies.

Incompleteness of the mind means that an individual, as a whole, is monopolar or that within an individual there exists a monopolar state
or part. Since the dualist is entirely dipolar, he, as a whole, cannot be incomplete. Yet, as with the monist, he too can have parts that are monopolar. As such, any exclusively given plus or minus is "unstable." The only means whereby such a monopole can become stable is if it coordinates itself with its counter. As shown below in "a" and "b," there are two possible resolutions of such incompleteness or instability.

In "a" the resolution is a bilateral inclusion where both exist but only one is present at a given time. In "b" the resolution is conjunctive, where both exist and are present at the same time. (It should be remembered that mind is under consideration and therefore it is possible, as will be argued, to formulate a dualistic state from two monistic states as expressed at the beginning of this chapter.) What is shown in "b" is basically a simplified formation of the dualistic state. Attaining such a state from two monistic states is much more complex and entails more than what is shown here. Its complete consideration and justification will have to await the section on "intellect." But for the time being, let us review and extend what has been argued as it directly applies to the mind.

First of all, parts of the following diagrams extend beyond the content covered in this section. Nevertheless, it is thought to be worthwhile to give as much of a panoramic view at this time. The uncon-
sidered material, such as "self-confrontation," "intuition," and "intellectualism," will be taken up in their proper sequential order. But for now, let us first consider some simplified diagrams of the developmental process of the monist. In 2 and 4 below, it should be noted that projection of a minus to that of an external plus does not mean the annulment of the minus within the individual. An image, idea, or concept can exist in more than two places at the same time. In sharing a thought we do not lose the thought, but rather duplicate it. Hence, a projected minus remains a minus within, and a plus without. In regards to 3 "repulsion within the self," the similar forces will increase the distance between themselves as much as possible. Number 4 is one of three possible means of alleviating the state of repulsion within the
self. One of the two other ways to alleviate the repulsion within the self is simply to associate and confront an external minus whereby the inductive construct becomes plus. The third possibility will be shown in "la," to follow briefly. But before considering this, it should be noted that projection of self in 4 is, as shown in 5, an "illustrative" act rather than a "creative" act in any sense. This is because, as shown in 5, the former external plus, having given rise to the inductive construct, is essentially similar to the projected plus. They might be different but only without a distinction, which is to say that they are essentially similar. The \( \pm \) in 1 through 5 represent completed parts. They are stable forces. Only singular minuses or pluses (monopoles) are unstable. However, and for the reasons that these parts are not dipolar, they can be separated into monopolar states, or for that matter, recombined with different counter forces.

As stated above, it is possible for a monopole to become stable in yet a third way by inclusion as diagrammed in "la" and "lb" below. First of all, it should be noted that in "la" repulsion does not occur for the reason that a minus within is a plus without. However, if the whole of the individual was a minus, then repulsion would occur. But since
it is possible to have the case of a non-fixed individual, or if you will, a person in equilibrium, the situation of "la" is attractive. In this sense, then, the minus in "lb" can change to a plus by way of inclusion. At such a point, if one projects then one projects a minus which would repel the individual as shown in 2. Given this situation, the plus and the minus within the individual would be attracted towards one another resulting in the formation of a new stable part as shown in 3. All of this makes it possible for an individual to attain stability without "expression" or projection. It is, however, a reduction of possible parts since, as shown in "la" through 3, the individual has changed from a quarternary state to that of a ternary state. It is at least a quantitative if not qualitative reduction.

That which is true of the monist is as well the situation of the dualist. The dualist, however, has some distinct possibilities which are not an actuality of the monist. Specifically, this is made possible by the presence of a boundary within the self. First, as shown below in "1c" and "1d," it is possible for the content of self A to be transferable to self B and vice versa. This is a means of being aware of the
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second self by transferring content across a boundary. Obviously this assumes that there are penetrable boundaries. But without a boundary there could be no dualistic state and, further, without such a boundary being penetrable there could be no face-to-face situation. As such we could have no dualist, but rather two distinct individuals.

A boundary can be non-descriptive in the sense that it is simply nothingness or no-thingness separating two or more areas or properties. Yet, a boundary can as well be descriptive in that it is constituted by content, such as a fence made of wood, or a river containing water. In this regard, the content in "1c" and "1d" transferred across the nothing-boundary could become content of the boundary as shown in 2. This will be discussed as "per intuition" in a later section. Whether or not such content is dualistic or monistic would by and large depend upon the qualitativeness of the forces in question. This, to a large extent, necessitates the understanding of art and the nature of the artist to be discussed in a later chapter. Nevertheless, expression or projection of this content is quite possible at least in the sense that Benedetto Croce argued it—"To intuit is to express." This content, as projected content, likewise converts as shown in 3. But let us now further consider the second minus of the inductive construct.

Self Confrontation and Conjectures About the Superego

Conjectures made earlier on the minuses or the pluses derived from inductive construction might well apply to the literature on the superego. In the section on Construction: An Epistemic Process, it was first conjectured that the second minus—the one not attracted to the
external thing—was a "free-agent" accounting for the qualities so often attributed to experience, ("imagining," "pervasiveness," and "sensuousness"). Conjunctively, this writer believes that such a monopole, in search of stability, accounts for superego content. This is to attribute much to a single monopole! Yet, the very fact that such a monopole is a free agent in search of a counter force would imply quantitative and qualitative contact with an array of mental content. As stated in the Dictionary of Psychology, the superego according to Freud is...

that part of the psyche or personality which develops from the incorporation of moral standards and prohibitions from the parents, particularly the father. The superego is roughly equivalent to conscience.

Moral standards and prohibitions are not only difficult for adults to accept but for children as well. This is because there is no rationale given for their existence or their acceptance other than "that's the way it is." This is ostensive of the common-sense world. Hence, without a rationale they remain incomplete and unstable. They must be accepted in and of themselves; otherwise, by definition, they cannot be moral standards or prohibitions. Conjunctive with this, there must exist unwanted, yet still feasible, alternatives. For instance, the prohibition on liquor in the twenties was not without its alternative, and aligned with this, the prohibition was also unjustifiable and argumentatively non-rationale. As a matter of fact, a prohibition that is justifiable and rational, and thus without alternatives, ends up being a situation that is "self-evident." This would be like prohibiting a paraplegic from walking across the street.

Descriptively, the superego is always incomplete and unstable. It, as content, is always in search of stability—that is, finding
reasons for its own existence. The superego in its inception is either one or a series of minuses or pluses. They cannot be both in the same place for that would make them stable whereby they could not constitute the superego. However, and as monopolar, this is precisely the metaphysical destiny of the superego, which would conjecturally resolve for the individual his or her guilt complexes, insecurities, and other mental distortions by the fact of their possible stability. This is, however, not an easy matter, in part because of the general education scene functioning often as a parent, and a common sensical one at that.

In this role, general education is concerned with social and moral standards as the consistence for maintaining the social structure. Hence, little consideration is given to the counterness of the superego or any specific counter thereof, for that would facilitate student independence, not only from the public schools, but from the social structure as well. Religion may well owe its existence to this very fact; that is, religion exists as a desperate and miraculous means of attaining superego counterness whereby the instability can become stable. However, in this regard religion and the public schools are only different without a distinction. A religious person is continuously confronted with the questions of "Am I doing the proper thing?" or "How do I know when I'm morally correct?" In that general education is monopolar and thereby offers little counter content, it caters to mystical resolutions if for no other reason that it does not provide for the resolutions. Since religious discourse is only different, and not distinct from general education, it puts the individual in a similar predicament. All of this is quite evident in religious and educational literature and their
praxiology as a misunderstanding of the human condition. In general education, it is made explicit and rather ad hoc in an article written by Jack Frymier, the editor of The Educational Forum, viz.,

Almost all people who smoke, for example, know they ought not to smoke. They know that smoking is detrimental to their health—but they behave otherwise. No one can call that "intelligent" or "educated" behavior. It must be labeled some other way. In my judgment, it must be described as "ignorance." People who know one thing but do something else—people who ignore the information that is available to them—can hardly be said to be "educated."

Our task is to help young people learn to do as well as to know; to behave in ways that are consistent with the best factual data that are available today. The above exemplifies how general education builds superego in a parental way. It further depicts the overall misunderstanding of the human condition, specifically that of behavior and conduct. As will be shown, intended behavior or rather conduct, when first and foremost projected onto the social context, inhibits consciousness. The educational goals stated by Frymier would in fact: first, prevent behavior from becoming conduct; second, inhibit consciousness; third, prevent individuals from discovering counters to their superego content; and fourth, add more unstable superego to an individual's psychological space. All of this should be easier to realize after having considered the section on intellect. However, here it is simply presented as an actuality of general education. In the last chapter it will be re-considered specifically in regards to "art education." But for the time being, let us consider the superego more in depth.

In further consideration of the nature of the superego itself it is conjectured that it is the "middle voice" and "directional indicator." The superego as a middle voice implies that it is literally a
voice and that it is centralized between two or more aspects that exist for and against one another—i.e., the potential interrelation of the id and the ego. Because the superego is a continuously forming character, it maintains an elusive, alien, and subversive character that is often not envisioned as the self or even part of the self. It is often thought of as the other within the self giving advice and guidance, and at times purporting risky situational encounters.

I have to imply that someone or something is acting upon me, and I fail to give an inkling of the part I am playing in the process. Depending on the context, I may say, "I am moved . . . touched . . . affected . . . upset," etc., but I could not change the exclusively passive situation. In French, the middle voice means a complex process, which I might describe as follows:

1. An emotion surges within me, and at this stage I pass no judgment as to its origin.
2. I become aware of that emotion.
3. I acknowledge the experience as mine.
4. I let it, or help it, develop. 

The middle voice described by Samuel Bois above is very characteristic of the superego. It is also very characteristic of how a monopole might well affect and effect one's already established self. It is alien in this very regard and threatening to the already-established stable forces within the self. If one cannot shed such a monopole then one must find means of containing it, and accounting for it, as an aspect of oneself. As such, and without a counter, it would exist as an unstable boundary between stable parts, as possibly monitoring the id and the ego.

The superego as a "directional indicator" is basically the means and mechanism whereby behavior is extended into conduct. Conduct, simplistically, is intended or willed behavior. It is selected behavior. Furthermore, behavior of the past remains with an individual, yet not
necessarily as a manifestation. In this regard, the superego as a di-
rectional indicator, not only prevents certain behavior from becoming
conduct, but as well, categorizes new behavior as either similar or
different from past behavior or present conduct. This is made possible
by the fact that the superego is a boundary, either stable or unstable,
but a boundary nevertheless.

By the fact that superego content, at the outset, is always
monopolar, it organizes and categorizes content simply by its metaphy-
sical nature. Searching for its counter to attain stability, former
wholes, when interpenetrated by its presence, can become halves or
parts. Furthermore, these halves and parts can cancel with other halves
or parts, or for that matter, other wholes. In other words, it is the
movement of content into sets or categories dictated by counterness and
the actuality of cancellation. Without cancellation new wholes cannot
be formulated. A category or set cannot quantitatively increase unless
cancellation is possible, as discussed in previous section.

In this sense, former behavior can become compartmentalized pre-
venting its manifestation or objectification. On the other hand, in-
cidental or fragmented behavior can become aggregated into a more fluid
and extended projection, if for no other reason that the possible de-
crease in number of parts and wholes formerly in a state of equilibrium.

It should be noted that the superego, even though it is monopolar,
is a consequence rather than an antecedent. Since the superego dic-
tates whether or not behavior will become conduct and the character of
the conduct itself by way of categorization, much of an individual's
development is shaped by consequences. This is evident by the fact that
the monist is basically taught in a consequential manner, not only because the educational system is pragmatically monistic, as discussed in Chapter II, but accordingly because the monist has a direction of interpretation that originates in the consequential, and specifically in this case, by way of superego content.

Educationally, and comparatively, this puts the dualist in an awkward situation. If he is to succeed educationally he must be willing and able, to bracket or suspend his second self. Accordingly, he must dis-concern himself with the antecedental. Basically, he must learn not to ask "why" questions if he is to be "educated" and "intelligent" according to social standards. He must learn, as Jack Frymier points out in the quote on smoking (page 175) to behave according to what is consequentially right, proper and best for him, and never mind the antecedental argument.

Were we to consider educationally the dualist, we would be concerned not only with antecedents but also with dual antecedents. First, this would necessitate a "why" discourse prior to all other considerations such as "how," "when," "where," etc. Second, the "why" concern would be incomplete if only a single explanation is given. Third, the explanans must be dualistic; otherwise we end up again with a monadic explanan. Fourth, the formulated or the explanadum is singular; therefore, its consideration is dependent upon its counter explanan in achieving a dualistic state.

From all of this, there exists a perplexing situation between the dualistic student and the teacher, whether he or she is dualistic or monistic. First, the dualistic student is always in a state of confrontation with the teacher or educator since there exists an
interrelation and a relation. Second, the student is apt to find general educational content and discourses of no concern to him for the reasons that most of it is consequential rather than antecedential. Third, if the antecedential is not formerly known by the student, any such acquired content will be ascribed to the self and confronted by the second self as though it was always an attribute of the self, rather than content acquired from without. This adds further discontentment to the student/teacher relationship or interrelationship, sometimes to the extent that the student denies the teacher's role by acquiring it himself as a second self. In such a possibility, the dualist can "educate" himself but at the possible expense of diversified, or at least more so diversified, content by the presence of a different human being. Resentment on the teacher's part in having had his or her role "stolen" by the student will most likely add further confrontation between student and supposed teacher, especially if the teacher is monistic since his or her existence is somewhat dependent upon another human. Retribution often occurs at such a point by the teacher either simply in denouncing the student's formulated or denouncing the formulated in respect to an improper counter antecedent whereby the student is somewhat forced to re-recognize the teacher's role. In most cases it may be no more than "vanity," yet in respect to a monistic teacher it is likely a matter of self existence.

It is for such reasons that in "educating" the dualist without forcing him to bracket or suspend his other self, another dualist is metaphysically the instrumental educator. Furthermore, for the dualist to encounter the self, a monistic teacher must remain inactive or inert so
that self-confrontation can occur in the student. Self-confrontation is something that only the dualistic teacher can have empathy with, as well as facilitate in ways of students emulating their teacher's conduct. It should be emphasized here that where the monistic teacher has to be inert, the dualistic teacher should be active. In this latter case, one would be paying for a teacher at least to function, and hopefully function educationally, but in the former case one would be paying for no-function. In a sense, one would be paying a teacher not to be a teacher.

Encounter: Two Given, One Formulated

In consideration of self-initiated motion and change, encounters of the self are mandatory in regards to the dualist. Such encounters must be projected whereby the individual will be repelled by the projected encounter. If this does not continue endlessly, then he will either cease his motion in exclusively confronting the second self or he will be pulled back to the realms of common sense and natural standpoint.

In having moved away from common sense and natural standpoint the dualist has left behind a sense of security, social and natural order, recipiency, as well as enslavement. As illustrated on the following page Figure 15, one is alone with one's second self and one's possible encounters. These encounters are formulated by properties of both selves, represented by the new and different face in the center of the figures. This is made possible in that the two selves exist in different places, yet are face-to-face with one another. Thus, the new face or the new encounter is alien to both selves since neither self is exclusively responsible for the encounter.
Fig. 15—Encountering the Self
In such a situation, apprehension not only befalls the self in having to confront something unpleasant about the second self but as well in having to confront the new encounter as someone who might be illfated. From this triadic situation, the anxiety of becoming inert and thereby lost to the rest of the world sets in. Yet, to return to the common sense and the natural standpoint is to dehumanize the self. To do so also presents the possibility of not being able to depart again if one's second self becomes bracketed in the entrapment. The ideal situation is if one has a "guardian"—another dualist who can save the self from being bracketed by society and also prevent one from being inert or lost in space—unable to confront but the self for eternity. All of this is possibly best illustrated in the figure below.

In the above figure, the dualist, as with the monist, finds himself confronting either or both common sense and natural standpoint represented by the circle around the environment. However, the monist finds himself within the environment whereas the dualist is alongside as shown above (previously discussed at the beginning of the section on
Developmental Extension of the Monist and the Dualist, page 164). The elliptical orbit represents the movement away from the environment, the break with common sense and natural standpoint. The motion and change of this movement is dependent upon the projected encounters. First, the circling direction of the first encounter is the converse of that of the environment. Second, the movement away from the first encounter is altered in respect to the previous movement away from the environment. This is true vis-a-vis no matter how many sequential encounters are considered. Accordingly, the possible "return trip" to the environment, represented by the arrows going the opposite way, has a similar correspondence. In this regard, it is also possible for the individual to re-encounter a former encounter and therefrom another sequential encounter or simply fall back to the environment. Without the encounters, as the formulated, it would simply be a matter of degrees of distance and time before the dualist would confront the environment. There would exist at best but one elliptical orbit, that being around the environment. The encounters, as the projected or if you will expressed, serve then as "steppingstones" in further projection and, along with this, deliverance in not having to confront the common sense and natural standpoint worlds.

Given that the monist is moved from within the environment to that of alongside the environment, it is likewise possible for him to depart the environment. However, since he is monadic, another person's presence is necessitated, as illustrated by the "X(s)" in Figure 16. Furthermore, the "A" of the dualistic state is not a property of the monist, since he is monadic, but rather the presence of another individual. 'Encounter' would have a special meaning and existence in such a case.
since it is not a formulization of "two given selves." As will be discussed in the chapter on art and the artist, such an encounter, as projection, is at best "illustrative" rather than "creative." The role of the other person as the elicitor for the monist to depart the environment is always viewed by him as one of being "with" as shown below.

![Diagram of Monistic Movement]

Fig. 17—Monistic Movement

Being with the monist, a consequential state of being for and against in the movement away from the environment, is likewise necessitated in the monistic expressive act in projecting encounters. The presence of another human is, however, not required in the return to the environment since this is basically an inevitable fall for the monist in the absence of another human being. It is true that he can project by himself and likewise encounter such projections. However, since the monistic encounter has a special and different existence from that of a dualistic self-encounter, such projected encounters are minimal and necessarily dependent upon the existence of unstable monopoles. (Later on it will be shown that the dualist can project stable states which is not possible by the monist.) As a matter of fact, the monist can only, by himself, project as many encounters as there are unstable monopoles within him. This means that there can only exist one other encounter for projection within the monist since the presence of both a minus and
a plus results in their stabilization within the self. Furthermore, since boundaries within a monist are always penetrable, there cannot be numerous monopoles compartmentalized for projection. This, however, is possible in the case of the dualist since non-penetrable boundaries can exist. All of this means that in the absence of another person, the monist can only project one encounter, by himself, without further confronting either another person or the environment. Obviously, he can project the same monopole quantitatively and sequentially, but this still only results in a qualitative singular projection.

On the other hand, the dualist can have endless sequential encounters without confronting the environment or another human. Accordingly, another human is not necessitated in departing the environment. However, as stated earlier, it is ideal to have another human facilitate both the departure and the return of the dualist in not getting lost to the world nor getting bracketed in the common-sensical world. This other person, as previously discussed, must be a dualist; otherwise, he could become patronized in the presence of the monist, in the monist's need to confront others.

Per Intuition

In the previous two sections, viz., Pre-Intuition and Developmental Extension of the Monist and the Dualist, motion, change, and freedom were considered in respect to another person and the environment. The following material in this chapter will be a concern with, first, the corridor to intellectualism (per intuition) and second, the intellectual content as a system of counterness and a process of reasoning. As such, what is basically under consideration is the "workings of the mind" or
"the mind as a system" in its possible extension. But before getting into this, it is necessary to consider the intermediate state of existence of confronting the environment and confronting the self intellectually. Intuition will be argued to be this very intermediate state, a penetrable boundary serving as a corridor in escaping the natural entrapment leading to the realm of idealism (intellectualism). However, preliminary to this argument two contrary views of intuition will be presented—that of intuition as experience held by Bergson and that of intuition as expression held by Croce.

Intuition as Experience and Expression

One of the most influential philosophers of contemporary thought would probably be Henri Bergson.\(^6^0\) Phenomenological-Existentialism, Pragmatism, Gestalt and various other anti-intellectual movements are indebted to the Bergsonian thought. Specifically, it was his effective attack upon "Scientism" and his interest in intuition, as vastly superior to the scientific intellect in its power to describe things accurately, which helped set precedence for much of contemporary thought.\(^6^1\) This is especially evident in Merleau-Ponty's work.

Intuition, in the Bergsonian sense, is the immediate awareness of life itself, whereas intellect is an artificial geometrizing detached from "real" or "true" reality.\(^6^2\) Since intellect is geometric it is accordingly static and immobile, and thereby alien to the fact that the universe is motion and change. In other words, intellect is the apprehension, or better yet misapprehension, of a frozen collection of things in space. At best, intellect is to be regarded in the Bergsonian sense as a "kind of instrument or tool employed in the service of life."\(^6^3\)
On the other hand, intuition is a series of acts of direct participation in the "immediacy of experience." Immediacy of experience results in direct awareness and the apprehension of time and motion as ceaselessly changing processes characteristic of absolute reality. This immediacy of experience is first and foremost the awareness of "our own personality"—an existence which we unquestionably know best. Conclusively, the universe, as ever-changing, must be intuitively grasped by means of one's inner experience which epitomizes reality as ceaselessly changing processes. Intuition, rather than intellect, is the proper means in apprehending the true reality of all things. "Metaphysics must therefore begin by applying its method (intuition) to the inner experience of the individual." In the Bergsonian sense, intuition becomes a metaphysical method, and when it is directed towards one's inner nature of becoming, it reveals not only absolute reality, but "real" or "true" reality.

It follows from this that an absolute could only be given in intuition, whilst everything else falls within the province of analysis. By intuition is meant the kind of intellectual sympathy by which one places oneself within an object in order to coincide with what is unique in it and consequently inexpressible.

As pointed out by Thomas A. Goudge in the editor's introduction, "the Bergsonian metaphysics contains many mysteries." Evident in the above quote, it is strange that the intuitive content, the metaphysical, the absolute, is "inexpressible." If it is inexpressible, how then are we to know the "intuitive content" much less that there is even a content? Here again we have the problems of Phenomenology Proper, discussed in chapter two.
This writer is confident that Benedetto Croce's work on intuition and expression was a direct rebuttal to this kind of Bergsonian mysticism. As Croce argued, "To intuit is to express; and nothing else (nothing more, but nothing less) than to express." The adherence to a Croce philosophy removes the mystery from mysticism. But not only that, it also anticipates what has come to be known as "Behaviorism." In a sense, Croce anticipated such behaviorists as Gilbert Ryle and B. F. Skinner standing in opposition to the "ghost in the machine" or the "mind in the body," adhered to by many idealists.

However, stranger than the Bergsonian "inexpressible intuitive content" is the assertion made in The Encyclopedia of Philosophy that since "[t]he broadest definition of the term 'intuition' is 'immediate apprehension' . . . [g]iven this range of uses, nothing can be said about intuition in general." It is one thing to say that the "intuitive content is inexpressible" and quite another thing to say that "intuition itself is inexpressible." Bergson went to great lengths to show us that not only the concept but the process "intuition" could be descriptively delineated, which is a definition, if not in a strong sense, then at least in a weak sense, a definition. It is hardly that we cannot say anything about intuition in general. Furthermore, if we accept Croce's extension of intuition, then we not only can talk about intuition in general but accordingly the intuitive content. However, in lieu of the aforementioned and consubstantial with the principles and the line of argument already presented, intuition has a totally different actuality and reality.
Intuition as a Penetrable Boundary

Most things can be considered experience. Seeing, feeling, thinking, etc., are all experiences. Intuition, however, will be argued to be an exception. Hence, it is neither sensing nor reasoning. It is not confronting. It is the intermediate state of confronting the environment and confronting the self intellectually. The importance of intuition lies in that it is a means of escaping the natural entrapment whereby one can reach the realm of idealism (intellectualism).

Any content that passes from one side of a boundary to another is intuitive content and the boundary itself is intuition. Hence, it is content without context, without relativity. It is content without counterness. Once context or counterness is made available, intuition has ceased. "To intuit" is the ceased demarcation of intuition.

Since intuition (the boundary) and the content thereof is without context and without counterness, it is then content forgotten. It is inattentive and without awareness to its possessor. When one intuits, one has provided a context or counterness for the content. At such a point, one is perplexed, or at least able to be perplexed, as to wherefrom the intuitive content has arisen. It is sort of like being lost in the wilderness, unexpectedly running into another human, and exclaiming, "Where have you come from?" Or, having a dream of something that does not correspond to one's experiences of the world, yet is still feasible.

Intuition is, then, "knowledge without experience." It is "knowledge without evidence" since its context has been lost and thereby forgotten. However, it is not "belief" (non-evidential knowledge) since its attentiveness necessitates contextualism. A belief is stable with
or without a context whereas intuition is unstable. A belief categorizes or clusters one's knowledge. In this sense, belief is the context for the acquisition and compartmentalization of knowledge. Intuition, on the other hand, is the converse of belief. It searches, in its instability, for a context or a counterness.

When inductive construction occurs there are two similar forces present within an individual. One of these forces remains, temporarily at least, attached to the external force having made possible the inductive construct. The second force is immediately repelled in its similarity with the other emergent force of the construct. Its presence within an array of stable forces makes it a divider of those stable forces. As such, it is a boundary. Furthermore, its association either in confronting or confrontation with other monopoles or dipoles predicates self confronting and the perplexity of accounting for its emergence and its given presence. It is difficult to account for its construction and its presence by the individual who possesses it, not only because it is monopolar but also because it is out of context. Since it is alien and unstable, it necessitates expression, or if you will, projection. In this very sense we can say that "expression is intuition" but not that "intuition is expression." This means that expression is entailed by intuition but not vice versa. Not all intuition is expressed since it serves, as well, as a boundary intermediating stable forces. Yet, that which is expressed is expressed because it is unstable and/or noncontextual. This makes expression not equal, but "equivalent" to intuition. That is, there is more to intuition overall than that which can be evident in expression.
Furthermore, it is not only that unstable forces are compelled towards stability but that pre-existing stable forces effect their status and context. Given both penetrable and impenetrable boundaries in at least the dualist, unstable forces can become the content of these boundaries, by the fact that such boundaries are repellingly surrounded by stable forces. They are then contained in at least being away from the stable forces. In such a situation, one would be at liberty to confront external things. But given the emergence of the unstable forces from their boundary context, external confronting would cease necessitating internal confronting (both are not possible at the same time as argued earlier). Here again one would become perplexed as to wherefrom the content had emerged.

Even so, the intuitive content owes its origin to the externally opposite force, which cannot experientially be realized by an individual since it no longer exists in that regard. Only analytically can the intuitive be accounted for in either its origin or its existence. This, then, is also to say that only analytically can the expressive be accounted for in either its origin or its existence. All of this is obviously contrary to Bergson's argument that intuition is experience and contrary to Croce's argument that intuition is nothing more than expression. The importance of intuition is that it is boundary and boundary content. This enables one to escape the natural standpoint and common sense whereby intellectualism can become an actuality.

**Intellectualism**

Intellect is different from experience in that it has a permanency whereas experience in and of itself is always transitory. And yet,
as argued earlier, intellectualizing and intellect are experiences. This then is to say that intellectualizing and intellect have dual realities—permanency and transitoriness. But this duality and its apparent paradoxical nature has its origin in that the permanency is a "property" of intellect per se whereas the transitoriness is qualitative of the "awareness of intellect." As stated earlier, and as will be argued in this section, intellect is the "formulated," meaning that the transitoriness has attained form resulting ostensibly in permanency. In other words, the transitoriness of experience becomes "frozen" or "geometric" as pointed out in the discussion of the Bergsonian distinction between intellect and intuition. Basically, experience is to intellect as $H_2O$ is to water. One cannot have intellect without at the same time having experience, which is to say one cannot have water without also having $H_2O$. However, one can have $H_2$ and $O$ (meaning that the hydrogen has no bond with the oxygen) without having water, which is to say that one can have experience without intellect.

Intellectualizing is the binding of experience, or if you will, the formulizing of experience. When there is transitoriness of and about intellect, then it is at best "awareness of intellect" and at worst experience per se.

Besides the fact that intellect is the provenance for consciousness which will be discussed later, its importance is basically that it can remain the same throughout time and space. This is necessary if it is to be considered essential (essence) and, likewise, considered a truth. Truth must necessarily remain constant throughout time and space. Hence, and for this very reason, experience can only be considered
truth if and necessarily if it can be formulized—that is, if it can be intellectualized.

Granted that if one holds to the principle that there is nothing but change, then change becomes the constant throughout time and space (as in Marxism). In such a case, that which is formulized, then, becomes at least the non-truth if not the untruth. However, in either case truth is constant throughout time and space since change does not necessarily and conclusively alter (change) to a static state. In either case, the problem is with what is non-truth or even untruth, rather than truth itself. This concern and its possible solution is dependent upon the actuality of "transformation"—the transformation of a changing state to that of a static state. Given this actuality, truth is then only the formulized since change would conclusively result in a static state which makes change itself a non-universal throughout time and space. Descriptively, change would only be the interim of two or more formulized states (truths). In this section on intellectualism, the overall concern is with transformation as a non-truth and intellect as a truth, which are both different from experience, an untruth.

Image

The origin of intellect is a most vital, yet problematic concern. For instance, a realist would probably argue that intellect has its bases and origin in experience. The phenomenalist would hold that it is in perception, and the idealist that it is of the mind. Furthermore, the linguist would likely claim that it is of language given that he, as with the others, is not an eclectic.
It is argued here that the origin of intellect has two distinct, yet related realities. The monistic manifesto is that of "belief," whereas the dualistic is "image." Yet, image, as with belief, is monistic in and of itself. It is the simultaneous occurrence of the two that is the origin of intellect. The two are necessarily counter to one another if intellect is to be a reality.

One's direction of interpretation will determine whether the image is acknowledged in light of belief or vice versa. For instance, monistic behavior deems it necessary that the image is acquired in light of belief, and dualistic behavior that the belief is acquired in light of image. As will be argued, and has previously been stated, a belief is independent of context. It is itself context; it is the tenacity, the steadfastness, or the stabilizing of monopolar states such as intuition, discussed earlier, and image as will be considered here. Hence, the direction of interpretation for intellectual discourse by a monist would be "belief-image," and that of the dualist would be "image-belief." In other words, the monist would view things from the point of stability (truth) counterly directed towards instability (nontruth or even untruth), whereas the opposite is true for the dualist.

But how is it that one may be so assured that the image is the directive basis of intellect of the dualist? Simply by the monistic nature of belief and its counterness to image! Yet, why are "idea," "knowledge," "language" or "conduct" not counter to belief, whereby even though it is true that belief is descriptive of the monist it would still not follow that image is descriptive of the dualist? It is for such problematic reasons that one must necessarily account for the
structure of related entities, yet, inevitably the problem lies with
counterness in this case, as with others. Therefore, image and its
occurrence in the overall structure is shown in the figure below, which
will be discussed step by step in the following sections. It is here
simply to serve as a general overview.

First of all, there are many kinds of images, such as an imagin­
ary companion, an afterimage, a dream or daydream, an illusion, as well
as eidetic images. Within each of these kinds of images one could like­
wise find specific images, such as man walking down the street, as dif­
ferent from, let us say, imagining a trip to the moon. However, the
subcategorizing of different images and talking about specific images is
not under consideration in this section (this will be of concern in the
chapter on art and the artist). Hence, what is under consideration is
the nature and function of the image.
Notwithstanding the fact that intuition could well be viewed as more basic, or precisely speaking, primitive and/or axiomatic, it nevertheless is not the basis of intellect since, as argued in the last section, it is the end result of external confronting. In other words, and commonly speaking, intuition is "perception" ceased. Nevertheless, the image is the most primitive given state of intellect which eliminates knowledge, idea, language, concept, conduct and consciousness from being its counter since, as will be shown, they are complex whereby they do not appear in the same realm. Belief, in and of itself, is the only other primitive, notwithstanding intuition. As an additional point, it is for this reason that intuition, image, and belief have been presented on the same latitude, shown in the previous figure.

Image, as a given, is descriptively "neutral phenomena" which means that it is immediately present to the mind without having been altered in any way by either inference, interpretation or construction. Image is always an unknown. It is that which appears without analysis and without context. It reveals itself in perplexity as intuitive content having emerged from a penetrable boundary (intuition). It is intuitive content revived in a totally different context than that of its former origin in construction. This new context is "belief." In a sense, the image as a monopole becomes the content of a monopolar context--the belief. The two are attracted because they are opposite forces and without stability in one another's absence. The attracted state of image and belief results in what will be discussed as "idea," a complex entity. However, for the time being let us return to a more in-depth elaboration of the image itself.
It is impossible to look at the physical world and contemplate an image at the same time. Conjunctively, contemplation of the image itself will yield nothing other than what is given; basically, image must be ascribed to a faculty and process other than that which is often referred to as "perception." Hence, it is proper to regard image as something divorced from the act of perception. As long as an individual confronts, let us say, a tree, the individual is commonly accredited with perceiving. When this bond is broken he or she will be able to form an image of the tree. It is therefore proper to specify the existence of an image in lieu of perceiving. An image is a sensory quality reinstated by the mind in the absence of sensory stimulation. External stimulation might well have provided data for the facilitation of an image. However, the image itself is not directly derived from this source, but rather from an intentionality source.71

All of this is another way of saying that which has been espoused for some three thousand years—mainly that there is a "mind's eye." Furthermore, speculation has had it that the mind's eye is not identical with the brain's eye. In recent studies of the mind/brain correlation, additive evidence has been accumulated to corroborate such theories. Specifically, recent breakthroughs in research with the aid of radioactive isotopes injected into one of the main arteries to the brain has revealed a more detailed picture of the function and the nature of the brain.72 In these studies, a subject asked to "imagine" reveals an increase in blood flow to the frontal regions of the brain, particularly the supplementary motor area.73 Conversely, sensory perception changes the pattern of blood flow in the cortex to that of the visual association cortex in the rear of the brain along with the
frontal eye field, and, as well, the supplementary motor area.\textsuperscript{74} This at least implies, and as asserted: "Image . . . represents the localization of a pure mental event."\textsuperscript{75} The part of the brain responsible for reception and assimilation of sensory perception is not identical to that part of the brain responsible for image formation. One might well be advised to be skeptical about this research, if for no other reason than it needs further corroboration. Even so, it is a major empirical contribution in substantiating the "mind's eye theory," if the brain has a correspondence to the mind. Yet it is disclosing in that sensory perception and image formation do not have the same locale, in or of the brain, which means that those who hold to the "no mind theory" must as well account for this difference within their own philosophical camp (specifically the materialist and/or behaviorist).

However, notwithstanding such concerns and problems of the exclusively empirical and monistic world, the brain as matter transforms into mind in light of the argumentative principles set forth in this dissertation. This is further to say that an increase in quantity of mind is a decrease of matter. However, it is only a decrease of the brain insofar that the brain is not thought of as a separate entity from the body. Insofar that the brain/body are accepted as inseparable matter, then, and only then, is there a correspondence between the increase of the mind to that of the decrease of the brain. Granted that the brain can transform other than into mind, nevertheless, if there is a marked increase in the mind then there is a corresponding decrease in the brain. This is exceedingly evident in the process of aging along with the qualitative, if not quantitative, increase of the state of the
mind. For an empirical argument on this matter it is suggested that one read Robert E. Ornstein's books, specifically in regard to the subjects of aging/perception/consciousness correspondence. However, the underlying argument in this dissertation is that matter, as a force, would be part of an interrelation rather than a relation with the mind. Hence, in such a situation the "transformation" of either mind or matter would not be one of change but simply an ultimate attraction. As discussed earlier, in such a situation there is no change in identity of either, at least in the sense that one does not change to the other. Only when matter is in a state of equilibrium, a state of no external force, whereby it is of a relationship rather than an interrelationship, can identity change. This is to say that it has no identity other than its associative or more precisely its acquired inductive identity. In other words, when matter is afflictive (in a state of equilibrium) and associative with the mind then it transforms to mind.

Since conversion is likewise argued as an actuality the reverse must also be true—mind to matter. However, as argued previously, and eminently evident, the projection of the mind is not a loss nor a destruction of the mind but rather a quantitative increase. Even in the case of transformation it is not the annihilation nor change of the mind itself but rather its "cloned" or projected state. This is possible because an image, idea, or concept can exist in more than one place at a given time. Mind is a universal particular counter to matter, which is to say, and has been argued throughout, that Idealism is counter to Materialism. It is also a confrontational state since mind is dualistic and matter is monistic.
The image, as the origin of mind, and intellect in specific, does not have its inception in either empirical data, perception or analysis, but rather in metaphysical transformation of matter. This is accordingly true with "belief," which is basically to say that they occur in the same realm. Furthermore, belief is also a force. This fact is all the two have in common; otherwise, they cannot be considered counter to one another. In further consideration of image it is necessary to take up a brief discussion of belief; but more than that, it is necessary to consider "belief as knowledge" whereby, when considered from the point of Monism, it becomes a "dead end"—curtailing transformation.

Belief

Even though it may be argued that all humans have belief(s), there is, however, a difference between saying that belief dictates one's behavior and saying that one has a belief. In the former case one's total existence would be a contextual existence and in the latter one would simply, in part, have a context. Even so, the presence of belief carries with it obvious consequential behavior for the reason that it is a monopolar context.

It is not so much that this monopolar context manifests itself as behavior but rather that it dictates behavior, and thereby, a determining factor for the formulation of conduct. In light of the definition of "conduct" in this dissertation, the greater or more prominent the monopolar context, the less formulation of conduct. This is to say, as has been stated, that when one views or approaches the world from the point of belief first and foremost in regards to image, then the belief-context is re-affirmed. The entity image simply becomes content for
the re-affirmation or extension of the belief-context. Not only is this nonprogressive but accordingly it is the very aspect that typifies and enables belief to be intersubjective, whereas image is intra-subjective.

The re-affirmation and/or extension of the belief-context is a quantitative increase of the context, such as, simply, the birth of another human who reflects common sense. In this sense, "belief becomes knowledge" in that belief becomes its own evidence. It becomes intersubjective where one's belief is re-affirmed evidentially by the fact that someone else has a similar belief. But not only that, belief itself, as context, suffers by a similar circularity. It is not only possible, but as well socially feasible, for people to believe for the sake of believing. Belief can be both antecedinal and consequential. As such it is the very rubric of intersubjectivity, the social structure.

For instance, the belief in a "father figure" or, if you will the or a god, is the most common and universal belief. Not only is this belief a particular that is universal, but belief itself is a universal particular. Since such a particular or specific belief is non-evidential, either by definition or because it is contextual, it is impossible to negate it in its specificity or universality. However, the content of the belief, god figure "A," can be altered, changed or transformed to god figure "B." All of this is to say that the belief-context itself does not change; however, the content thereof which has been previously argued to be the image does change. At a given point in time, one can believe that there is a universal god independent of man's own existence and at another time believe that one is the god. In such a case belief has not changed, the context has
not changed, yet the content of the context has changed. Such transformation is the central essence and importance of art and art education which will be taken up in the next chapter.

Belief, then, has a double existence but its actuality is still monopolar. This is simply to say that it is a $\sqrt{\pm}$ meaning that both exist, but if one is present, then the other is not at any given time. Its double existence is that of context and knowledge, but not at the same time for that would make it dualistic. Hence, when belief is simply context for the image it is intra-subjective and when it is knowledge it is intersubjective. This means that belief, in and of itself, can be either $+$ or $\pm$. As shown below, if the image is designated a

```
Image $+$ Imagining $\rightarrow$ Belief $\rightarrow$ Belief as knowledge $+$
```

plus, then belief must be a minus, otherwise there will be no attraction. But if belief, as context, is a minus, then belief as knowledge must be a plus; otherwise, conversion and the actuality of intra-subjectivity and intersubjectivity have no bases. This means, as argued, that when belief is knowledge it repels the image, resulting in association with non-subjective forces. It finds a counter in either the social or natural context.

The obvious question is "Why is it not possible for belief as knowledge to be a minus making belief as context a plus while all along the image remains a plus?" It is possible! But with little distinction the result is the same. It is the situation previously discussed where the image is viewed primarily in light of the belief so typical of
monistic behavior. In the situation where belief as knowledge is the intersubjective state, the image is projected "into" the social context, terminating the subjective process. In such a situation the image is prostituted for the perpetuation and proliferation of the belief, giving credence to the reality of belief as knowledge. This is the actuality of "illustrating" which will be taken up in the next chapter. Its importance is that it does not extend the subjective state. It curtails intellectual discourse and development because the "idea" is not formulated. When the "idea" is not formulated there is no counter for language, which ultimately denies concept formation and what follows it.

Before getting into the specifics of the idea, the correlative process of image and belief must be considered. First, it is an interrelationship only when belief exists as a context and not as knowledge. In the latter situation it would be a relationship. The consequences of this were previously discussed. Where belief is simply context it is argued that the two give rise to the process of "imagination."

It is not claimed that a thing or an object is identical to process as argued in Marxism. Furthermore, it is not claimed that process gives rise to product so typical of common sensing. Rather, the image as a thing is a force, if and only if, it exists associatively in regards to the belief—it also being a force. Hence, the two forces, having the property of image and belief, necessarily and sufficiently give rise to imagination. This is to say that imagination does not give rise to the image, but, in part, the reverse. One might claim, as is so often the case, that a person is imagining, meaning that he is about to conjure up an image. However, if this be the case, it is simply ex post
facto of the image. This should be clear enough especially since one can have images in one's sleep or even in an awakened state disassociative of any confronting, much less any volition.

Imagination is the least confrontational state if it can be considered confrontational at all. Since confrontation is the interrelationship of a monopolar state with that of a dipolar state, it cannot, in a strict sense, be considered confrontational since image and belief are both monopolar. But since the existence (not the essence) of belief is double, it can, to this extent at least, be considered confrontational in regards to the image. As such, it is possibly best to predicate imagination a "borderline case" of confrontation. This in turn is consistent with the argument presented earlier that the image is the most basic and antecedinal state of intellectual discourse. To argue that the image is the most basic, while claiming that its process function is not, would lead to suspect of either or both.

Idea

Idea is very similar to image for the very reason that it is image transcended along with belief. It is similar to belief in that it too is not exclusively a monopolar existence. Nevertheless, in a contrastive sense, belief is intersubjective whereas idea is exclusively subjective as shown on the following page. This distinction is most important in not claiming an idea to be either $+$ or $-$ or $\pm$. This is quite impossible since in the first instance the image would have simply become part of the social, in the objectification of belief as knowledge. The formation of idea cannot be anything else than the subjective, given the triangular principles put forth in this dissertation. Furthermore,
its formation cannot be a dipolar state since any two monopoles do not exclusively equal a dualistic state, argued earlier in this chapter. Even so, and allied with the same argument, it was asserted that "mentally" it is possible for a dualistic state to be formulated—it being the major distinction between mind and matter. However, this is not possible in the exclusive case of an idea since its antecedinal is essentially two monopoles. In that idea is image and belief transformed it cannot be anything else than a subjective bilateral inclusive state.

Idea is the most stable state of the three, mainly because it is a bilateral inclusive state. On the other hand, image and belief are the least stable of the three. Belief is less stable than idea for the reason that it is monopolar, essentially an exclusive disjunctive monopolar state.

From this, and the descriptiveness of behavior made earlier, it should follow that behavior has decreased, which is to say at the same time that "conduct" has increased. Accordingly, it should follow that the affective domain of an individual is the most relaxed or pleasant at the point of idea formation. All of this is true for the reason that the idea is not constituted solely by a monadic monopole. The reader should recall the previous discussion on projection (behavior) and
anxiety (the affective unpleasant) as essentially a monopolar state in need of association.

However, according to the principle of association an idea cannot remain unassociated. Therefore, it will either reverse itself to the previous state of image and belief or become associate to its counter, language. This further implies that, affectively, idea is the most valued since it is a choice-making state. It should be noted that this is only true for those who desire or need choice making; otherwise, it is affectively the reverse.

In regards to the whole topological structure, idea is the minimal state of self-awareness—concept being the next greatest and consciousness being the absolute. The image is excluded from such a status on the basis that it is not a formulated but rather transformation of matter to mind.

In the above, awareness should not be confused with consciousness. Consciousness entails awareness but not vice versa. For instance, the situation of idea being counter to language is when one is aware of the idea, and oneself as the idea, but not consciously so. Consciousness, as will be argued, is a state of "out-of-context." This further asserts that at the point of idea formation one is not conscious of image/belief since idea is image/belief transformed, which means that idea is not "out-of-context" of the image/belief.

In a broad perspective, all of this means that we only become aware of something because we have created it, and we can only become conscious of it because it proves to be identical in structure in a different place, or if you will, in a different situational context.
This, then, obviously means that it must exist in two different places at the same time.

**Language**

Metaphysically, language is identical to belief. It is for this very reason that belief and language cannot be counter to one another. The consideration of the two conjunctively simply results in repulsion of both. But since language and belief are essentially identical, is it then not possible for language to be considered counter to image and belief counter to idea? Primarily it is not possible on the basis that language is not a given which is necessary if it is to be counter to image. In a different sense, it is not because language is functionally more complex than belief. Language functions predicatively, referentially, demonstrably, symbolically, descriptively and many more possible ways. Belief on the other hand, has a minimal function either because it is linguistically defined as non-evidential making it functionally inept, or because it is, as argued here, a context that attracts monopolar states rather than being attracted. Basically, whereas language is ostensively volitional, belief is the converse. If language is not continuously ostensive, it will cease to exist. This is not the case with belief, not simply because belief is a given, but because it is a context having a universality. Albeit that language will also be argued to be a context, it is however not a universal. Furthermore, it is a context in motion, whereas belief is a static context.

In regards to belief as knowledge, this too is different from language as knowledge for the reason that belief as such is terminal (non-transformable) whereas language is infinitesimal—continuously
changing. Accordingly, this makes language as knowledge an untruth, not simply because it is changing, but more precisely because it is not a universal given whereby it changes.

Throughout this dissertation, and in various ways, this has been the criticism of linguistics in its epistemological and at times metaphysical discourses. This is not to say that linguistics should be forsaken, but merely put in proper perspective as a common-sensical endeavor without truth. Furthermore, in and of itself, it serves only to perpetuate existing social conditions. In this light, it is Monism exclusive of Dualism, a most adverse educational endeavor for possible social amenities and/or the extension of the humanities. Only when it is counter to idea is it par excellence.

As with the prostitution of image for the perpetuation of belief itself, this too is possible of the idea in the furtherance of language itself. This should not be confused with the objectification or exemplification of one's ideas but rather the objectification of language at the expense of the idea in its possible transcendence to "concept" formation. Albeit true that this is advantageous in the instrumentality of language, it nevertheless makes the existence of languages more complex. Complexity for its own sake incapacitates communication. Hence, reduction in, rather than reduction of, language is a most important objective if language is to serve as a tool of communication.

The interrelationship of idea and language is thought, or according to this author, "speculating"; that is, a basic and orderly state of reasoning. However, the term is not intended to
connote a conclusion or judgment on the basis of "incomplete evidence" as so commonly implied by the term's usage. All be it that it may lead to

\[
\text{Idea} \pm \text{Speculating} \rightarrow \text{Language}
\]

\[
\text{Language as Knowledge}
\]

a judgment, notwithstanding a conclusion; nevertheless, the concept 'evidence' is what is eminently deceiving. In the sense that evidence usually implies empirical data, the similarity ends, mainly because it is argued in this dissertation that mind (intellect) is independent of empirical data. Were this not the case, speculating and/or reasoning would be quantitatively and qualitatively contingent upon information. This would not only assert that we cannot speculate without empirical data but in so doing we speculate from specific information. This means that we would reason from the specific to the universal, rather than as in traditional philosophizing, from the universal to the specific.

Furthermore, it would also assert that image, as the origin of intellect, is directly derived from perception which has been argued not to be the case. Even in the possible situation where the idea might be prostituted for the perpetuation of language as knowledge, the idea, nevertheless, does not function as evidence of the existence of language since ideas are not evidently linguistic. Were this in the first place to have been true, they would have repelled one another in their basic similarity.

Hence, speculating is a functional process of the idea/language interrelationship. As such it gives rise to "concept" formation in the transcendence of idea and language.
The formation of concept is metaphysically similar to that of idea. The result is obviously different; concept is different from idea. Concept is primarily greater than idea for the reason that it is linguistically a "character" (sign/symbol). Concept has an additive property which in a sense makes it a complex idea, an unstable idea, a $\pm$ as shown below. First of all, the reader should think in terms of $\pm$ as "three as one" rather than "three in one," formerly discussed as a pluralistic or Homoousian state whereby both result in a monistic state. This is to say that the three are with one another if and only if it is viewed in the antecedinal state of with—that is, for and against. The conceptual state is one of high tension, anxiety, and self affliction. It is the closest to a dualistic state, to a self-confrontational state, or to a conscious state without being any of the three. But most importantly, it is the greatest volitive state possible. It is then not only imminent but immanently so, which will be discussed as "conduct." But before getting into "conduct," let us return to concept and its nature.

It is not uncommon for people to purport that terms embrace concepts. For example, it has been asserted by Arthur Koestler in Act of
Creation that words sometimes remain the same while the concepts they embrace can alter from one historical age to another. What Koestler believes about the nature of language and concept does not coincide with the argued content of this dissertation. Mainly, if one "embraces" the other it would be the concept embracing the term rather than vice versa. If the term "embrace" is ambiguous and/or vague for the reader it is suggested that it be substituted for the term "entail" since they are different but not distinct. Concept entails language; language does not entail concept.

The reason that it is possible for "words to remain the same while the concept changes," as Koestler asserts, is because the idea has changed. Hence, the concept must change. Furthermore, and for the same reasons, if the language changes, then the concept changes. But there is an important matter to consider in these regards, viz., if the idea is essentially different, then, the language must as well be different; otherwise, they will repel one another. This very point has been immanently realized by such scholars as Albert Einstein whereby he had to construct, or if you will create, a language that would interrelate his ideas. This is to say that if one has a new concept then it is ex post facto that the idea and language are both demonstrably novel; otherwise, in the first place, the formation of such a concept would not have been possible.

Conduct

As Douglas Arner argues in Perception, Reason and Knowledge, a conceptual system is an instrument—the supreme instrument that humans use in making their way in the world, and I might add, the creation of
"objectness" from thingness. Conjunctively this means that not only is a conceptual system the means of making one's way in the world, but this very world is conceptually formulated. Thus, the behavior in the formulated world is voluntary action without external determination or contingency. In a strict sense it is conduct and not behavior per se.

Obviously, both behavior and conduct are actions, but behavior is without intent whereas conduct is exclusively intentional. Conduct is then the action for which a person may be held responsible since it is not only intentional but intentional within a formulated world. Conduct is, however, first and foremost the objectification of oneself within oneself. From this it may follow that one's actions are projected externally into a formulated world.

All of this is inevitable and made possible by the nature of the concept. Since concept is constituted, in part, by a monopolar state, an unstable state, projection is mandatory in its necessity to associate wherefrom instability is at least decreased if not resolved. Since there are only two types of projection, that of external projection and projection to one's second self, the possibilities are minimal. If projection is first and foremost made external of oneself, then it is a monopolar action either indicative of a monist (for the reason that there is no second self) or a bracketed dualist. In either case "consciousness" is not attained. On the other hand, if projection is first and foremost to one's second self, then conduct, along with concept, transcends to "consciousness."

To restate this, first the minus of the concept is projected to the second self resulting in a plus as shown on the following page. It
should be remembered that any force that crosses a boundary alters from
a minus to a plus or from a plus to a minus. The minus of concept and
the plus of conduct are then attracted toward one another. The metaphy­
sical objective of both is to attain an ultimate attraction or in other
words attain an ultimate state of stability.

Without considering a third monopole, how is it possible for
the two to attain an ultimate attraction, a double bilateral inclu­
sive state, since every time a monopole crosses a boundary it alters
its identity? The external projection of the plus (conduct) of the
second self would simply result in a minus which would repel the minus
of the concept. The same would occur if it were simply re-projected
back to the former self. The only way for the concept to be constitu­
ted by two bilateral inclusive states is if neither the concept nor
the conduct are parts of either selves. This is only possible in
their existence as "boundary content" discussed earlier.

The projection of the instability of the concept to the second
self and the interrelationship of the two is thought by this writer
to be the process of "creating." Thus, creating is first and foremost
self-creating whereby a dualistic state is formulated as boundary
content, to be discussed next as consciousness.

\[
\text{Conduct} \quad + \quad \text{Creating} \quad \rightarrow \quad \pm \quad - \quad \text{Concept}
\]
Consciousness

Consciousness is the most desirable state for the reason that it is the most stable state. All be it true that idea was predicated a stable state, it, however, necessitates association with language. Consciousness is different from idea in that it is not only a double bilateral inclusive state but also a double dualistic state as shown above. This, then enables self-association which is not possible in the case of the idea since it is monadic.

This double dualistic state is different from a given dualistic state only in the sense that it is reversible. This means that the double dualistic state can revert to the double bilateral inclusive state and furthermore to a series of monopolar states. (The reader should keep in mind that even though there is reversibility of a dualistic state or a bilateral inclusive state, this does not negate either state for the reasons discussed throughout this dissertation that a state of mind is a universal particular—only its cloned state is reversed, altered or made contextual.) Such reversal is not possible with a given state, hence a crucial distinction between the given and the formulated, or if you will, matter and mind. Even so, and for the reason that the dualistic state can be formulated, no metaphysical state then exists apart from its possible mind formulization. It is
therefore that one can be conscious of the metaphysical, and the only way one can be conscious of it. Furthermore, since the dualistic can be reversed when formulated, the human state supercedes the metaphysically given, since it is not possible for "nature" to reverse a dualistic state. This further asserts that nature (the given) is not conscious. Consciousness is something that man has brought upon himself for better or worse.

Consciousness as boundary content is consciousness without an object. This is contrary to the general view of consciousness. It is common, even among scholars to argue, as Merleau-Ponty does in *Phenomenology and Existentialism*, that all consciousness is consciousness of something. Notwithstanding this, there are others, such as Franklin Merrell Wolff, who argue that it is possible to be conscious without an object, as expounded in his book *The Philosophy of Consciousness Without an Object*. In this dissertation it is impossible for consciousness to be dependent upon an object on the basis that an object exists *ex post facto* of consciousness. Accordingly, it is not that consciousness is of a thing any more than it is of an object, but that consciousness is a thing in its own right. Even in our everyday experiences the term "consciousness" is most often used to predicate the "state of awareness of one's mind." Mind, in this dissertation, is argued to be a thing, basically a force. Consciousness is simply a thing, a dualistic force, that is vis-a-vis to itself without contingency or contextuality by the fact that it is boundary content. Though true that we are conscious of objects in the world, but that is simply because things have acquired a similar state of existence as that of
consciousness. An object is a thing isolated from other things and thus exists as a boundary. It is taken out of its natural given context by the fact that it is associative with mind. Thus, the thingness of the world is slowly transforming into objectness by the presence of man. The world is becoming human. The world is given value, purpose, objective by the fact that man is transforming things into objects.

Such transformation of the environment is the second sense of encountering the environment. It is not the situation formerly discussed where one is pulled and pushed by external factors but rather the converse. This second encounter is made possible by the fact that the properties of consciousness are similar, in either being two bilateral inclusive states or two dualistic states. In other words, at a state of consciousness one is aware of oneself in that consciousness is self-associative. This also means that one is similar to oneself facilitating self-projection as the creation of the objective world.

Without the reality of this second conduct as an external encounter one would be inept in simply altering back and forth from the dualistic states to the bilateral inclusive states. This is obviously possible and conjectured by this writer to be descriptive of "psychic impotence" and symptomatic of neurosis as well. Along the same lines is the possibility of continuously reversing back and forth and extending the same content of the whole topological structure. Were this to be considered "analysis" it would, however, be in the most basic and narrow sense. Yet, and more to the point, it might simply be predicated "obsession" or in its extremity "obsessive-compulsive neurosis." In this regard, not only would the idea be ostensive but as well image, belief, language, concept and conduct as unchanging
content. Nevertheless, in either situation one's identity, the self-created, is maintained on the basis that it is thought to be negated if projected externally. It is obviously not negated, as argued throughout this dissertation. It is, however, a "flight from oneself."

Thus, and for the reason that consciousness is a state of stability, the flight from oneself is a flight into instability. This is a situation quite unacceptable to a person with a neurotic disorder since it is at least thought by him to be the cause of his ailment. Even so the conscious state remains with oneself since it cannot be negated by its projection. However, since it is stable boundary content it need not be confronted. In such a situation, it exists as bracketed content without awareness to either self. But alternatively, one ends up confronting instability whereby one must again contend with the whole topological structure or fall into environmental subserviency.

Consciousness, then, is a mixed blessing. Once experienced it remains in memory as the most enticing and pleasing intellectual summit. Yet, the state of consciousness itself, whatever particular considered, is a painful encounter. It is an enticement for intellectual transformation while being the switch at the end of the circuit mandating an array of particular confronting in formulating one's identity. Without this latter aspect, one would remain exclusively the first consciousness formulated.

Function of the Topological Structure—
A Summary and Conclusion

In no other time in history has it been more problematic as to what should be considered the antecedent of mind, intellect or reason.
This is evident by the numerous philosophies or so-called philosophies that exist. From these areas of discourse it can ostensibly be argued that either perception, experience, idea, object, social structure, consciousness, conduct or language is the basis of intellect. On the one possible hand we can accept one of the above, while in turn denying the rest—a very monistic approach. In conjunction with this is the possible equal acceptance of all which is Pluralism, different, but metaphysically indistinguishable from Monism. On the other hand is the acceptance that there are two counter antecedents while all else fits into a developmental hierarchy of counterness. This, predicated Confrontationalism, has been argued as the basis of not only the given but, as well the formulated, the topological. Since the topological is dualistic, some consideration is needed as to its possible function. This will not only serve as a summary of this chapter but likewise provide perspective for the consideration of a specific case of the topological structure which will be the thrust of the next chapter.

More than anything else, experience comes to mind as one other possible beginning of the topological structure. There would be no problem in substituting it for the image, at least for the reason that it is a given. It could even be substituted for the belief thereby being intersubjective. If the topological structure was applied to the Deweyan philosophy, then this would be precisely the situation. From this, any aspect such as language, concept or object could fit into the structure at any given point. But as argued in the beginning of this chapter, this would be a misconception of experience. Since everything is experience, except of course nothingness, it is already extensive
thoughout the topological structure. It cannot exclusively exist at any one point or exist to a larger degree at another point. Conjunctively, it cannot exist counter to itself. Hence, it cannot be an underlying factor, or substructure if you will, for determining what and how things fit into the topography. Analogously speaking, this is to say that "if A exists everywhere" it cannot be a directionality.

In a different sense were we to argue that language is the beginning of intellect, as possibly a strict linguist might, our first problem would be how language could be conceptualized as a given. It should be remembered that language, as a lexical system, is complex not basic or primitive. But let us suppose that language was argued to be basically signs and/or symbols. Offhand this would seem to make it applicable, yet not clearly indistinguishable from image itself which is of course necessary. But given its difference, is it possible to think in terms of sign and/or symbol as non-referential? If not, then sign and symbol would be contextually bound, again a state of complexity. Alternatively, it could be argued that a symbol, if it is referential, is self-referential which translates into saying that belief is excluded as its counter since belief is basically the context of and for meaning. In regard to any transformation nothing could be counter to the symbol itself since it is stable. (It should be noted that only so far has the topological structure been considered from the view of transformation.)

A similar situation arises when consciousness is predicated the beginning of the topological structure. In this writer's judgment, this is precisely what makes much of the so-called Oriental philosophies
suspect, especially transcendental meditation. In predicking consciousness as a basic human disposition and advocating its possible transcending, if not transforming, hierarchies of levels of consciousness are thought to exist. How one could account for this diversity, much less the transformation of consciousness itself, remains a mystery to this writer and possibly to the meditators themselves. The consequences of their thesis being wrong, results not in transcendence to higher levels of consciousness but rather a descent from mind to the determinativeness of body and/or environment. In placing consciousness at the beginning of the topography, and viewing it in this light, transcendental meditative discourse simply curtails intellect. This does not, however, result in nothingness but it does result in "intellectual deprivation" whereby one can confront bodily or environmental processes in their effectiveness and affectiveness. Granted, as such, it is a state of high awareness and experience but it is not a state of consciousness. Even so, both awareness and experience are transitory and only maintained insofar as they are confronted. Thus, the guru or meditative state is a mode of existence that ceases if not continuously practiced. Furthermore, there is no intellectual formulation or projection. Were it not for the fact of bodily and/or environmental factors, the state of meditation would be a psychotic state much like catalepsy.

Even though transcendental meditation is suspect when applied to the topological structure, it can be said to have its beneficial sides even in light of the criticism. Consciousness, placed at the beginning of the topological structure enables one to be part of the "natural processes" exclusive of confronting intolerable intellectual
content or chaotic intellectual processes. Thus, it becomes a relief, and not so much a repression of one's mind. This fact might well account for the popularity of transcendental meditation in the western world, and in its relief from the massive data that exists or the inability to synthesize it. Nevertheless, and since consciousness is both the end and the beginning of mind in meditation, one can as well become "trapped" in the conscious state of perpetually altering the dualistic states to the bilateral inclusive states and vice versa, manifesting itself as psychic impotence.

The above discussion of consciousness typifies the alteration of one's "direction of interpretation" from Dualism to Monism. The result of consciousness being placed at the beginning of the topography is similar in effect to the first triangle being placed upside-down, whereby Monism is the antecedent. As discussed in the section on the triad and the triangle this move curtails formulization and transformation of intellect. As with consciousness re-placed, it gives rise to determinativeness of body and/or environment, and possibly even more consequential, monadic neurosis with at least the symptoms of psychic impotence.

In a different sense, when one's direction of interpretation of the whole topological structure is intersubjective, it becomes a social view of the individual. As shown on the next page in "a," belief and language are the social binding factors. But "a" is only possible when the intersubjectiveness of belief and language is identical to its intra-subjectiveness. This is to say, as discussed previously, that there is transcendence of the topological when and only when the
intersubjective can exist as the subjective. Otherwise, in the first place, the image is prostituted for the credence of the belief in the social realm, whereby there is no formation of the idea. Only in the case where the belief is held by an individual subjectively similar to its possible intersubjective existence can there be intellectual transcenden­
dence while maintaining a social status, or if you will connection with the social realm.

It is probably worthwhile to reiterate here why conduct is not social. Since the formation of consciousness is contingent upon con­duct first and foremost being projected intra-subjectively—to the other self—it cannot exist socially, at least not if consciousness is to be a reality. If the concept has been formulated, yet con­sciousness does not follow, then conduct has first and foremost been projected socially. For these reasons, there can be no "social conscious­ness," even when individuals relate socially. Social consciousness is argued in Marxism as a reality whereby and wherefrom one becomes conscious. This is obviously impossible in light of the argued content of this dissertation.

Even so there are social structures or clusters having the simi­larity of "b" on the previous page. They are similar in the sense that either belief or belief/language functions as the binding force. All be it true that the content of such clusters might differ; even so, the binding forces remain essentially the same. Therefore, all clusters whether it be a family, unit, club, co-op, religious sect, city, state, or national affiliation would relate similarly to "b." Given the prim­itiveness of certain groups or sects it is possible that the whole
topological structure is not present. This could range from the basic presence of image/belief, with or without idea/language, to that of concept/conduct. However, in no sense is consciousness necessitated, much less is it possible, as a binding factor as previously discussed. This variance in clusters of completeness of structures would add further interpretation along with a rationale, for the formation of numerous clusters. However, it is theoretically possible for all mankind to be part of a single cluster insofar as it is a complete topography, and thereby, ostensive in allowing and accounting for individuals.

This, then, brings us to a more complete view of how a dualist can exist separate from a social structure or cluster. Granted that belief or belief/language exists as the binding force for social status, nevertheless, they function necessarily so for the monist while optionally so for the dualist. This is primarily because belief is a given and language is infinite, thereby neither are exclusively of the social realm. Accordingly, this is true for the monist as well. He is, however, made social on the basis of the law of association and thereby his possible beliefs and languages are contextual, if not contingent to those existing socially. On the other hand, the dualist cannot default on these bases, indicative of the monist, since he is able to remain independent while abiding by the law of association.

In regards to the topological structure this then means that the self and the second self should be envisioned as the existence of two topological structures within a purported individual. This, however, does not make the topological structure itself or even the content thererof, more complex since under any circumstances confronting and
consciousness are singular. Undoubtedly, it does make the dualist's character and conduct "strange," for it should demonstrably indicate self-confrontation. The character and conduct of the dualist will be taken up in depth in the next chapter, but for the time being, there is a second aspect of the topological structure to be considered, not only in regards to its basic function and its function within the dualist, but as well preliminary to the next chapter.

In the section on the nature of the image it was briefly argued that the image is descriptively an unknown. This very thesis will be ostensive throughout the last two chapters; however, at this point it will be considered without question. As such, the claim that the topology is founded by way of the "unknown" further asserts that it is as well founded by way of the "known." Otherwise, two major principles have been broken, viz., 1. there are always two antecedents, not one (metaphysical); 2. the comprehension of an entity necessitates its counter (epistomological). This is to say that belief (known) is counter to the image (unknown), and further, that the "unknown" is described/explained by way of the "known," a very imaginative process. From all of this, and the principles set forth, it also follows that the "known is described/explained by way of the unknown."

This latter point is not altogether an unusual realization. As a matter of fact, it is a very contemporary description of science. For instance, in Karl R. Popper's book *Conjectures and Refutations*, he asserts, "... that in science we always try to explain the known by the unknown, the observed (and observable) by the unobserved (and perhaps, unobservable)." This is possibly best understood, and
demonstrable, in the fact that science constructs "model-identity" (unknown) to describe, if not explain, for instance a compound (known). In this very context and method lies the debate of whether or not science in fact explains anything at all, but simply describes by re-constructing the world. In a strict philosophical sense of "explanation," it would be suspect to claim that science explains, yet undoubtedly it is an inspiration, if not a goal, of the scientist. Nevertheless, the assertion that in science the "known is described/explained by way of the unknown" remains problematic in that it conjunctively necessitates the understanding of the "unknown described/explained by way of the known." The unknown described/explained by way of the known will be argued to be central to the "process of art." Thus, in that the two methods are counter to one another, it further follows that science and art are counter to one another. The concern and problem becomes what the topography is like when viewed in the light of science that is, the known described/explained by way of the unknown.

To begin with, in that science re-constructs the world, or better yet, "re-constructs the observable," it cannot account for transcendence or formulization, at least not in the sense in which the concept 'formulization' has been employed in this dissertation. This fact should be obvious enough. But what does it mean to say "that science re-constructs the observable"? Here, in the strictest sense, an explanation is required; yet, as previously pointed out, it is questionable as to whether or not science explains. However, there is a branch of inquiry referred to as "philosophy of science" capable
of explanation. From the philosophical side, re-constructing the observable means "Phenomenalism." It is for these very reasons that science is most often equated with Phenomenalism. An inquiry into the re-constructing of the observable necessitates an extensive analysis of Phenomenalism, realistically more extensive than the brief description provided in Chapter III. Even so, a concern with the antecedinal of Phenomenalism will conclusively result in paradox, a monistic state, which has been argued to be in and of itself non-comprehensible. But conjunctively, and with the counter consideration of art, it should at least yield the feasibility of comprehension.

The fact that scientific discourse, either in itself or in regards to content, is not a concern with transcendence or formulization makes it distinctly comprehensible in regards to "art discourse." A complete consideration of this point will be taken up in the next chapter on art, but for the time being, some reflections on the topological structure and its possible implication will be considered in the following brief discussion.

Since the topological structure not only accounts for the given but as well formulating and the formulated, it is then "ultimate" and thereby the most heuristic device possible. Thus, it must likewise be able to account for science and scientific discourse; it is likely as shown in Figure 19 which follows. The term "likely" is used here for two reasons: 1. in the scientific community itself there is much disagreement on what science is and does—one need but read Karl Popper's *Conjectures and Refutations* to realize this fact; 2. as far as this writer knows there is no analytic way to corroborate
scientific discourse, as was done in regards to the art topography in utilizing magnetism. Even so, there is one outstanding factor about science. It corroborates itself in testing the actuality of the predict. For example, the hypothesizing about the nature of the atom was in part corroborated by the construction and explosion of the atom bomb. There is in science a built-in "facticity" (reality of facts) of accomplishment or failure. Such ostensiveness, more than anything else, enables science to accomplish ends without being very "scientific" (methodical). Granted that science is methodically well disciplined. But this is more in regards to possible contamination of its re-constructions than in regards to its own means/endpoint objective. In that scientific discourse is an abdication in transcendence or formulation whereby leaps occur in its methodology, along with having a built
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*Fig. 19--Conjectured Topography of Science*
in facticity of accomplishment, it is conjectured to exist at its best, as shown in Figure 19 on the preceding page. The reader should note that the topological structure shown on the preceding page is slightly different from the art topological structure in that broken lines occur depicting no transcendence and no direct formulization. Here each triangle asserts that "if $A \rightarrow B$, then $D$," whereas the art structure is "if $A \rightarrow B$, then $C$." In either structure the format is argued as necessary. That is, in science it is necessary that $D$ is not directly derived, encountered or deduced from $A \rightarrow B$; in art, it is necessary that no leap occurs whereby $C$ is the transcendence of $A \rightarrow B$. Were this not the reality of science, of leaps being a major component of its discourse, then in many cases re-construction would take thousands of years since in the first instance it took that long. It is the object that is re-constructed, not the time/change/transcendence factors. Hence, the situation of designating a hypothesis is necessarily dependent upon data/object, but in no sense deductively so. At best it would be inferential. All of this is not to say that scientists, or at least most scientists, abide by the "leap theory," as discussed in the previous chapter. It is simply that leaps are necessary in science and advantageously so in regards to the "time factor of re-constructing" while at the same time not faultering epistemologically in its success or failure since ultimately it corroborates itself.

In a broad sense, the topological structure enables interpretation, categorization, explanation and others as well, mainly because they are the consequentiality of the existence of the structure itself. Thus, its function is broad for the reasons that it is first and
foremost general. But even so, it should be evident that any intersubjective content of the scientific structure cannot be bilateral inclusive with the intersubjective content of the art structure (the two structures cannot "hold together" as shown on page 222). This then basically says that they are of different realms, at least in the way they are shown here.

In regards to a dualist who might utilize both structures, such a reality would be productively rewarding, yet frustrating in regards to self-identity. It would be a state of high anxiety whereby the individual would find himself in an either/or, for/against situation unable to identify with both at the same time or identify with one over the other. Yet, and more to the positive side, the transference of content from the one to the other would not only be indicative of an intellectual summit but heuristically advantageous for the individual and society, given its projection.

Further speculation on the function of the structure would be too involved. Therefore, the concern at hand for the next two chapters will first be to deal with a specific image counter to its belief in regards to the art structure, and second, to show how "education" relates and interrelates to all of this. We must also consider the topological structure as it functions interpretatively of specific works of art counter to science, and finally, the interpretation of so-called "disciplines" of higher education and their identity.
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A Problem of Identity

The character and conduct of the artist, as documented by Rudolf and Margot Wittkower, illustrates the diverse and complex nature of the artist, if one could at all conclude from their book that the artist has a nature, other than being an "alienated melancholic." The Wittkowers do, however, concern themselves with the psychological and sociological aspects of the artist which is so often overlooked by many art historians. The Wittkowers, however, are caught in the same vicious paradox as other art historians find themselves in relying upon past and present social acceptance of who is and is not an artist as the determining criteria for what art is and is not. In an attempt to get out of the paradox, the art historians have elevated stylistic development (Gothic to Renaissance, Renaissance to Baroque, etc.) as a necessary and most crucial criterion in determining a would-be artist. Conjecturally, this has led to "art is change" which in turn has been the supposed rationale for the inability to define art and the artist. The argument has been that since art changes it cannot be defined. The major problem with this view is that it does not distinguish "art" from non-art properties, conceptually or materialistically. But there is a further problem created by the art historian's criterion of "stylistic
development as the determining factor for a would-be artist" since that inferentially implies that "the artist is by necessity one who changes, or must change art if he is to be considered an artist." This kind of an argument is of little avail since there are many so-called "non-artists" who change art, and furthermore, it presupposes that art remains art though it may change.

In a different light, the Wittkowers have, in part, relied upon documented judgments of fellow artists as a means of assessing would-be artists. Unfortunately, this creates all sorts of problems such as the artist's vested interest, competition, limited perspective of the arts, and his own discursive ignorance.

Discursive ignorance is rampant in the artistic community. For centuries, the artist has been assailed with the accusation that he doesn't know what he is doing. There are good reasons for this accusation; mainly the artist's own admission. As Picasso once said, "The artist is a receptacle of emotions come from no matter where." Or Chagall, "I do not understand them [his own pictures] at all. They are not literature. They are only pictoral arrangements that obsess me." Or Maxfield Parrish, who stated that it was impossible for him to write a little story of Daybreak or any other picture, for that matter. "I [Parrish] couldn't tell a single thing about Daybreak because there isn't a single thing to tell; the picture tells all there is, there is nothing more." And accordingly Dali, "To a reporter who asked him why he wanted to depict Christ exploding, he replied, 'I don't know yet. First I have ideas, I explain them later. This picture will be the great metaphysical work of my summer.'" When it comes to the artist and his
work, we are faced with enigma, as in Dali's case, not only in the ori­
gin of the work itself, but as well in its title.

If one considers the artist non-psychologically (that is, not as the Wittkowers have done), then discursive ignorance is a bliss, since the problem of "intent" is non-existent. To deal philosophically with the nature of the arts, intent must not be an argumentative factor. The argument that X is an artist because he so intends, leaves open the pos­sibility that X is in fact a non-artist who wishes or intends to be an artist. A man who intends to be a bird is not a bird, nor is a monist a dualist simply by intending to be one. An artist's nature is not neces­sitated by intent.

The Artist is Necessarily a Dualist

The artist's nature is dependent upon the dualistic state. A dualist is an artist but that alone does not make him a painter, sculp­tor, writer, or a musician. This very problem will be taken up later. Nevertheless, without a dipolar state a being could not introspect since a single property reveals nothing in and of itself. Introspection is a method of "reflection" which necessitates two distinct properties to be in a state of vis-a-vis. Likewise, without a dipolar existence a being could not remain apart from the natural or social structure (implication of the law of association), which would accordingly mean that society could not change for the reasons that there would be no counter to it (implication of the principle of counterness). And obviously, if the social structure could not change, then culture could not change either, since culture entails the social (implication of the principle of parts/whole).
On the other hand, a monist as different from a dualist, cannot reduce himself, nor can he extend or transcend himself. A monist is simply at the mercy of natural, social, or dipolar determination. He can choose within this reality, but the reality itself is not a matter of his choosing. The dualist, however, can choose in both senses since he can exist associationally in respect to his other self. This is not possible for the monist since he cannot opt exclusive self confronting; hence, external confronting simply remains for him, which conclusively puts him in a continuous choice-making situation within a reality of determination.

From this, the monist always has an "identity." But any such particular identity is directly determined by the natural, social, or specifics within the social structure, or even, that of dualistic predication. Identity, in the case of the monist, is basically nothing more than what he associates with, such as a chair, car, tree, belief that he is a child of god, or what have you. On the other hand, the dualist is always trying to formulate and create his identity since his existence is not dependent upon anything external but rather his own second existence. This second sense of "identity" is a true identity. But its creation, necessarily in a dualistic context, results in the double formation of any identity. This in turn causes the dualist to flee his own created identity since similarities repel. Ultimately, at best the dualist could be said to have an identity that is descriptively "left behind" or "shed." Such shed identity is not only evidence of the dualistic existence and transformation but potential identity for the monist as well.

From the aforementioned certain behavior, conduct and character are not only expected but hardly surprising in light of the nature of the dualist, as different and counter to the monist. A few of these will
be considered next—but by no means will it be extensive since it is such a broad and complex area of study.

The Character of the Artist as Different From that of the Illustrator

Whatever philosophical, psychological or sociological camp one might consider, there prevails the concept 'alienated' as a paradigm characteristic of the artist. The Wittkowers even go as far as to "attempt to trace the cause and effect of his [the artist's] alienation . . .". But the concept itself is a misleading one. The artist cannot justifiably be described as "alienated." Only a social being can be alienated—not a being who exists outside or apart from the social structure. All be it that if the artist desires to become social, then, and only then, can he at all be considered in any sense alienated; but then, his identity, or at least his conduct, as an artist, is eminently in question. As the Wittkowers themselves point out, there are justifiably "two types of artist," the conforming and the non-conforming. The latter is usually referred to as the Bohemian; that is, a person with artistic interests who disregards conventional standards of conduct, fashionably Gypsy like. It would be nothing short of absurd to refer to a Gypsy as an alienated being, mainly because it is the life that he chooses and the life that he desires.

But, then, what about the artist who wishes to conform to the social structure—that is to exist within the social structure? Is he still an "artist" or a "type" of artist? First of all, he must bracket himself to a monistic state; otherwise, he cannot exist within the social. But as previously argued, a monist is not an artist. Yet, a dualist, by nature, is able to function in two different senses—
monistically and dualistically. If a dualist brackets himself to the monistic state, whereby he becomes social, then he is at least not functioning as an artist even though he is essentially dualistic. Rather than calling such a being a "type of artist," which is hardly descriptive, it would not be unwarranted to predicate him an "illustrator." As will be discussed in depth later on, an illustrator is either a monist who is artistically inclined or a bracketed artist. If the artist wishes to be an illustrator, but is ostracized by society, then possibly there would be grounds for applying the concept 'alienation'. However, it would be alienation of the illustrator, not the artist. To confuse the two leads to the kind of misrepresentation found in much literature, with no exception to the Wittkower's own book, viz.,

The first signs of a rebellion are noticeable in the sixteenth century and found expression in Federigo Zuccari's scholastic treatise.50 He advocated that artist's freedom to represent 'whatever the human mind, fancy or whim may invent'.9

First of all, since the artist exists apart from the social structure he cannot "rebels" against it. Rebellion is a process from within. An illustrator, however, can rebel. Secondly, Federigo Zuccari's aspiration is that of an illustrator's, not an artist's, as the Wittkowers would have us believe. An artist already has the freedom to represent, since he is outside the social structure, and as such, he has expressed freely since the dawn of man. Albeit, the artifacts of free expression have not always been acknowledged or accepted as such by society. However, this is not to say that there hasn't been "freedom to represent whatever" insofar as the product's existence was not made dependent upon social recognition, such as the many various professional organizations and guilds which have often tried to dictate artist's taste, conduct,
production or whatever. The reality of such dictation is by the way, what has made it difficult and problematic in determining artistic exemplars historically, since, and in many cases, such artifacts have not survived their creators because society did not uphold them as art.

A further misconception of the artist is that he is a "humanist." Depending upon how the term is used, and its denotations, it may well be an appropriate description of the artist but only insofar that it does not have **common, contemporary** usage. If the term is intended to predicate "a concern with human welfare" or "a compassion for one's fellow man," then it is descriptive of the monist, not the dualist. This is mainly because the artist is outside the social structure and thereby hardly concerns himself with other people. He is like Godot in Samuel Beckett's play or the Sibyl's son in Pär Lagerkvist's book.

It would not only be strange, but suspicious, to find an artist doing social work of any kind; he simply doesn't care much about the welfare of others, but more importantly than that, it would necessitate his dipolar state bracketed to a monopolar one. On the extreme side, and without moral consideration at this point, he (the artist and specifically Bartolomeo Torri, who died in 1554), is the kind that would keep "... so many limbs and pieces of corpses under his bed and all over his rooms, that they poisoned the whole house." Or, possibly, walk the streets covered with corpses dead from hunger or disease observing and noting anatomic characteristics. It isn't that he would be the cause of the death; even so, he might well gorge himself with food in front of a starving child without the slightest thought of sharing. It isn't that he is cruel, far from it. It's just that he is extremely inconsiderate. Cruelty is an attribute of the monist who is by necessity
dependent upon others. It is the kind of existence depicted in Jean-Paul Sartre's play, "No Exit," viz., the monistic characters who discover that "Hell is other people." As Jean-Paul Sartre rightfully points out, there is no exit for man; however, this is not equally true for the dualist, which somehow, Sartre fails to recognize since he makes no such human distinction throughout his philosophy. But since the law of association applies equally to the dualist he is then fortunate or unfortunate in having to live vis-a-vis with himself. Cruelty, if it exists in the dualist case, is self-cruelty from that of masochism to suicide, whereas sadism is the main principle of the monist. As evident throughout the Wittkower's description of the artist, conclusively the artist is hardly outwardly destructive but eminently self-destructive. For example, Masaccio (1401-28), cared little about himself and still less about others. Typically, the dualist gives little thought to the cares and concerns of the world nor even himself. He concerns himself with the unknown and not the known, and thereby, either neglects or remains indifferent to the common, practical world. If he is concerned with "humanism" it is only to the extent that it is synonymous with "metaphysics." Not only is this true in regards to man himself, but likewise to a social structure or even a nation.

A misunderstanding or ignorance of the above has caused critics and historians throughout history to misrepresent, not only the essence of art, but likewise in confusing the illustrator's nature with that of the artist's. As evident by Gabriel Mourney's statements about the British artists viz.,

It has become a common-place to declare that 'art has no native land': however this may be, it is an incontestable fact that every artist has one. Forgetful of what he owes to his Fatherland, the
artist too often repudiates his home; but the really honest, the really great will ever remain faithful to the land of their birth.13

And further, by Charles Francis on the American artists:

There has been a good deal of talk lately concerning the clause in the tariff bill limiting to five years free entry of works of American artists living abroad. It has been repealed, for Secretary Gage ruled that so long as an American artist does not renounce his allegiance to the flag, his works may be entered free of duty.

... Neither in sentiment nor in the character of his works is he American, and five years is certainly a very fair interpretation of temporary residence abroad for purposes of study. American art—art that is inspired in America, produced by Americans, for Americans, is not being developed nor advanced. Protect the student by every possible means, and then protect the artist by making him come home and carry out the principles and techniques of the art he has learned as a student. Otherwise we must coin a new word, for American he is not.

... Painters and sculptors, come home if you wish protection for yourselves and your art! American art will only be produced under American skies, and it is injustice to use the same honored title for both those who are living abroad, and the faithful ones who are missionaries of art at home.14

It is fairly clear in both quotes that unless artists recognize nationality they will suffer retribution. It is however "contestable" that an artist has a native land, hence an impossibility for him to be "repudiating" his Fatherland since he is not, in the first place, entailed by it. "Repudiation" suffers by similar criticism to that of "rebellion," previously discussed. In the artist's freedom and concern with the metaphysical, he counters nationalism, regionalism, or any unifying ideologies, such as the symbolism of a flag. Evident in the previous quotes and the circumstances surrounding artists throughout the world today, it does put the artist and his loyalty in suspect especially when viewed comparatively from the point of the illustrator's monistic social missions. Not only is the monists' view of the artist's nature an incorrect one, but their whole philosophical base is in question in demanding with
threats, a dualist's allegiance to something that has no essence. Furthermore, to demand allegiance to a consequent rather than an antecedent, in light of the artist's concern with explaining the unknown, is nothing short of ignorance about both the artist and nationalism. It is outright insolence to the importance of the artist's role at large.

The aforementioned might denote the artist as having little bearing on the social structure. In a special sense this is correct. However, this is only correct in regards to a direct effect and not an indirect one. The indirectness will be considered in the following sections, but for the time being there is another metaphysical role possible for the artist which is at least a borderline case, of direct and explicit effect on the social structure. This is the situation where the artist is the leader of a group or a society.

Leadership is a most confusing and perplexing attribute. Scholars throughout the centuries have tried to determine the characteristics and circumstances surrounding leadership. It is still a puzzling matter.

What is important here is that it is possible for a dualist to function in this very capacity. The social situation must, however, be one of total submission, if not commitment to the wishes and desires of the dualist. This would conclusively be an authoritative or dictorial situation whereby the masses would either willingly carry out the wishes of the dualist, or at least where the populace would discipline itself into obedience.

Depending upon the social yearning and the philosophical disposition of the dualist such a situation could be as diverse as the social influence of either Hitler or Christ. But often, and more than anything
else, the dualist simply serves as the conscience of the masses, licensing the overt behavior of the people. Characteristically, it is like that of a playground where an adult stands idly by observing children's actions towards one another, and whereby the situation gets more and more violent as they test to see what is proper and improper behavior or conduct respective of the adult's standards.

With the aforementioned character and conduct of the artist in mind, let us take a close look at the expressive act, which has been argued to have its origins in the image and the belief. First, and in regards to comprehending the following sections, the artist in his infancy will be referred to as "the image maker" so as to be able to take into consideration some transformation of his existence. The image maker matures some throughout history which is very important in assessing the artist's nature. Second, the rationale for having chosen religious art, as opposed to some other subject matter, is not because it is the paradigm of art, but rather because it represents not only the social role of art but likewise the artist's function in regards to society. Furthermore, it is also a subject extensively considered by the artist, and therefore, historically reveals transformation as an exemplar of many of the arts and the artistic enterprise.

Explanation of the Unknown from the View of Religion and Religious Art Re-Interpreted

The Origin of Religion

A question about religious art is a question about religion itself. To fully understand religion one must turn to its susceptible roots. Here we find man's fear of the unknowns: antecedinal causes
of everyday occurrences, incidental sounds and sights, good, evil, self-identity, conception, death, etc. We would be exposed to fables, myths, legends, and superstitions as accounts for, and attempts at, explaining such phenomena. Through these fables, myths, legends, and superstitions illusive beasts would emerge as responsible for man's misfortunes and others for his prosperity. More than anything else, these origins and evolutionary trends are exemplified in the dragon myth.

The dragon myth is the single most ostensive myth in the world. From Africa to Europe to Asia the dragon myth has played a prominent role in cultural development. It is explicitly the foundation of most religious cults and most assuredly the Old and New Testaments. As John Leyland in "The Dragon of Mythology, Legend and Art" so clearly points out, "... we can not only trace it with perfect clearness in its origin, but can understand the full significance of its every development; ..."15

To begin with, the evolutionary birth of man was marked by many ills which bestowed him, and which were attributed, by him, to a malevolence, characteristically a horrible, monstrous creature. At its inception, this monstrous creature had no shape or form—it was basically non-substantive, an unknown. There were good reasons for this. Basically, had this not been the case then the dreaded creature would have had limited power, and possibly have even been mortal. As such, the creature would have been no different from many of the commonly hunted animals. These animals, and their destiny, were to a large extent determined by man's decision of whether they should live or die. He was their monstrous beast. On the other hand, man's monstrous beast had to
be superior to his own powers, otherwise he would not have been at its mercy. For these reasons, the cause of man's ill faith had to be attributed, by him, to something that was not like him or those animals which he commonly hunted. It had to be a "thing" that was illusive as a snake, powerful as lightning and fire, versatile as a bird. It could exist here and there at the same time making it the cause of infinite ills. It was obviously immortal since man's ills persisted throughout the ages.

There was, however, one outstanding problem with this. How should one account for both the indifferent times and the prosperity that intermittently occurred? Throughout the dragon myth we find two recurrer- ing explanations. One was that the "dreaded creature simply slept." The other was that there existed what amounts to a counterwhole who sometimes neutralized the evil force, or at times had the upper hand, accounting for man's prosperity. For instance, the enemy of the Aryan man was Vritra or Ahi, the trotting snake, and conversely, Indra who was the wonder worker. Such counters existed throughout the various cultures as representing elemental and universal conflict. It is the conceptual basis of good and evil as attributed to the various modern gods. (This includes the Roman, Greek, Judaic and Christian gods.)

The role of the wonder worker basically remained the same throughout history. It only changed when the dreaded creature's role changed since its existence is basically dependent upon, and counter to, the role of the dreaded creature's. But in this very respect, and since the wonder worker's role did change slightly, the dreaded creature's role also changed slightly. This very point will be taken up next since it is not only crucial in establishing the dragon myth but it is also very
important for a complete and comprehensive understanding of the world of religion.

The basic and fundamental role of the dragon throughout history is the persistence of ill infliction and/or deprivation. For instance, the Aryan creature locked up the necessities of life, particularly by depriving man of his needed water. As John Leyland points out, this is the keynote of the whole subsequent development of the dragon myth as attributable to the Aryans' way of life and their environmental circumstance. As the Aryans settled the fertile regions of Europe in more recent times, "... it was in the nature of things that the dragon they brought with them should [accordingly] become subject to considerable change." The evil one ended up being depicted with less terror and malignity, as compared to the Oriental dragon, whereby it ceased to be the mere custodian of water changed to the custodian of treasure, often consisting of gold and precious stones. But even as such, the dragon was still viewed as the ill inflietor and assuredly the depriver, since man, the selfish creature that he so often is, thought himself as an innocent victim of what rightfully belonged to him.

Such, then, was the development of the mythic dragon. He began as an oppressor of man, depriving him of that which was his birthright and necessary for his sustenance; he was hated and feared as the universal enemy; he became the object of propitiation or even of worship, for the avoidance of his malevolence, or the procuring of that which he could bestow; he was assailed for the possession of his secret hoard; by him was man deprived of those who were fairest and most dear; ... .

Such ideology is deeply rooted in pre-historic thought and was indeed transmitted from one society or nation to another, or simply evoked by similar conditions. In this very sense the evil one was introduced into the Scriptures formidably to be found in its dragon-like
description in Genesis as a snake; in Isaiah (27:1) as Leviathan, a fleeing serpent, a twisting serpent, a dragon living in the sea, who the Lord will slay with his great and strong sword. Accordingly in Job (41, 1-34), the evil one is described as a fearsome creature that even frightens "the mighty" (or god) when he raises himself. He is further described in Job (41:26) as one who cannot be slain by the sword nor by any other means.

As a point of reference, some five years following John Leyland's two articles on the dragon myth, he wrote another article titled "The 'Evil One' in Art" wherein he states that "we all know who the evil one is"; and further,

Two aspects of the Evil One were chiefly to find expression in Christian art. They were Satan as the tempter of Christ, laying out the enticements of the world for the undoing of men, and as the triumphant demon who grabbed with and tortured the souls of the damned. Thus, we can see how religion owes its theology to the dragon myth in establishing a purported cause of man's ill infliction and deprivation, and how the wonder worker counters the evil one's force or even how he might totally overcome it (as in the possible case of God destroying Satan). The following task is now to show how the artist played a part, if not a total part, in the creation of the evil one and his change of character, wherefrom the wonder-worker's character changed.

The Artist and the Dragon Myth

To begin with, it should be realized that knowledge, and its cognition, is often not attained at the spur of the moment; it is a long range process of generations upon generations accumulating bits of information to be conceptually synthesized. Along with this is the
crucial discardment or reorganization of information into appropriate categories whereby fables, mysticism, superstition, philosophy, science, etc., are recognized for what they are and developed accordingly. It is only in recent times that man has recognized this very important developmental necessity. It is not that as categories these are, nor should be, exclusively separate from one another; hopefully each will facilitate the development of the other. However, to make no distinction between them, is to confuse prayer with medicine as a means of fighting disease. Establishing the nature of such categories has been for a long time an unconscious, crucial endeavor of the artist. For it is basically the objectification of created boundaries from within the mind of the dualist.

In pre-historic times almost everything was mysterious to man. We can suspect that ignorance pervaded the pre-historic society. Certain individuals, such as the elders, chief, medicine men, and mystics gained prominent positions in the society, or clan, as those who could, or were at least willing to, account for the ills that befell their community. They were not only able to put to rest the fears of the individuals within the community, by supposedly accounting for the strange sounds that pervaded throughout the night, or the strange sights during the day, but accordingly able to keep the community united in obedience, by introducing the threat of reprisal by monsters. Such mythology kept the community united in establishing a social structure from within, and likewise, gave direction, by way of fear, to the whole development of the community.

Undoubtedly, much of this fell short of the people's expectations. There was probably a curiosity that spurred questions as to why and how the monster lived, appeared, and manifested itself, how the monster
might be appeased to curtail its own evil actions, or how it could be counteracted by man. But more than anything else, there was an outright need to know as much about the monster's appearance in evading it, or at least not in confronting or encountering it. This was likely the outcry by the hunting party who would be most apt to encounter it or even hunt it unknowingly and mistakenly. But those who preached the mysticism were not necessarily those who could exemplify its appearance. We can suspect, then, that the mystic (such as the medicine man) would patronize the image maker to compensate for his own shortcomings. Justifiably so, the mystic would recruit the image maker "with reservation" for the reasons that he would in fact be subcontracting his own work. If the image maker was too successful, then the mystic might be out of his job, losing his social status. However, for the mystic to continue preaching without concrete exemplification or evidence would lead to the questioning of his credibility. As such, the image maker was summoned with reservation to imagine, speculate, and create from that which was known in describing and hopefully explaining the nature of the unknown (evil one).

One of the first tasks for the image maker was deciding upon a form that would represent the nature of the evil one. This must have displeased the mystic greatly, for this would change the spiritual creature into a substantive beast, whereby he and the image maker would be in disagreement on an essential property and principle. One can suppose that the image maker or makers conjured up many different images throughout history, but those that survived did so selectively, because they had a human correspondence, whereby they would be understood. This apparently was the dragon form since we have such an
abundant representation of it. But the artist was not simply a passive
illustrator of such religions. He took upon his own shoulders the abil-
ity to interpret these unknowns.

He projected his own personality into the operations of nature,
of which he felt himself to be the plaything [reference to the
dragon]; and gave, as Shelley phrases it, 'a human heart to what
we cannot know'.

But in doing so, the evil one was depicted with less malignity. Yet, if
it were to be identified for what it was, then the artist had to compen-
sate for its personification. The Oriental and Western dragon, conceived
in serpentine or saurian form with its powers of flight, are additions
of poets or artists, who have sought, in mighty wings, to endow him
with greater terrors. As people confronted the picturesque evil one
their fears changed to an acceptable awe. The picturesque dragon could
never quite parallel its supposed original dreadful reality. If the
dragon's malignity did not simply depreciate by the artist's personal
projection, then assuredly, by the viewer's ability to confront it,
whereby it would become an acceptable acquaintance. For instance, it
became so much a part of everyday life in the Oriental societies that
almost everything was decorated with its image to the point in recent
times where it has become idealized.

The dragon's represented horrendum had its limitations. It could
only be depicted with so much uniqueness and ferocity, since it is rather
impossible even to imagine something that is totally distinct from one's
reality. Consequently, and because that which one becomes more acquainted
with becomes less ferocious, the dragon throughout the ages became more
human like and acceptable. It became a creature that could be con-
quered. The dragon began to lose its mystique and power, and since
the wonder worker is directly counter to the evil one it too lost some of its extreme characteristics.

In direct opposition to the mystic's wishes, no doubt, the artist began to represent various possible assaults upon the evil one. Siegfried slays his dragon foe and bathes in the monster's blood rendering him invulnerable. In Scandinavian legend, Sigurd, by tasting the heart-blood of Fafnir, is enabled to understand the mystic language of the birds. Accordingly, the Rhineland is full of dragon stories, such as the monster slain by Bromser of Rudesheim. There are also numerous stories where knights go forth to slay their dragon. The essence of the evil one is however never totally destroyed since he represents the ills that befall man and invariably such ills continue throughout time.

What is important here is that the powers of the wonder worker have depreciated throughout history in accordance with those of the evil one, so much in fact, that the wonder worker becomes a special human being. By the time the Scriptures appear we see the wonder worker (God) as one "depicted in the image of man" (not vice versa). The dragon, Satan, the fallen archangel, is nothing more than a misguided angel isolated from the wonder worker, or rather, man's domain.

The artist could not but give the dreaded monster a form, if he was to represent it visually. Conjunctively, throughout the years, the artists in relying upon visuals of the monster, compounded the humanly personal characteristics which stripped the monstrum characteristics to the point where it could be slain. Conversely, the same happened to the wonder worker. All of this, quite unconscious on the artist's part, becomes an explanation of the formerly unknown whereby the prestige of man is elevated in decreasing his fears of the evil one. As will be
shown, the artist does not destroy such counters, but rather transforms them into their categorically logical realities. The artist, because of his duality, is able to formulate from "two givens."

The Artist and Religious Art

In certain areas of the world, specifically in Africa or New Guinea, one can still encounter the image maker patronized by the witch doctor or medicine man. Here, as in the "past," the image maker continues a strict interpretation and explanation of the tribe's religion. Depending upon how prolific the image maker(s) are directly determines the extent to which the tribe's unknowns are explained, and the extent to which the tribe can develop. The social and the cultural cannot transcend as long as they remain phenomena as will be argued. Both have their origin in religion and without the explanation of that religion they remain stagnant. It is in this sense that the artist changes the social and also the cultural.

For many centuries, the western world has been a culture dominated by religious mysticism. It has been a culture dominated by unknowns and the proliferation of such phenomena by so-called "preachers." Had there been no counter to all of this, then there would have been no change. There would have been no social development for the unknowns would have inhibited the development. For instance, there would have been no knowledge of the human biological condition, and in turn medicine. All of this was once acknowledged as the antecedinal phenomena of the evil one and the wonder worker.

To the extent to which we would find the proliferation of mysticism we should likewise find a direct correspondent proliferation of the
artist, since they are not only patrons but counters to one another. Without this there would be an unchanging, undeveloping, extremely closed social structure. The task at hand now is to show and support the premise that the artist, as counter to the preacher, has and does directly transform phenomena and thereby, the social and the cultural.

As the preachings of the medicine man were deemed, by the populace, as needing further elaboration so was it with the "Christian doctrines." It can be suspected that a similar rationale pervaded the populace "that if the evil one and the wonder worker could even be considered, then they could also be depicted." Hence, the church (organized religion) regretfully patronized the image maker to appease the populace. It was the kind of regret exemplified by Pope Julius II towards Michelangelo; or Hugo van der Goes' relationship with the monks in their trying to humble him. According to the clergy, there were numerous problems with the artist. To mention but a few, they were considered "godless unbelievers," "unconcerned with their patrons (the clergy)," "obsessed with nudity" which has always presented problems for the Christian civilization, "madness" because they were severe critics of their own work to the point of destroying it for not having attained an ideal excellence. The artist was viewed as heathenish, two faced and untrustworthy as depicted in Figure 20 on the next page. He was often suspected of having supernatural powers, of being a witch. Likewise, he was also viewed as ignorant of what he did. Thus, he was not only disliked by the clergy but feared by them as well. Most likely it was the fact that he was feared and needed by the clergy, as well as ignorant, which saved him from the gallows.
All of this was unintentional on the artist's part. The artist simply concerned himself with the unknowns perpetuated by the priests; but in so doing, all sorts of contradictions arose. Michelangelo, who tried to narrate the gospel, insisted upon representing man nude to show as the gospel states, that he was created without sin. Yet, as we see in The Creation of Adam, (a detail of the Sistine Ceiling), Adam was undraped to represent sinlessness whereas God was represented draped. Michelangelo, in adhering to the Scriptures, ended up depicting Adam without sin and God with sin.
Hugo van der Goes, in *The Portinari Altarpiece*, depicted the three kings, or wise men, having ugly faces, gnarled bodies—humble peasants on the verge of insanity. (It should be noted that H. W. Janson in his book *History of Art* refers to these three figures as shepherds, not wise men). It was the manifesto and the manifestation of the Christian doctrine that the "have nots" were closer to God. Hence, God favored some, not alone on matters of sin, but simply because they had less. The perpetuation of such doctrines created further contradiction within the church.

Likewise, according to the Scriptures, Christ suffered on the cross which was depicted explicitly by many German artists, such as Matthias Grünewald's *The Crucifixion*, from the Isenheim Altarpiece. The Christ figure was made to look deplorable, pitiful, and hardly god-like. Christ appeared more human than at any prior time. Undoubtedly such impressions have facilitated the twentieth-century Christology where "Christ is still divine, but not as divine as he used to be."27 The loss of divinity of Christ has over the centuries been furthered by the depiction of the Christ child. The Christ child during the Gothic Age was shown as a "small adult," slowly changing in appearance to a "baby" in the nineteenth century. The Christ child as a baby is well exemplified in the painting *Le Sommeil De Jesus* by L. Deschamps which appeared at the Salon in 1887.28 But not only that, the picture also depicts Mary with confusion and anxiety on her face as she peers at the viewer—not the child.

Such works changed the view of the populace, whereby beliefs about religious doctrines changed all without any conscious intent on the artist's part. Granted there were many works explicitly intended to
change the religious doctrines (some of these will be considered later). But before explicitly considering intent, some borderline cases difficult to assess and categorize will be considered. These are important in their own right since they are extremely effective in changing the view of the populace by the fact that they are so widely acceptable in their supposed indifference. An example of such a case, and a possible interpretation, is a work from the late eighteen hundreds by Dicksee.

Prior to 1882, Frank Dicksee painted a picture titled The Symbol, with the subtitle "'Is it nothing to you, all ye that pass by?' Lam. 1.12." The Symbol was hailed as one of the great works of art in England that year and was made the frontispiece of The Magazine of Art, June, 1887, followed by a review written by Sydney Hodges on Dicksee and his works. The critic, Hodges, allots little space to the discussion of this work other than a brief, and inadequate description, of what transpires in The Symbol. He concludes that the moral of the story is conveyed by the motto attached to the title (Is it nothing to you, all ye that pass by?) which apparently makes the work of art self explicit, at least according to Hodges. His description of The Symbol is basically that it represents a group consisting of three young females and four young males who are gaily dressed, revellers in gayest costumes, coming through an archway in some old-world Italian town. The young people are comporting themselves in a Bacchanalian fashion (at worst they have indulged themselves in modest drink, hardly at all intoxicated beyond sense). They are jubilant, but orderly, engaged in conversation and playing of instruments (specifically, the five last members of the group about to come down the steps through the archway). At the very front of
the group is a gallant young man holding the hand of a young woman who is enthralled by an apple in her hand, and which leads one to believe that she is about to pluck it off the branch. Her escort, the gallant young man, is irritatingly and unwantingly looking to his side where an old bearded man, impoverished in appearance, sits against a wall holding up a crucifix for sale. Next to the old man is a chest full of relics, trinkets, and other objects. On top of these relics is a human skull, specifically the parietal bones. On the opposite side of the old man stands a figure covered by a robe. Head down, he stands with a staff. One's first impression of this figure is the similarity it has to the various depictions of death. The relationship of this figure and the old man with the crucifix is speculative; however, it would not be totally unwarranted to think of them as companions.

The previous discussion of Dickeee's work is basically descriptive. Description itself whether complete or not, is a far cry from, and merely a means to, the importance of interpreting the work. Much could be added to the previous descriptive content such as style, color, and various details which, however, do not pertain to the interpretive act in this case. Access description, or if you will, description which is not directly and necessarily the antecedent to interpretation would simply make the interpretive act more difficult, if not mis-oriented.
The Symbol is a unique work in that it readily lends itself to thorough interpretation. It does so for the reasons that two antecedents are explicitly given whereby formulization can be accomplished. Furthermore, the formulated can be countered with a single external social event, relevant to the work itself, enabling a complete interpretation as shown below in Figure 21.

![Diagram of the Symbol]

Fig. 21—An Example of Dualistic Art

Most works would simply, at best, end with the first triangle. At worst, some works would not even constitute a counterness, which would make the interpretive act almost impossible since the work, no matter how it was viewed, would remain monistic (if a monistic work is viewed as dualistic—as having counterness in and of itself—then the "Intentional Fallacy," by W. K. Wimsatt and Monroe C. Beardsley would be suspect).

As in question here, we are not sure that Dicksee overtly intended to belittle the Scriptures since it is a borderline case on that matter. Nevertheless, the interpretation is an explicit, provocative assault on religious doctrine whether or not such an intent existed on the artist's part. It is, in the sense that The Lamentations is about Jerusalem, left deserted because,
Jerusalem sinned grievously, 
therefore she became filthy;
All who honored her despise her, 
for they have seen her nakedness;
Yea, she herself groans, 
and turns her face away.29

Furthermore, all of this tormenting is acknowledged to have been the 
doings of the "Lord" who inflicted it on the day of his fierce anger.
Jeremiah's concern with Jerusalem is identical to the old impoverished 
man's concern with the crucifix in asking, Is it nothing to you, all ye 
that pass by?

The old man is a consequence of his own chosen faith. In his 
Christianity, he is impoverished, sinful, and obsessed with salvation as 
he tries to peddle the crucifix, symbolically from a box that likewise 
contains a human skull. But more than that, he is trying to peddle such 
death and sin to a gallant, jubilant, and prosperous group of which, for 
them, the apple has not even been plucked, much less eaten. If there is 
sin in this group, it is of a totally different kind than that which is 
represented in the Scriptures.

This juxtaposition of church doctrine (Christianity) and human 
nature is the counterness of the two antecedents of the work. The answer 
to the subtitle of the work is an obvious "No"—no it is nothing other 
than an attempt for sympathy and empathy by those gone astray in their 
choice-making! It is sin and guilt by association only, and of no con-
cern to those who are indifferent.

Whether or not all of this was consciously understood by the cri-
tic, Sydney Hodges, and the rest of those who were responsible for bring-
ing it to the attention of the masses, will probably remain a mystery.
Nevertheless, this writer is sure that the work elicited a strong
impression in the viewer's mind similar to that of Sydney Hodges' im-
pression, viz.

Indeed, he [Frank Dicksee] is one of the very few exponents we
have of pure poetic art, the art which does not take its subjects
from the common events of life, nor from the books which have
been so continually drawn upon by both bygone and living painters,
nor from the classics, nor (except in the case of "Too Late")
from the higher inspiration of the Scriptures. He works up to an
ideal evolved from his own inner consciousness.30

The above description of Dicksee and his work is a mark of high excel­
ence, valued in the late eighteen hundreds. It is not exclusive to
this period but more so pronounced as a preference, possibly because of
the vast concern with literal representation of natural settings done by
a vast majority of so-called artists during this period in time. Where
many of Dicksee's contemporaries were illustrators of natural settings
he, however, was an artist. But even more than that he had consciously
or unconsciously discovered dualism in art whereby expression can be
communicated and interpreted. Even today such an artistic approach is
rare, at least for the reason that educationally the would-be artist is
told that a work of art must have one and only one theme. But let us
return to the task at hand of showing how the artist is responsible for
social and cultural changes by means of religious art.

One could go on for pages about exemplars that bring to our at­
tention inconsistencies within religious doctrines. Even those so­
called works of art that not only society recognized, but likewise those
that the church upheld—not to mention all the works that have been lost
throughout the ages. These inconsistencies were brought to bear, not at
all by a subversive intent on the artist's part, but rather by his con­
cern with the unknowns and their explanation. Both Michelangelo and
Hugo van der Goes wanted to remain faithful to the church giving a just
and faithful representation or narration of the Scriptures. However, as so many Christian artists discovered, this led to a betrayal of consciousness and integrity of their high ideals. The artist, if not accomplishing personal representation of the text overtly, would at least do so in his privacy. The artist, as different from the illustrator, had as much to say about the content of the unknowns as did the priest.

Tintoretto treated the Gospel narrative as Milton treated Genesis; it was natural he would do so. The instant the poet or the artist recognizes himself as such, he ceases simply to narrate, he must also expound. I, too, am a power, he says to himself; the great events of history are barren and meaningless to the mass of mankind if we confine ourselves to bare details. Explicit narration of an idea, concept or whole text is the occupation of the illustrator. As stated above, this sort of limitation is unacceptable once the artist realizes his potentiality. In this very sense, the artist also asserts himself with explicit intent in reinterpreting or even countering a given theme. Such is the case with Hieronymus Bosch's The Garden of Delights (1500) wherein he reinterprets man's life on earth as a continuous carnal of desire. Bosch depicts man as doomed to be the prisoner of his own appetites without salvation—destined for Hell. In a sense it is a pre-Sartreian theme of "No Exit" which goes directly counter to the Scriptures.

Contemporarily speaking, such overtness is exemplified by Mark Twain's Letters from the Earth wherein he intentionally assaults man's stupidity, arrogance, bombast and folly in his adherence to religious doctrines. As noted by Henry Nash Smith in the preface of the book, it was this later writing of Mark Twain which distinguished him, not simply as a celebrated humorist, but as a great artist. Furthermore, contemporary plays, records, and movies such as "Jesus Christ Superstar" have
provoked the populace to re-think and re-interpret the Scriptures. Such
direct intent by artists may have spearheaded the Christology of our
time, facilitating the new cultural movement known as the "Reborn
Christians," which, by the way, is a personal religion in opposition to
church doctrine. It is descriptively an aspiration, not simply to be
"like" Christ but rather to be Christ.

All of the changes of the evil one and the wonder worker and the
artist's role in regards to the church, culminate in the humanly/meta-
physical studies by Salvador Dali. Dali's Christ is no longer the
Christ found in the Bible; it is a human Christ. That is, it is man at
his ideal, at his metaphysical state. Dali's Christ figures have no
crown of thorns, representatively in Christ of Saint John of the Cross
(1951) and Crucifixion (Corpus Hypercubus) (1954). Furthermore, in the
Crucifixion (Corpus Hypercubus), as in Madonna of Port Lligat (1950),
the Madonna in both pictures is Dali's wife Gala. As Dali has stated,
"I only approach nobility while painting Gala, and nobility can only be
inspired by the human being."32 Expressively, Dali's Christ is man;
they are one and the same.

The realization that the artist was no longer concerned with
theology in the traditional sense became evident in the 1800s. As the
editor of an 1893 issue of The Magazine of Art, noted, viz.

The painting of religious history or religious sentiment is every
year less and less in favor. Why this should be so it is not
quite easy to see. It is hardly enough to explain that commerce
has taken the place of the Church as the patron of the arts, and
that painting is now used for the pleasure of man which was once
practiced for the greater glory of God.33

Furthermore, it would also be inadequate to argue that religious senti-
ment was less and less every year in the eighteen hundreds because of
the Protestant or Puritan Reformation started early in the fifteen hundreds by Martin Luther. Granted that much religious work had become iconic to the extent that it was directly worshipped or thought to have special powers. And because of the widespread iconoclasm (destruction of the worshipped art) throughout northern Europe and the abolition of the artist as a patron of the Church, one might easily think it the cause of the decline in religious imagery. It is true that the religious artist was shocked by the widespread iconoclasm. He was astonished by the powers of the priests in their regaining their status proper as the initiators of the unknowns, and by their ability to put the image makers in their supposed proper place. This was all inevitable from the point of view of the clergy since it was basically the medicine man's nightmare come true. It was he who suspected as much when he first subcontracted the image maker to objectify his ideology.

Even so and explicitly documented, by the mid-seventeen hundreds the artists and the so-called artists had in England at least gained such power through The Royal Academy Banquet that even the royal family, the diplomatic body, the highest church dignitaries and members of the government were present for the yearly occasion only because they had spent huge sums of money on art.

It was clear that some plan should be devised wherewith to impress the minds of the people—aye, and the 'upper classes' too—with a sense of the supreme dignity of art which their hearts could not feel; and to teach respect for the art if not the artist by playing, if necessary, on their native snobbery, and eventually, perchance, to raise that potent little 'bump of acquisitiveness' on the head of John Bull, on the existence of which all prosperity in this direction must of necessity depend. And this was the undoubted origin of the Royal Academy banquet.
The occasion was on such strict and grand scale that a "gentleman in the London Stock Exchange offered to purchase ten thousand pound's worth of pictures if they would but bid him to the feast; ..." He was, by the way, flatly turned down. The extravagant dinner bill of forty thousands pounds was, at that time, considered a judicious investment when considering how it benefitted the artist.

In the eighteen hundreds the artist hardly needed to be patronized by the church. He could indulge himself in whatever subject he so chose while making at least a modest living, if not a superfluous one. But not surprisingly, the subject matter that the artist chose in his freedom was exactly the one that he had been concerned with before the Reformation. Religious content was an unknown to be explained by the artist, and as such remained an obsession insofar as it remained a phenomenon. The artist never abandoned "religious sentiment." Maybe he abandoned "religious history" because of the Reformation, but not the religious doctrines themselves. Yet, there was an obvious difference, as the editor of The Magazine of Art noted, in the quantity of religious work from the fifteen hundreds to the eighteen hundreds. But, specifically, it was categorical change of subject matter which deceivingly led one to conclude that there was a quantity change (notwithstanding the change of quantity within the categories themselves). Much of the religious doctrine, as phenomena, was transformed and re-categorized into a human metaphysical category by the nineteenth century which resulted in at least some explanation of religious phenomena.

The aforementioned is evident in the numerous and extensive works of the late eighteenth century. For example, Walter Langley's Betrayed,
1887 could simply be viewed as a specific incident of a young unmarried woman with child under her shawl, being ostracized from her small community. But there is much more to this work than simply a specific incident. Abandoned by J. C. Boquet, Evicted by Blandford Fletcher, and Their Ever-Shifting Home by Stanhope A. Forbes, all done around 1887, are universal particulars of the Mary and Christ child theme. As indicative of Abandoned, we see a young mother sitting against a roadside crucifix with her child in her arms. It portrays the universal theme of Mary (a woman) ostracized from a community on grounds of conceiving a child out of wedlock. This work, as with the others mentioned above, is concerned as much with religious doctrine as a picture of Mary and child per se. Thus, it is deceiving to say that the artist of the late eighteen hundreds was not concerned with religious doctrine. He was concerned with this specific religious doctrine and others as well insofar as they were universal phenomena, but not as clerical or church principles. As a matter of fact, the artist has never been concerned with any theme, first and foremost religious, cultural, nationalist, or whatever, but rather because it has been an unknown to be explained.

By the late eighteen hundreds the artist had at least realized and to some extent explained religious doctrine as basically a universal human phenomena and appropriately categorized as such.

In viewing Le Sommeil De Jésus by L. Deschamps, in 1887, which depicts Mary and child with human divinity rather than unknown godly divinity, one sees the same identical worldly condition, the human metaphysical condition as evident in Betrayed, Abandoned, Evicted and Their Ever-Shifting Home. Furthermore, in such other works as specifically
T.C. Gotch's *The Child Enthroned*, 1892, man is given the symbol of sainthood represented by a young girl, very human and rather common, in a godlike pose with a solid halo behind her head.\(^2\) By this time in history man is indistinguishable from the supposed saints of earlier centuries. Such human virtuousness is made ostensive by the artist's concern, not just with the external aspects of the human figure, but rather the innermost being of man as a universal principle. At least to this writer, this is evident in Antoon Van Welie's works, especially his portraits.

The . . . [conscientious style of the 'primitives'] are the most remarkable of all. These portraits resemble in no way even the most approved of modern methods, and it is not the least of their many merits that they are more or less strong from their psychological aspect. Van Welie strives above all to interpret not the mere momentary feeling of his model, nor yet its luxurious external aspect, but rather its true innermost being.\(^3\)

As a reminder, the innermost being of man is a metaphysical world, not a psychological one. It is the universal particularity of man that the artist is concerned with. To say that the artist is concerned with the psychological is to say that he concerns himself with merely the specific, other, human being, not a being who exemplifies universal principles. Man can only be considered universally when viewed philosophically and not psychologically. Granted, it has been "... the tendency of such philosophers as Hume, J. S. Mill and William James to approach philosophical problems, whether ethical, logical, aesthetic or metaphysical, from the standpoint of psychology."\(^4\) But this presupposes man to be basically a psychological being rather than a philosophical one. This is unacceptable to the artist, at least the twentieth-century artist for the reasons that he views man as having a universal existence and therein finds the universal unknowns to be explained, rather than in a specific purported figurehead.
Summary

The evil one was imaginatively conceived as a dragon. The image maker gave form to this supposed evil one who was responsible for natural and social ills. He was conceived in light of his supposed powers and the various social beliefs of the members of the clan who, monistically, were dependent upon one another for their metaphysical existence. Yet, it was also inevitable that the image maker had to give form to the wonder worker since counters exist in the universe. All of this was the origin of religion and the artist's task to explain.

By the twentieth century the evil one and the wonder worker (devil and god) had become one. They had also become "man" whereby man was devil-god and devil-god was man, recognized and categorized by the artist as a human phenomena. This revelation led to the recognized actuality that "man" had never been one, but rather metaphysically split as monistic and dualistic. The state of affairs in recent centuries has been the explicit struggle between the two, a state of confrontation.

The evil one is but one of many unknowns that have existed throughout history. Whereas others were easily explained by the artist, the evil one remained enigmatic up to the modern age mainly because it was a dual problem of also having to explain the nature of the wonder worker. In the fact that the artist realizes that both are essentially his existence, whereby he turns to its explanation in man, this must however not be construed as a concern with psychology. The artist's concern with man is a metaphysical concern not a psychological one. The artist is a metaphysician, and thus, philosophically oriented. In this sense he is the most instrumental force for social change and has been throughout
history whether he is an image maker per se or a creative writer. He is, however, not an artist unless his creativity has its origin in the image, whether or not the final product is imagistic, linguistic, acoustic, or terpsichorean.

Up to this point the artist has mostly been viewed as one who changes the social structure by explaining unknowns that exist foremost as social. In the following sections the artist will be viewed as one who changes the social structure in projecting "possible worlds" into the society. This brings forth various problems in the existence of trans-world lines and boundaries for the artist, and assimilative for the viewer, as to the how and the why of the artistic discourse and its meaningfulness. All be it that it is metaphysically a difficult topic, and one needing much analysis, it is however important in assessing the nature of the "arts," and accordingly, a viable art education content. For these reasons the following will be more of a directive for research, than a proclamation.

**Possible Worlds**

A concern with possible worlds is a concern with the unknown. It is metaphysically that which is latent in nature. Its existence is dependent upon the artist's ability to create it. Without this it merely remains indistinguishable from essence or all other forces, if you will.

According to Saul A. Kripke, "[a] possible world isn't a distant country that we are coming across, or viewing through a telescope." "A possible world is given by the descriptive conditions we associate with it."45 "'Possible worlds' are stipulated, not discovered by powerful telescopes."46
Similar to stipulating possible worlds, is that of "inventing worlds" or specifically, "inventing cases" as in conceptual analysis. The concept of 'invented case' is derived from John Wilson's *Thinking with Concepts* and is rooted in the Wittgensteinian philosophy. The invented case enables one to find out the essential criteria for the concept under consideration. As a point of reference, this is one of nine moves in assessing "the locus of inference" when analyzing or determining a concept.

The invented case is formulated as a world quite different from our own but which has to do with the concept we are interested in. It may provide us with a context where factors which were previously overlooked could easily be seen. According to authors of "conceptual analysis," only when we are able and willing to imagine a world very different from our own will we come to appreciate the significance of some simple facts about our own world. For instance, the importance of art and art education is likely to become much clearer if we can imagine, in the minutest detail, the features of a world in which it is absent. Or, for example, the meaning of death and its role in creating the kind of world we actually have, can be contemplated only if we are able to consider in detail the kind of world in which death is altogether absent or at least so for human beings. It is therefore especially important from time to time to be able to create worlds very different from our own whereby we can take, as our data for analysis, circumstances which do not at all occur in our ordinary experience.

Before going on, it should be pointed out that the importance of imagining in either the invented world or the stipulated world is not, so
to speak, to **exist continuously** in such a world but rather exist differently in our own given world. The former implies a life similar to Don Quixote of living in an imaginary world where windmills continuously appear as villains to be conquered. The latter implies that because we have imagined a world of windmills, denizensed as villains, we thereby become more knowledgeable and analytic about our everyday world.

The aforementioned of stipulating or inventing worlds has its human difficulties as discussed earlier in this dissertation. First of all, one must bracket the common sense world to be able to deal with possible worlds. However, if one brackets one's total existence then one is faced with being "lost to the world" as indicative of Don Quixote.

As discussed in the last chapter, there is much risk for the dualist in his creative discourse: of not bracketing, of over bracketing, of becoming lost to the world, of becoming viewed as insane by the fact of encountering and expressing possible worlds. There are other inherent problems with transworld lines, specifically when one is considering lexical transfer.

The problems with transworld lines are expressed well by Robert Kraut in his lecture and paper, "On the Philosophical Relevance of Possible-Worlds Semantics."

... [there is] ... the simple fact that there might be circumstances in which certain lexical items are inapplicable to the environment, given the role that they play.  

Likewise, as Dr. Kraut goes on to say:

A world line which yields no value at the actual world (as happens, e.g., regarding the function correlated with the *golden mountain*) is occasionally rolled into a ball and called an **unactualized** possible!
Unless certain lexical terms are transferable across transworld lines we could end up, comparatively, with dissimilar and irregular worlds whereby linguistic identification may break down or simply fail to be meaningful in respect to the actual world. In such a situation, "coining" terms to account for the stipulated existence would not resolve the problems of identification or description, but likely add to the vagueness. Furthermore, but in a different sense, if a particular of the actual world can be identified by way of two distinctly different proper names, then possibly so can a particular of a possible world, adding to the problem of identification. For instance, in music there are certain sounds that are "enharmonic." That is, "there is a sound" that is referred to by two different names—C♯ and D♭ (C sharp and D flat). There is then one sound that has two distinctly different proper names. Therefore, both names while being different could be argued to be descriptively, and most assuredly demonstratively, identical to a single particular. This is obviously a linguistic shortcoming, making Kripke's article "naming and necessity" noteworthy. For, without names being rigid designators (non-interchangeable) not only do we have term/object identification problems in a single world, but the possibility that a predicate must necessarily change in reference to its object when transported from one world to the next.

The other problem, noted by Dr. Kraut as the unactualized possible, does not create greater ambiguity or vagueness by way of language but rather feasibility of transfer. Aside from Dr. Kraut's concern with value, another "unactualized possible" might be the stipulation of, let us say, Mr. Jones into a world that is descriptively non-existence-of-human
beings whereby Mr. Jones would disappear. Given that Mr. Jones is to remain a human being in the stipulated world the result would not only be valueless but meaningless. Furthermore, this writer believes it impossible to imagine "infinity" in any sense (notwithstanding the symbol $\infty$ which is obviously not what is claimed impossible). Thus, one may have to admit that there are some unactualized possibles that feasibly still exist, yet remain unknowable or inconceivable. As with the inconceived, and the case of Don Quixote of the imagined for the "imagined sake," so it is of the case of the unactualized possible, of no value at the actual world.

When stipulating possible worlds there must be some coexistence between them and the actual world. There must be some correlative necessity of time/space, preferably some linguistic transferability of lexical items, and the possibility of actualizing a return to the everyday world; otherwise, the task becomes valueless in respect to the world where we live. The invented case found in conceptual analysis, even though it might lack formal strictness of coexistence because of its linguistic origin, nevertheless carries with it the importance of lexical items and the method of reintroduction of the case into ordinary language and ordinary world view. The invented case and the possible world approach have much in common; and it is possibly up to the reader to make of each as he or she sees fit, since they are both stipulations. Neither are "telescope worlds" that exist prior to our viewing.

What has been discussed can be simplified and summarized by way of the following. In the diagram on the next page there is no relation or interrelation between the actual world and the invented world. This
is to say that we have not at all maintained a trans-world coexistence; everything in and about the actual world is totally different from that of the stipulated world. In the aforementioned situation, Mr. Jones would disappear. Given that there were some properties of the stipulated world similar to the actual world we might have Mr. Jones not disappearing, but rather living a life similar to Don Quixote. Descriptively and demonstratively something must be noted about the stipulated world compatible to the actual world. The following should fit such a state of necessity,

where the two share a common boundary. The boundary must of course be penetrable; otherwise, no transfer would be possible. In "B" there would at least be transworld coexistence by the actuality of the shared boundary; yet, similar problems of maintaining existence, exclusively within the stipulated world, would pervade. Obviously, if the stipulated world was comprised of, let us say c, e, f, g, then some existence would
be assured. It might seem that the resolution of any such problems would be best accomplished by way of what is shown in "C." But, as briefly indicated in the previous chapter, overlap is a metaphysical impossibility, thus unactualizable. This is basically because if the actual world and the stipulated world have parts and are wholes, then the parts must cancel one another in giving rise to the actuality of either wholes. Hence, the whole of the actual world and the whole of the stipulated world would either repel one another or be attracted towards one another. However, in being attracted they would be attracted towards one another as wholes and not by way of particulars of wholes. Now, if it is not the case that the parts cancel one another giving rise to a whole, then all the above is possible. This would be simply to say that we are no longer dealing with two worlds but simply rather one, in their state of attractiveness. In other words, no boundary would exist. There is of course a third possibility of the two worlds transforming into a new and third world as shown on the following page. This, however, is no different from the situation found in "B," but simply a possible extension of it. The consideration of "D" will be taken up in a following section, but for the time being, let us briefly return to the dilemma of overlap.
Were we to consider "overlap" exclusively from the point of perception it would seem to be a descriptive state. For instance, on the previous page one might say that perceptually the stipulated world overlaps with the actual world. This situation would be similar to saying that the moon overlaps the sun in a solar eclipse. However, what one could descriptively mean to say is that the one "obscures the perception of the other," which has nothing to do with whether or not the one even touches the other. Conjecturally, it is believed that "overlap" is merely a perceptual term, quite deceiving and without demonstrability. It is unactualizable because of the part/whole principle.

The Tactual, the Auditory, and the Visual World

To make a full and complete metaphysical comparison of the tactual, auditory and visual world one must necessarily consider the possible world of "no-material bodies." Furthermore, this entails at least some consideration of "no-space." This is neither a new problem nor a novel approach to an old problem. As a matter of fact, P. F. Strawson, specifically in his chapter on sound, expressed a similar concern. However, Strawson's major discourse is that of identifying particulars in such worlds, whereas here our concern is with the worlds themselves. Because of the similarity, however, Strawson will be considered briefly in the following section.
The three worlds, viewed from the common sense world, have the similarity of being dependent upon material bodies. The problem at hand is which world or worlds would be conceptually meaningless or incomprehensible given the world of no-material bodies? Obviously, the tactual world would disappear in such a world. According to Strawson, the tactual world should be quickly dismissed on the basis that it is "combined . . . with kinaesthetic sensations, . . . [and therefore] . . . it is clear that we have the materials of spatial concepts." Furthermore, the tactual world is basically a common sense world, having little to do with the unknown. In regards to the auditory and the visual worlds such explicitness is not automatic. Thus, the problem becomes how one might distinguish the auditory from the visual.

To begin with, let us, as Strawson does, envisage a world where one maintains one's "conceptual scheme" (necessary for comprehension) but where no space exists. Such a possible world, according to Strawson, would be a purely auditory world. Strawson selects the auditory world, not because it might be the only possible model for a "no-space" but because it " . . . is relatively simple to handle, and yet has a certain formal richness." According to Strawson, the no-space world is at least a world without bodies. And such a world . . . [of sounds] . . . has no intrinsic spatial characteristics . . . . The possible world that Strawson wishes to consider is then a world where there are no material bodies, but nonetheless there are some element(s) in that world, and these element(s) must not have spatial characteristics. These element(s) are then sounds.
Strawson discusses the world of sound by way of "loudness," "pitch" and "timbre." He further introduces a seemingly unimportant quasi-analogistic case—that being color.

For colour, like sound, exhibits three characteristics of variation—brightness, saturation and hue—of which the first two, like pitch and loudness, admit of serial ordering in respect of degree, while the last, perhaps, like timbre, does not. What Strawson has at least asserted is that the lexical items themselves have an analogue viz., brightness/loudness, saturation/pitch, hue/timbre. However, when one considers what these terms refer to, or denote, then there is apparently a distinction to be made by way of spatial relations. According to the author, that which the "color terms" predicate "leads us to characterize one as being above, below, to the left or to the right of another" when "these elements are simultaneously presented." But such a spatial relationship does not occur when considering that which the "sound terms" predicate because such elements, when separated, "cannot be presented simultaneously, all at once."

Or, to put it in another way: the momentary states of the colour-patches of the visual scene visibly exhibit spatial relations to each other at a moment; whereas the momentary states of the sound-patches of the auditory scene do not audibly exhibit the auditory analogue of spatial relations to each other at a moment.

Strawson asserts the above in several different ways using the phrases "color elements" and "sound elements" interchangeably with "color patches" and "sound patches." Even though he uses the terms "color patch" and "color elements" he obviously does not mean the "blue notebook" or the "red paper" as demonstratively a color patch. In the same sense, by "sound patch" he does not mean that of an instrument's vibrations, for then color and sound argumentively become material bodies.
But can we even separate these supposed elements? Can we separate brightness from saturation from hue? Now, in respect to terminology, we obviously can. But what would brightness of no color (hue) be like, or from the opposite point, what would color be like without any brightness? We are obviously faced with the same problem in respect to the sound elements when considering loudness for instance—loudness of what?

Brightness and saturation are qualities or properties of a specific color—such as red. If we separate brightness and/or saturation from a red then it becomes neutral in color, and if we mean to separate it completely then we have "blackness"—that is, the non-existence of red. To propose that brightness could exist apart from a neutral color or hue would be to talk in terms of "intensity" per se. To talk in terms of "light intensity" is at the same time to qualitate or denote it as a quality of hue. What brightness or intensity would be in, of and for itself I could not even begin to imagine. It would be like the separation of $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ from water while maintaining that over there is the "water" and over here is the $\text{H}_2\text{O}$. Simplistically, it is unactualizable.

If Strawson is referring to the possibility of having a red over there and a lighter red beside it, and a green red over here then he is talking in terms of three qualitatively and distinctly different reds. This, however, would be a "relation between numerically different particulars" rather than "relations between elements of a given particular" which is obviously not at all what Strawson intends.

This writer fails to see how the color elements could exist any more separate from one another than the sound elements. Therefore, and from such an argumentive direction, the world of sound and the visual
world remain indistinguishable. Nevertheless, there are distinctions to be noted in regards to the two worlds, yet from a different approach to the problem.

As noted earlier in this section, and argued by Strawson himself, it is necessary in whatever stipulated world dealt with, to maintain one's "conceptual scheme"; otherwise, comprehension is impossible. In the previous chapter it was argued that the topological structure is this very "scheme." Hence, sound must fit into this scheme or topological structure; only its use can reveal the essential distinction of the visual world and the auditory one. From this point of view, let us consider the auditory, and finally the visual.

To begin with, sound is as much a force as the visual and the mental. Unlike the tactual, which is dependent upon kinaesthetic sensations, the auditory, the visual and the mental can all exist aside from material bodies since force is not dependent upon objects. This, however, brings us to the question of what kind or type of force it is? The most obvious characteristic about sound is that it is transitory.

It is not transitory in the sense of transforming, which necessitates change, but as simply motion. Granted that a sound could be said to "change" in the sense of "fading away." But this is simply a matter of degrees of loudness and not a change in the identity of the sound in question. The full spectrum of sound is its existence to inertia, or if you prefer, state of equilibrium. The state of no-sound is simply sounds, as forces, in a state of equilibrium. In other words, it is sound in a contradictory state resulting in nothingness, similar to light when it is in a contradictory state (darkness) as discussed in
Chapter IV. Sound, as with light and experience, has no counter. Yet, there is a difference between experience and sound in that experience does not have nothingness at the end of its existence spectrum. Hence,

\[
\text{light} \quad \text{sound} \quad ? \quad \text{experience}
\]

were the three to be considered triadically, light and sound would be in the same realm, as shown above. All three are givens but they are not essentially the same. An important question is obviously whether or not there are other such universals without counters? Also, if there are, is there a specific and finite triadic nature to them as implied in the above schema? In as much as these are important concerns they will however not be considered further in this dissertation mainly because they are too encompassing. Here they are only offered as a means of "direction of interpretation" for the following problems, and as well, for possible future extended research.

More to the point, sound cannot be dipolar for the same reasons, as argued in Chapter IV, that light and experience are not dipolar. Since sound has no counter and is not dipolar—making its existence spectrum merely that of existence to no-existence—it therefore cannot transform. Sound per se is merely context and non-sensical context at that. There is no shape or form to it. Yet, there is order to it in that there is order in fields of forces. Sound, then, is as well motion or movement having order, but no shape, form or content.
Man attributes shape, form, content, and meaning to sound. All of this is quite evident in the Walt Disney movie "Fantasia" produced in the late 1940s where sound is attributed meaning by way of visual imagery or whereby visual imagery is given a sound context. Even though "Fantasia" was an admirable attempt, it, however, cannot be accomplished since sound has no such counter. Thus, a visual image attributed to a sound is either to make the image non-sensical, correlated to the sound with more or less high probability, or suffer greater separation of the image and the sound as unrelated. On the opposite hand, is that of prostituting the sound for a greater visual impact. This is possible since sound is at least motion or movement. Hence, it is possible for sound to illustrate. The objectives in "Fantasia," however, of synthesizing the two is impossible, mainly because it is not at all possible analytically.

Sound should be appreciated for what it is—pure aesthetics. There is no incarnation of sound into image, nor any other transformation of it. People who appreciate the sound of, say, Beethoven's 7th, as a specific theme or image, have desecrated its aesthetic state. This is precisely what happens to sound when it becomes the spoken language in that it is made predicative of thought. As stated throughout this dissertation, language in its origin is non-sensical in that a word, as exclusively sound, is a non-sensical utterance. The spoken language and the written language are merely nonsense contexts attributed form and content—meaning.

There is then a huge gap between sound per se and sound with meaning, or if you will, uttered thought. Obviously, the sound itself has
not changed or transformed in having meaning even though there may have been some organization and delineation of the various possible sound combinations. "Sound with meaning" or "uttered thought" is simply an assimilation of sound with thought without the sound itself being descriptive of the thought which it predicates. Thus, sound, as language, has form and meaning only insofar that the sound is assimilated with something, such as thought, which has form and meaning.

However, and the point being, if sound appears in one's conceptual schema (the topological structure) then it appears with language as illustrative of it, and whereby sound has lost its pure aesthetic state. Hence, sound as expression presupposes idea, belief and image. On the other hand, if sound is not prostituted for something else then it might appear at the beginning of the topological structure, such as the point where the image appears. But since it has no counter there would be no transformation; thus, it would merely remain in and of itself whereby the rest of the topological structure would be impeded.

In summary, the world of sound is a purely aesthetic world without content and a transitory one at that. The same could be said about the visual world—that it can exist as purely aesthetic. The distinction is however that the visual can transform but the auditory cannot. There is then a transworld problem with the world of sound. To stipulate something alien into the world of sound results in either its disappearance or that of the world itself. Furthermore, to stipulate the world of sound to assimilate other worlds is to desecrate the world of sound.
The Artist and Possible Worlds

Similar problems exist when considering motion as meaning or dance, as with sound as meaning or language. This is mainly because they are indistinguishable. They are however different in the sense that motion is characteristic of the whole topological structure whereas sound is not, or at least not likely to be. Yet, the existence of motion, as expressive action, occurs by way of conduct whereas sound occurs by way of language on the topological structure. Thus, in regard to dance, there is even more presupposed than with sound as language.

To say that motion is characteristic of the whole topological structure is obviously not to say the same of dance. If dance is to have any meaning, then it must necessarily be predicative of intended action rather than simply behavior; otherwise, any motion becomes dance. The difference between motion and dance is precisely that which is presupposed to attain conduct. In a similar sense, the difference between sound and "music" is that which is presupposed to attain language.

In regards to the written, not only do we have the problem of lexical transfer across transworld lines, as discussed at the beginning of the chapter, but accordingly the possibility of content contradicted. Terms, concepts, propositions, or any descriptive content can result in a contradiction whereby nothingness is asserted. If it is argumentive, and the contradiction occurs in, or by way of, the premises, then everything which follows, being dependent upon the premises, necessarily follows as merely the re-affirmation of nothingness. Furthermore, this is all ostensive in that there is the antecedent evidence of the two aspects contradicting one another. All of this is quite impossible for
the artist who objectifies an image visually. In the painter's or sculptor's mind, as in the writer's mind, there may well exist contradictions; however, and different from the written, such contradictions cannot be expressed in the visual work of art. There are two reasons for this: one, it is impossible to "objectify" nothingness for that is in itself a contradiction; two, nothingness cannot be seen.

All of this should not be confused with emptiness. Emptiness can be seen since it is not nothingness but rather somethingness. Emptiness is simply the expected missing, such as evident in many of Giorgio De Chirico's paintings, for example, Mystery and Melancholy of a Street whereby we are confronted by a lifeless city (except a young girl on the street) and an empty furniture van. There is no conceptual or material contradiction in saying that an empty furniture van does not contain nothingness. It is true that this specific van does not contain any furniture, that it is empty, but again this is not to say that it contains nothingness.

When dealing with possible worlds the artist who writes is enigmatically faced with the possibility of having made no transfer of content from one world to the next and also the possibility of having expressed nothingness in either or both worlds. This is not problematic for the visual artist since at any given moment in objectification it is revealed to him whether it is possible or not. Furthermore, this distinction of the two does not arise in that the written can be dualistic whereas the visual can only be monistic. Earlier in this chapter a visual dualistic work, The Symbol, was discussed. Granted that throughout history most paintings, drawings and sculptures have been
monistic in expression. This is quite evident in the seventeen and eighteenth century visual arts. Monistic works seem to have reached their crescendo in the abstract movement of the twentieth-century, viz. Jackson Pollock's works. Obviously, a work need not be abstract to be monistic. Much of the landscape paintings and portraits of the seventeen and eighteenth centuries exemplify monism just as well. As a matter of fact, subject matter or even the lack of it, is not the determining factor for whether a work is monistic or dualistic. It is rather the metaphysical status of the work which is the determining factor. Hence, a dualistic work must be "two works as one," whereby we have neither two distinct works nor simply one. This means that the two wholes must not be reducible to a single whole, and they must not be distinctly separable without totally altering either wholes.

Even though much of the visually expressed art is monistic, it need not be. Hypothetically, the visual arts are mainly monistic because studio teachers have been under the impression for centuries that the expressed should always be singular in theme, style, etc. Thus, educationally for the expressive artist, there remains much knowledge about dualistic expression as a possible world of communication. Precisely, it is this very factor of communication which is enhanced when expression is dualistic since it can readily be interpreted without suffering from any "intentional fallacy" on the viewer's part. A dualistic work of art is necessarily counter to itself whereby the viewer need not bring anything alien to the work for its possible interpretation. As a matter of fact, a dualistic work of art is its antecedental state whereas a monistic work is its consequential state. Accordingly, even though a
The above is precisely what has made the visually expressed so important in this day and age. Philosophical discourse, troubled by linguistic ambiguity, vagueness and paradox, has begun to discover the assuredness in being able to visually express philosophical problems. Accordingly, the same holds true with philosophical science, such as in the case of Albert Einstein, who used "mental imagery" to probe, test and describe many of his beliefs and theories. The visual is not only adhered to because of its conclusive assuredness, but as argued throughout this dissertation, because it is precisely the means of describing and explaining the unknown.

Many of the leaders in abstract art in the twentieth century acknowledge that... abstract works of art body forth a vision of ultimate verities or reflect a metaphysical reality beyond the world of the senses.59

Kandinsky once wrote, in 1938, 'That art creates alongside the real world a new world which has nothing to do with external reality. It is subordinate internally to cosmic laws'.60
Yet, a possible world imaged, existing alongside the "real world" or the common sense world, will become, as so often, part of the common-sense world whereby the common sensical is elevated. This is mainly because in such a state of being alongside, it exists antecedently as for and against which consequentially results in a state of being with.

In this way the content of paintings, drawings, cartoon, plays, movies, songs, stories and others have changed culture and the visual structure. They have done this not only in the sense of explaining away social phenomena but by introducing possible worlds as well. In the twentieth century, movies and songs, probably more than anything else, have had the greatest influence on the social disposition. In the sixties there were hundreds of popular songs with the theme "I will study war no more" which helped to make the draft difficult and military indoctrination transitory. But more than that, movies and/or plays, such as indicative of the following limited list, introduced or rather

**PLAYS AND MOVIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plays</th>
<th>Movies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Close Encounters of the Third Kind</td>
<td>Silent Running</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death Takes a Holiday</td>
<td>Star Trek (TV series)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Strangelove Or: How I Learned to Stop Worrying and Love the Bomb</td>
<td>Star Wars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fantastic Voyage</td>
<td>&quot;Steambath&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Jesus Christ Superstar&quot;</td>
<td>The Birds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;No Exit&quot;</td>
<td>The Time Machine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On The Beach</td>
<td>They Might be Giants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2001: A Space Odyssey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Waiting for Godot&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

re-introduced the populace to feasible worlds with a more enticing interest. Thus, for instance, it becomes more difficult for the social priests (politicians) to drum up fear, threat, and unified concern for
Middle East instability or the expansion of communism, to list but a couple. (It follows from this that an increase in description/explanation of the unknown made available to the populace is correlative to an increase in social stability and contentment since, and \textit{ad hoc}, change is taking place.)

Summary and Conclusion

It is difficult for the artist to explain his own work and that of his colleagues as well. In part, this difficulty arises by the fact that the artist is often misunderstood and miseducated. His conceptual schema is different from that of most people since there are two such schemas— one scientific and the other artistic. Furthermore, the artist is metaphysically concerned even in regards to the human condition, not at all psychologically as some might think. He expresses the consequential, not the antecedinal, of the metaphysical unknown. However, he is philosophically naive along with lacking various systems and methods needed for explanation. This is all compounded by the fact that he exists outside the social system; but because of this, however, he is able to change it. Even the practical world beckons his attention forcing him to bracket the common sensical if he is to be able to concern himself with possible worlds and the metaphysical unknowns. In his solitude he finds some contentment in that he has an identity different from that of the monist. Yet, he must flee his identity since it exists dualistically, manifesting itself repulsively.

In cases where the artist does not, at least at times, share a boundary with the common sensical world, his artistic enterprise often remains of consequence only to himself. This would be descriptive of
two worlds having no transworld connection. In the situation where the artist explains social beliefs, existing as unknowns, he has already bridged his world of images with that of the common sensical. In such cases, the transworld connection is maintained whereby change is readily at hand. However, in situations where the artist formulates ideas from his own beliefs and images, he runs the risk that neither are familiar in the common sense realm whereby his whole enterprise becomes unconceptual, at least for the time. Albeit true that the latter might well provide the most revelationary knowledge of all, even so, it might also never be interpreted by society. Therefore, his enterprise is crucial in the sense, and the extent to which, the artist is familiar with the monistic worlds, not only in regards to his needing solitary creativity but as well in being able to facilitate social change. Thus, if the artist is to be instrumental in either of the ways previously mentioned, he must be willing to exist in a state of confrontation. Furthermore, for the art educator, an extended or extending artist, Confrontationalism is a necessity in every facet and regard.
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CHAPTER VI

EDUCATION

No Philosophy $\equiv$ No Identity

Identity is a universal problem, by no means exclusive to art education. As with other fields of discourse, however, if art education has no identity then it also has no philosophy and vice versa. Furthermore, for art education to be considered a philosophy it must also necessarily be considered a discipline. Accordingly, for a discipline to exist there must necessarily be a "structure" present.

There are basically two types of structure: 1. closed structure (three dimensional); 2. open structure (two dimensional). In regards to the principles set forth in this dissertation, we can have a three-dimensional structure which exists in one, meaning that it is monistic. Furthermore, we can have a two-dimensional structure which is dualistic. Finally, we can have a structure which is both dualistic and monistic which means that it is three as one; a confrontational structure. It will be argued in this chapter that general education, predicated "science education," is a three-dimensional structure--an existence of three in one which means that it is monistic. Relative to this it will be argued that art education is a two-dimensional structure; a dualistic structure counter to the monistic science education structure which makes it a three-dimensional structure as one, a confrontational structure.
But before getting into the proposed identity of science education and art education, conceived by way of the principles set forth in this dissertation, it is first crucial to consider some past/present perspectives of the two, specifically in regards to "discipline." In doing so, it should become apparent what some of the problems and ailments of art education are, and how they might be resolved, which will be considered in the following sections.

**Past/Present Problems**

The concern with whether education is or is not a discipline is by no means a triviality. If other areas of discourse are considered disciplines and education is not, then education not only suffers honorifically, but it is subsumed under one or more of the existing disciplines. This would mean that education is basically a branch, possibly of science or philosophy, whereby education simply applies scientific facts or philosophical truths to the general populace.

There has been a good deal written on the question, "Is education a discipline?" In Mark Belth's *Education as a Discipline*, the author asserts that "[e]ducation, . . . , is literally the discipline of disciplines." This means that education is a kind of meta-discipline. It is not uncommon to think in terms of metaphilosophy, but the concept 'meta-discipline' is rather esoteric, mainly because the meaning of discipline in the first instance is problematic.

Now granted, one could theorize or philosophize about discipline, as in the case where we would mean discipline to be "subject matter." But then "discipline of disciplines" simply means a discipline about subject matter, or a philosophy about discipline, or a philosophy about
subject matter. The problem at hand with the proposition that education is a "discipline of disciplines" is that it asserts that we can think about thinking, feel feelings, or experience experiences. This would be valid if we could show in what sense the first experience differs from the second; that is, if we could show that the first discipline differs from the second. Otherwise, we have the situation of utilizing "A to explain A" which has been argued to be an impossibility. The major problem of whether education is or is not a discipline arises in the first sense of what one means by discipline or what constitutes a discipline. In other words, what is the nature of discipline?

Without having to deal with this difficult question, one could simply stipulate the criteria for what should constitute a discipline as Marc Belth does when he states: "In brief, we will be applying our criteria for a discipline to the study of education." The problem, however, cannot be solved by simply finding appropriate or more appropriate criteria for arguing education as a discipline, but rather, the justification of the criteria. How might one go about justifying the criteria? This depends upon one's philosophy, and in the case of Marc Belth we can soon discover his philosophy through some of the following assertions: "... the study of education is the study of knowledge-making," "... knowledge is created and altered," and "... invent knowledge, ..." The justifying criteria becomes one of "knowledge-making" or "creating knowledge." It is difficult to understand what is meant by knowledge making or creating knowledge unless it is "incorrect" knowledge or "misapplied" knowledge since, traditionally and contemporarily, knowledge is at least by definition held to be true. Knowledge is always "of something"; therefore, it is always true. It is only incorrect
in the sense of being misapplied to the thing in question. To say that one should "create knowledge" is to say that one should "create thingness" or in this case create discipline. Since this ends up being the axiom of his argument, it too must be explained, and justifiably so, since it is in direct opposition to a common understanding of epistemology and metaphysics. One is hardly convinced that education is a discipline, or for that matter a discipline of disciplines, in being presented uncommon axioms. However, if these axioms can be shown, one way or another, to be sound then one might have a case. This would necessitate philosophizing—the only way education can hopefully at all establish itself as a discipline.

In consideration of the various articles and books on the topic of "education and discipline," the problem becomes basically one of comparing education to familiar disciplines, such as philosophy, mathematics, or physics. Given these archetypes, it seems that education is not a discipline. If, however, education is noted as an "applied discipline," then the educator finds himself as an intellectual carrier—one who prophesizes about a specific body of knowledge without having to be an intellectual himself, but merely a carrier of intellectualism. Given that education is compared to familiar disciplines, the distinction becomes one of theory and application whereby education is identified as "application of knowledge."

What is at stake here is not just that education ends up being looked down upon as unworthy of the honorific title "discipline," but that one cannot fully come to grips with the "how" and "why" of education. From the thrust of these various literatures one is left with the apprehension "that the concept of a discipline is minimally a fuzzy one."
It is, however, not only a problem with the nature of discipline, but also with the concept 'education' and its nature.

The problem is basically that we do not understand the meaning of education other than it has been an "imperfect panacea since 1865." The contemporary philosophers—the linguists—have done much to clarify problematic concepts, but they have also stipulated terms to the extent that many such terms have lost their denotative meanings. By way of proposition they have managed to convince a large audience that "teaching does not imply learning." When "thought" is equivocated as having a one-to-one correspondence with terms, then thought becomes either vague or ambiguous or both as with terms. The trend becomes one of no essence of things. Teaching becomes not learning, and logic becomes, as Morris Engel puts it—With Good Reason, the presentation of informal fallacies rather than proper method. Teaching becomes a series of "not to dos" rather than "to dos." It is not asserted here that the reasons education is not conceptually or functionally a discipline is because of the influence of linguistic philosophy. Rather that it is trying to make it one. However, since the linguists find the concepts 'nature' and 'essence' meaningless to their philosophy, linguistics is therefore suspect in its ability to state what discipline is, or what education is.

In establishing art education as a discipline, problems and method of argument follow similar lines to those found in general education. We cannot, as Logan does in his article "Is There a Discipline of Art Education?" simply specify the criteria and therefrom show a correlation to departmental procedure. It is the criteria that should be questioned and justified when attempting to show whether or not art
education is a discipline. To argue that it is a discipline because it is "disciplinary" is to beg the question. Likewise, we cannot argue, as Logan does, that art education is a discipline because it has disciples like Frank Lloyd Wright and John Dewey. If allegiance is under consideration, then Wright would be a disciple of architecture and Dewey of philosophy, to which art education cannot make claim, as though that would even make it a discipline. Nor can we argue in a similar fashion by specifying art educators such as Ecker or Efland as disciples of art education because it ends in circularity which begs the question.

In a different approach, Manual Barkan asserted some years ago that there are potentialities for a discipline of art education, but that these have not yet been realized. He stated that "[a]rt education could become a discipline if it would develop a distinctive structure." Such a structure should be a "distinguishable and particular focus of concern, namely, the teaching of art." The central concern of art education is the teaching of art. Even today the central concern is "the teaching of art" and/or "the preparation of art teachers." But how is this any different from the preparation of math teachers or the teaching of math? The preparation of art teachers is similar, at least from the point of education, to that of preparing math teachers. Only the content has possibly been different, which is in an educationally preparatory sense a difference without a distinction.

Barkan likewise asserted that the understanding of the relationship between ends and means, purpose and procedure for learning experiences becomes the measure for either success or failure in establishing art education as a discipline. Others, such as Kaufman, have argued that a "logical deduction of a set of given standards" is necessary in
order for art education to at all be considered a discipline. For
Kaufman, art education does not have a "separate universe of discourse."
In light of what has already been stated about art and art education,
and that which will follow, it is difficult to maintain Kaufman's pro-
clamation. But the conclusive arguments for this will have to await the
following sections. For the time being let us consider further past/
present problems of art education, specifically that of methodology.
Method and methodology of art education is most crucial not only in realizing art education as a separate universe of discourse but as well in
organizing and systematizing a body of knowledge central to the field,
in the assuredness of it being a philosophy.

Not only has art education suffered because of its inability to
assert itself as a major philosophical movement but likewise from fuzziness in assessing its own needs and concerns. As Kenneth Marantz points
out, "[a] philosophical basis seems to be missing. And I [Marantz] suggest
that we are rather fuzzy in our thinking, as a quasi-profession, and un-
able to state our objectives with clarity and vigor."17

As pointed out by Stephen M. Dobbs in "The Problem of Communica-
tion in Art Education: The Need for a Theory of Description,"18 art edu-
cation is plagued by the ambiguity and vagueness of its crucial concepts,
i.e., "creative," "perception," "expression," "artistic," and I might
add, "capacity" and "experience."

There will probably always be some ambiguity and vagueness about
the past and the present content but when this is qualitatively projected
into the future then one needs to pay heed. With some justification, we
must be cautious in pledging allegiance to those who purport themselves
to be competent in 'prescription', especially when the content is met­
physically unfounded.

As an example, Kern proposed in 1970, that:

It is now possible to restate the "proper" function of art educa­
tion. A proper function for art education in this latter half of
the twentieth century would be to develop students with the capa­
city to critically judge and the desire to actively seek out sig­
nificant aesthetic experience, that is, an education which
strives to increase each student's capacity for visual aesthetic
experience.19

Whichever way—materially or logically—we attend to the above utter­
ance it doesn't seem to make much sense. Whatever could we mean by
"education" being an endeavor "to increase each student's capacity for
experience"? As educators, would we feed the student more sweets so
that bodily he would have greater capacity for experiencing? Or would
we drain his mind of all thoughts, as in the case of electrical shock
treatment, so that he would have a capacity to think new thoughts and
have new experiences? There are not only linguistic problems with the
above, but metaphysical problems as well. The absence of metaphysical
discourse has compounded and obscured various problems and their reso­
lation in art education.

For example, David Ecker and Eugene Kaelin excluded metaphysics
as inappropriate aesthetic inquiry in "The Limits of Aesthetic Inquiry:
A Guide to Educational Research."20 Their rationale for excluding it
was that it "... confounds the issue at hand."21 And yet, their
whole method and methodology in prescribing appropriate inquiry is
metaphysically founded by their assertion that an "object controls a
person's experiences."22 This is a metaphysical presupposition and
everything that Ecker and Kaelin deductively prescribe hinges upon that
given actuality. To assert that aesthetic inquiry has a metaphysics and then to exclude it as inappropriate inquiry because it would "confound the issue," is to exclude relevant inquiry by an unfounded assumption.

Furthermore, Ecker, among others, has noted that art education is becoming more and more concerned with aesthetic inquiry. An acceptance of this, would mean a more workable understanding of metaphysics.

In trying to incorporate the various aspects of aesthetics, it is not so much the understanding of the literature but rather certain methodological arguments and views held by aestheticians that will be difficult to comprehend by art teachers and art educators as well. For example, Robert McGregor in his article, "Art and the Aesthetic," argues that "art objects" are not appropriate examples for the understanding of aesthetics, but rather, and only, "natural phenomena." Since much has been done in the area of aesthetics, especially from the point of philosophy, art educators must contend with philosophical arguments which at this time, and in the past, have been rather esoteric to the field.

The reason for this absence is that art education has in the past been known to structure its field of inquiry on the model of psychology and the sciences. As a point of reference, scientific procedure is distinct from logical procedure in that "the premises of an inductive inference are often said to imply the conclusion only with more or less high probability, whereas the premises of a deductive inference (logical procedure) imply the conclusion with certainty." The importance of this distinction is that just because art education may have "methods of inquiry" which are similar to those of science, one should not presuppose that any such "art education method of inquiry" is either
valid or sound from the mere fact that it may imply, honorifically, the "scientific method."

Science assumes theories or laws to be factual, such as causality. Hence, such metaphysical presuppositions are unwarranted inquiries. That is, it is thought to be unnecessary to question or inquire about presuppositions in accomplishing a scientific task. It is therefore that science is not thought to have questionable presuppositions, in the metaphysical sense. However, if art education has metaphysical presuppositions, and questionable ones at that, then scientific inquiry has its limits in dealing with the realm of art education. In other words, there is a point where art education cannot rely solely upon "scientific methods." Or in other words, there is a certain point where pragmatism becomes passe' in art education discourse.

Related to this, in the name of aesthetic education, Ecker has proposed that the "arts" are deeply embedded in "experientialism."26 Ecker derives this concept in combining phenomenology (Merleau-Ponty) with pragmatism (Dewey). It is fairly clear that Ecker means "experientialism" as a concern with "experience." However, the author fails in giving due consideration to its philosophical context. By "experientialism," does Ecker mean that which William James noted as "neutral phenomenon?" According to James, "experientialism" meant a concern with "the given," as a non-intellectual concern.27 Now, if that is somewhat what Ecker means, in re-introducing this philosophical movement, then his whole theory and his prescription of "thinking in other categories" has no merit; because in this case, "experientialism" as a given, is likewise a given under the contrasted category "behaviorism." (Ecker contrasts experientialism with behaviorism as two distinct categories,
yet the distinction collapses if Ecker means by experientialism that which William James propounded.)

Unless something is atypically noted about "experientialism" from the point of aesthetic education and/or art education, it will not serve as a distinguishing factor from that of behaviorism, psychology or the social sciences. This likewise holds true with any or all concepts or methods of discourse that are considered as given or as 'primitive' conditions of mankind.

Imagination, feeling, intuition and capacity are but a few others that could be mentioned. From the point of art education as "education," such 'primitives' cannot be taught—given that we mean teaching to imply learning—because we cannot teach, in any meaningful sense of the concept 'teach', that which is already a condition of the learner. If a student already knows mathematics one cannot take credit for teaching him mathematics. Surely, no one would get excited were I to claim that I was teaching babies how to suck, think, cry, etc., and I'm sure no one would pay me for such a fallacious enterprise.

But to get back to the issue at hand, what other methods of inquiry typify art education? "Description" seems to have a prominence in the field of art education. As an example, fundings from the U.S. Office of Education, A Preconference Education Research Training Program for Descriptive Research in Art Education, was established in the early 1970s. The rationale for this study was to facilitate supervisors' and classroom teachers' interests in research, and as the title indicates, specifically that of descriptive research. It is interesting to note in Dale B. Harris's article, which occurs in the publication as "Observation: The Basis for Teaching and Research," the importance placed
on "definition." Harris states that definitions must be necessarily prior to observation in descriptive research. ". . . [S]electivity in observation requires that we define what we wish to observe, in order to state whether it did or did not occur."29 It could be said that Harris means only to use "definition" in the sense of ordinary language; however, he is prescribing a methodology, and no less, in contract with the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. What Harris ends up saying by his use or misuse of "definition" is that an understanding of "a given specific" has been accomplished prior to the research task. That is, we already know the nature of that which we will research. This would then mean that "research" should be understood as an activity of "adding up the particulars" as in the case of "taking roll at the beginning of a class session." In this sense art teachers would already perform as many as six research projects a day which hardly justifies the study for the purpose of getting art teachers to do research.

In a different light, and in regards to qualitative rather than quantitative research, is Maurice J. Sevigny's article, "Triangulated Inquiry: An Alternative Methodology for the Study of Classroom Life," published in the Review of Research in Visual Arts Education. Sevigny's argument about research of classroom life is that the researcher should approach the content to be investigated as a phenomenon and a holistic one at that. Furthermore, the tools of research should be multiple and diverse so as not to exclude any possibly relevant information.

The reasons that the content should be approached phenomenologically is so that one would have no pre-judgments, presuppositions, or pre-dispositions about the content to be investigated. Such a method of
research is very similar to that prescribed by Husserl in his Phenomenology Proper, discussed in Chapter II as problematic. However, as different from Husserl's prescription, Sevigny's second step, after having confronted the whole as a phenomenon, is to investigate and gather information about the parts of that whole. As Sevigny states, this 
"... results in a mass of data and demands awesome amounts of time for its processing and analysis."30 Thus, as Sevigny states, "... the investigator begins to categorize and organize the massive flow of observed events."31

Significant classes and subclasses are differentiated within the general phenomenon. As classes emerge, some become more important than others and the initial research focus often undergoes considerable revision.32

As Sevigny adds further, "[a] final stage in the research consists of an effort to identify relationships among the emerging categories."33

How one is to "differentiate" the information into classes and subclasses seems problematic. Furthermore, what criteria determine certain classes as "more important" than others? Sevigny implies throughout the article that one will somehow, intuitively or subjectively realize this. But from this, however, it is rather detrimental that one's "initial research focus often undergoes considerable revision," as Sevigny states. Is this so that one's data will coincide with a desirable result? I hope not. But at what point does one know what one is researching? Or for that matter, what is one's research focus at any point in the investigative discourse?

Obviously, as Sevigny implies, one will come to some conclusions about the nature of these problems and the given situation under investigation. But will it be descriptive of that which one is investigating,
or supposedly investigating, since one's "initial research focus often undergoes considerable revision?" Furthermore, will the conclusion be descriptive of the whole situation or simply its parts? If it is to be of the whole, then what is the rationale for categorizing and subcategorizing the parts? Much less, will this in fact not defeat the prior objective of investigating the whole?

But in all fairness, Mr. Sevigny does not need to concern himself with these questions, for as he states, "[a]ny research strategy is bound to have limitations or imperfections." This is especially true in regards to Mr. Sevigny's method, as he asserts at the end of the article. The reasons, however, that this particular research method has its imperfections is that it is common-sensical research. What isn't more common sensical and imperfect than to say to an investigator, "use diverse tools of inquiry, be open-minded, change with the situation as you see fit, and furthermore, see, hear, and listen so that you may come to some conclusion about the situation." Such a method hardly adds structure, philosophy, identity to art education other than as a common-sensical discourse which need not be taught as it is a given commonality.

However, the aforementioned does not totally typify research methods in art education. For example, this point can be made by contrasting a well-written article by Arthur Efland that appeared in Studies in Art Education. Arthur Efland in "Theory and Research in Art Education," discusses the nature of theory and its function in research as qualitatively description and explanation. Efland states that theory in research does not describe how a process occurs nor does it explain why events are connected. However, if theory does not explain why, then
in at least one case, theory does not explain! Likewise, if theory does not describe how, then it does not explain how, because explanation is necessitated by at least some description. The meaning of "theory" in this case is one of limitation—mainly description and explanation.

Such restrictions applied to the use of theory would not make it possible for me or others to inquire "how a child imagines" or "how a child learns," nor would it be possible to ask the same question in the why sense. In the philosophical sense of theory, it is precisely these kinds of questions that must be asked. It is therefore that theory, in the philosophical sense, means a "concern with the how and why of things."

Unless theory at least entails such concerns we cannot claim to have "theories of art education" other than in a limited and superficial sense. Those theories, as purported theories of art education, are not theories in a philosophical sense, unless they have addressed, problematically, the how and why. Therefore, in respect to Ecker's "Editorial: On the Possibility of Theory in Art Education," it is only logically possible for art education to be exemplified as "a discipline and theory—or theories" if, and necessarily if, theory at least addresses itself to the how's and why's of art education.

It is not without warrant to assert that what passes in the name of theory is rather descriptively "doctrine." If anything, art education is presently indicative of doctrines rather than theories. Two cases of common art education doctrines would be "art as experience" and Lowenfield's, "We believe in educating the whole child."

The second case is a doctrine in the sense that it is asserted to be a belief (beliefs are non-evidential). It is likewise a doctrine in the sense that it is dogmatic because it asserts nothing meaningful.
The first case, too, is meaningless for that statement could be made about anything.

The point of the aforementioned analysis is that our crucial concepts in art education are not only ambiguous but likewise vague. Hence, such vagueness is, and has been, projected as the proper discourse of the future, while all along limitations have and continue to be applied to the method and methodology of inquiry that could possibly alleviate the vagueness and ambiguity. That which has been thought of in the past as theory and/or philosophy in art education is a far cry from even a common understanding of philosophy—that being that it should explain.

Summary

There are others, not even mentioned in this review, who have attempted to make art education a philosophy by introducing philosophies or so-called philosophies, such as Pragmatism, Realism, Idealism, Existentialism, and often unknowingly Phenomenalism into the field. This however has not, and will not, make art education a philosophy by simply introducing such, and other, schools of thought. We would hardly expect, let us say, Existentialism to address the nature and problems that exist in art education. Nor could we afford to assume that it, or others mentioned, would be compatible with art education's unique structure even though such a structure is considered a universal particular.

It may suit the needs of general education to simply apply formally-held philosophies since general education is not thought to have a distinctly metaphysical structure. But since the contrary exists for art education, it cannot afford mirroring itself while searching for identity in such areas as psychology, science or even specific philosophies.
whether epistemological or methodological since this would weaken its uniqueness and hinder it from honorifically being recognized as a discipline.

It is from art education's unique structure that a philosophy must be built in clearly defining itself. It must have a unique theoretically, self-correcting view of itself and hopefully one that extends beyond itself. Obviously, as in the past, if metaphysics is left out of such a proposed scheme and schema, then the extent to which its theoretical foundation can be expected to explain and justify itself becomes questionable. The extent to which it would be competitive with other so-called disciplines would also be questionable.

In having exemplified art education's structure it should be possible to show that the cognizance of the art teacher and the art educator enables them not only to contribute unique knowledge, but likewise a competitive ability to reinterpret judgments, facts and truths. The extent to which the aforementioned is organized, systematized, justified, and accepted will determine the strength of art education as a philosophy. However, without such a characterization, art education remains as it has in the past, an orphan searching for a foster parent and identity.

Science Education and Art Education

Since the advent of science over a hundred years ago, philosophy has taken a secondary, if not a tertiary, place in the field of education. This is true in regards to epistemology and assuredly methodology since philosophy is more than anything else a method of acquiring knowledge rather than so much a body of knowledge. The emergence of art education in the public schools prior to the turn of the century found
itself in a scientific context, whereby it was presupposed to be an off­
shoot of general education. This presupposition has been to the detri­
ment of general education for decades, and is presently becoming a detri­
ment to art education as well.

General education cannot be considered a discipline in and of
itself by the fact that it is so heavily committed to the sciences and
the perpetuation of common sense and the natural standpoint. It is,
however, an "applied discipline," meaning that it applies science and
common sense to the populace. It does so as well in a scientific way of
rote memorization and the building of skills whether they be cognitive
or functional. General education maintains the social structure in em­
phasizing the "three Rs" while applying unquestionable scientific facts
for the advancement of society. Thus, general education has its roots
in science, and is only a discipline to the extent that it re-constructs
science and applies scientific facts. Descriptively, general education
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is "science education." Were it true that science education functioned
as meta-science, then possibly it could be considered a discipline other
than simply an applied one. This, however, is far from being a reality
and likely will never be, since it is difficult enough to simply keep
up the scientific data being generated.
In this century the proliferation of art in society and education has been enormous, for no other reason than art has been predicated undefinable. Furthermore, there has been a big push to have more art in the schools. All of this resulted in more art in the science education courses rather than specifically and centrally in art education courses. This was mainly because art education was formerly perceived as a branch of general education and, further, as a sub-branch of science. It is possible that the whole mis-conception arose because art and science have been viewed as a single school—the School of Arts and Sciences. However, as that may be and even though science is not methodical, at least compared to philosophy, it nevertheless, as argued in Chapter IV, cannot afford to be contaminated. Art, in its integration with science education, has contaminated science education. This is the rationale behind the present move of back to the "basics" advocated by science education, which is intended to be the exclusion of art education, at least in science education courses. With justification, it is making the correct move. Art has in the past contaminated science education to the point where Johnny could not read, write, spell, or add. Science education, is committed to the "knowns" and their memorization. If there exists a conjunctive concern with the "unknowns," then the two inhibit one another, resulting in Johnny's inability to master the knowns, much less understand the unknowns.

The actuality of science education and art education has been, and always will be that of art being counter to science. Thus, art education cannot be considered a branch of science education nor a sub-branch of science. Art cannot be taught conjunctive with science if both are to exist and be comprehended. A mis-understanding of this
causes science to fault, as presently evident in it being an imperfect panacea. Furthermore, the direction of interpretation and the overall education of both the monist and the dualist is not only confusing for the teacher and the educator but for the student as well.

Accordingly, and in regards to the existence and instrumentality of art education, a misunderstanding of the above will lead to the non-existence of art education. This is mainly because as it exists presently, as a branch of science education, art education will be curtailed so that science education can be more accountable in its objectives and more instrumental by an increase of funds from the art education area. This is, of course, another way of saying that Monism is not compatible with Dualism other than existing confrontationally with it. The possible non-existence of art education does not, of course, apply equally to the possible non-existence of art since it is a given. However, since education is not a given, its existence is not assured in either the sciences or the arts. Since art education, as will be argued, transcends art, there is less genetic assuredness for the survival of art education than science education. In other words, art education is less similar to its art origin than science education is to its science origin, thus being further removed from a state of givenness. But accordingly, this is also what enables art education to be a discipline distinct from its origin
(art); whereas, this is not possible for science education in that it is simply an applied discipline.

All of this gives rise to art education having a dual identity. The one is inherited from the discipline of art, while the other is counter to science education. The overall identity of art education is that it is dualistic, existing in a state of confrontation with Monism. Thus, its philosophical structure and content is the same as that of Confrontationalism.

This does not mean that the objectives of art education are, in any sense, the destruction of science education. On the contrary, Confrontationalism, as different from the nihilism in Existentialism and Marxism, does not entail negation, as argued throughout this dissertation. The objective of art education is to facilitate science education while maintaining its own identity. Hence, given the nature and situation of science education at this time, it is the urgent responsibility of art education to remove all aspects of art from science education in its need to return to what it perceives as its "basics." This does not mean, nor does it follow, that neither art or art education will not be taught in the public schools, but rather that it will not be taught in any facet of form under science education. Only now is this even possible by the nature and the definition of art and art education presented in this dissertation. In the past it has been difficult for the science educator to determine when he or she taught science or for that matter art. This confusion cannot prevail, if for no other reason than the science teacher/educator will not let it prevail. Accordingly, the art teacher/educator should be sympathetic to this same goal for it is the only means of salvaging and maintaining art and art education in
the public schools; for that matter, it is the only means of salvaging and maintaining it in higher education as well.

All of this can be a reality by the simple fact of art education functioning confrontationally in regards to science education. Specifically, and in regards to the above, it is for art education to reflect upon general education in assuring that its goals and objectives are realized and kept honest. The same is of course true for general education. There must be a "clean" and total division of labor whereby both hold one another accountable for their responsibilities. This is further advantageous for both in that "education" would finally become self-reflective, self-critical and self-assessive without having to rely on trial and error or for that matter, public or governmental interference.

A realistic means of implementing all of this would simply be by way of public school certification whereby someone who was exclusively certified as a science teacher could not teach any aspect of the arts (unknowns). He or she could, however, use the unknowns to describe (and if possible explain) the knowns, since this is basically the essence of science. The converse would also be true for the certified art teacher.

In higher education, specifically teacher preparation, the concern should mostly be with determining the criteria, and to some extent, the content of whether it is or is not art or science. Overall, it would not be altogether different from the way in which most student teachers are prepared today. A difference, however, would be a necessary familiarity with philosophy, and further, the explicit realization when one is or is not teaching art. This must be a reality, not only for the reasons of being able to teach art, but also in that the public school art teacher must make sure that the science teacher is not teaching art.
Ideally, a line should be drawn down the middle of every school, whereby, on the one side we would have science education and on the other art education such that they existed vis-a-vis with each other. As such, each student would be assured of being exposed to both, whereby he or she could realize the general or the specific application of either or both in a social and/or personal sense. Furthermore, the integrity and the disposition of the dualist would not be undermined at least as much as in the past. He would at least have some opportunity to develop his powers of reasoning, whereby he would hopefully realize how and why he is so often bracketed, and in what sense he is ultimately to survive. A more in-depth consideration of all of this and specifically what would fall on either side of the line will have to await the section on curriculum. For the time being let us return to the structure and the nature of art education.

Art Education and the Extended Arts

In various ways it has been stated throughout this dissertation that philosophy—whether it be metaphysics or a universal particular such as art education—is misunderstood and thereby meaningless unless it be conjunctively considered as a human factor. To talk about philosophy is to talk about the nature of man who entails and supersedes the natural structure. To consider philosophy aside from man is to consider philosophy only in part. Hence, to consider art education is to consider the art educator, for without the latter, the former would have no rationale.

To begin with, the art teacher and/or educator is either a transcending or transcended artist. This is to say that essentially he or she is a dualist who has performed "artistically," who has at least described, if not explained, some unknowns. But unlike the artist, the art teacher
and/or educator is able to reflect and analyze artistic discourse and its implications, and most importantly, he is able to bracket his second self so that, at least at times, he can exist socially whereby he can explain the nature of art. This is to say that the art teacher and/or educator is able to be confrontational and has a workable understanding of Confrontationalism which entails an understanding of Monism. To give added perspective to this, the following topography is offered.

In regards to the above, it is asserted that the artist is formulated from the dualistic state and the "School of Art." This may seem strange to some, since one could easily show that there are artists who have never been counter to such a school. Yet, such other artists are necessarily counter to something. As argued previously in the chapter on the artist, every artist must be counter to the reality of a society (sociality). The School of Art is simply a specific sociality, whether or not it is the best sociality for becoming an artist. As previously
discussed, the School of Art has a long way to go in regards to assessing itself and developing communicative skills for the artist since this would necessitate dualistic expression, rather than monistic expression and interpretation, as it presently advocates. Even so, and in regards to possible certification, it would be difficult for an artist to transcend to an art teacher in the public schools without having been specifically counter to the society of the School of Art.

The same holds true with the Department of Art Education in regards to the formulization of the art teacher. In the past there have been many art teachers who have never encountered a Department of Art Education, yet, nevertheless, they were art teachers in that as artists they were counter to a sociality. Granted that some were not permitted to teach in the public schools by the fact that they were never counter to the specific society of Art Education whereby they were never certified by the state. Yet, by the sheer fact of what has constituted art education in the past, one has to conclude that there have been many art teachers who knew as much and were as capable as those put through the Department of Art Education. One could always attempt to counter such claims by stating that "well, yes, but they never had the same experiences!" This, however, if it has any meaning at all, is fallacious since experience per se is transitory in the first place, as argued throughout this dissertation.

Only when art education is constituted by something which cannot solely be attained in the common-sense world will certification be justified and rational. In the first place, all of this is unconceptual unless art education is a philosophy, and obviously, an uncommon sensical one at that! But as shown below and argued throughout this dissertation,
this is an actuality and instrumentality given the nature and sequential presence of art, possible worlds, and confrontation as presented under Confrontationalism.

![Diagram of Art Education](image)

**Fig. 23—Art Education**

The **structure** of art education is obviously the three triangles considered throughout this dissertation. This very structure is an open structure in the sense of being two-dimensional. Also, it is open in the sense that the conduct or the specific content, which basically emerges under scheme (topological) and schema (topographical), is general rather than specific since the whole of the philosophy is primarily metaphysical. However, the thrust of the conduct and/or content is intellectual since science education does not have it as its basis, or in other words, since it is the nature of art and art education. The **method and methodology** of art education is counterness, and the various sub-approaches to be found under it, such as direction of interpretation, conversion, suspension,
projection, transformation, speculation, imagination, stipulation, creation, explanation. The body of knowledge is that which falls under the "rigid designator" Confrontationalism. (A rigid designator describes and predicates. The importance of Confrontationalism is not in the term itself but rather that it exists and functions rigidly.)

Thus, there is identity and philosophy of art education. This identity/philosophy is different from art or the school/department of art. Whereas science education never escapes or transcends science, art education does transcend art. Furthermore, it is also, therefore, that art education is dualistic since it must, at some point, exist counter to art and the school/department of art. The overall identity of art education is that it is dualistic whereas science education is monistic.

Curriculum and Policy

Since a good curriculum is philosophy, this section has already been presented throughout the dissertation. Much of the specificity of the curriculum has obviously not been directly stated, yet, it is deducible or inferential from the general principles of the philosophy itself. In higher education the philosophy itself is obviously the curriculum, whereas in the case of the public schools it must of course be simplified and made instrumental.

Undoubtedly the reader, especially the curriculum developer, would prefer a more in-depth delineation of specific and practical means and objectives in the implementation of Confrontationalism in the public schools. In a sense this would amount to the specification of the consequential matters of the philosophy itself. Yet, the whole purpose of presenting a philosophy is so that the antecedental can be debated and
likewise implemented in all its diversity. The specification of numer­ously possible means, methods, lessons, goals, objectives and policies would be the catering of simple mindedness and laziness of the curricu­lum developer in such a person not having to consider the antecedinal, much less, the argumentive rationale for the curriculum at large. It is therefore that only a certain and limited amount of specific content will be covered in this section. This is not because the philosophy itself has little application; on the contrary, it is so that the philosophy will be considered first in its generality rather than its specificity.

Along the same lines, there must be a division of labor between the art teacher and the art educator. It is not for the art educator, in higher education, to write public school curricula. The art educator should provide a philosophical base for the art teacher who in turn should write up his or her own, and at times, atypical curriculum. It is for the art educator to be concerned with higher education and for the art teacher or the prospective art teacher, to be concerned with the public schools. Undoubtedly, and as it should be, the two will affect one another. Yet, for both to be explicitly concerned with curricula in the public schools is to leave much unattended, which in the long run, will affect the public school situation, problematically evident of the past educational scene.

The art educator, in higher education, must secure and provide for the education of artists who desire to become more educated, artists who wish specifically to become art teachers, and art teachers who wish to become art educators. In regards to the would-be art teacher or art educator, this necessitates that all courses, at least in "education," be taken in art education and not waived for courses in science educa­tion. If a course is made mandatory in science education for the art
teacher, then the same course in art education must be made mandatory for all science teachers. It is for the art educator to develop such a higher education curriculum which assures the education of the art teacher. This is quite an impossibility left alone to the science teacher and his or her curriculum, for the reasons that the two are distinctly different and cater to different clienteles.

It is not only because science education cannot deal extensively with the dualistic nature that it faul ters, but accordingly because it cannot facilitate intellectualism. Science education is first and foremost committed to facts and their rote memorization rather than truths as in art education. It is also committed to the development of skills such as reading, writing, and arithmetic. Intellectual development has always, and will always, fall on the shoulders of those committed to the numerous facets of the arts. As argued in Chapter IV, this is because of the human conceptual schema, and specifically, by the fact that image and belief exist counter to one another, as the origin of any of the various aspects of intellectualism, such as reasoning and interpreting. This is also why the "visual arts" are so crucial to the development of the child in the public schools. However, and as indicative of the intellectual trend within the last hundred years, the "visual arts" have mistakenly in the past been equated with observation (science) rather than image as discussed in this dissertation. This has been to the detriment of both art and science education, not to mention art education which has in the past been largely unconceptual itself. Undoubtedly, it is a tremendous burden on the art educator's shoulders to realize that he or she is inherently responsible for the development and facilitation of intellectualism. Added to this is also the confusion about the nature and function of the
various arts and their content as to whether they are classified as science, art, aesthetic, or education.

If any content or subject is aesthetic then it falls within the realm of the unknown, which accordingly means that it falls under art. However, if it is aesthetic, as discussed in the last chapter, it remains an unknown and therefore cannot be considered educational, at least in regards to the development of the intellect. For if it is aesthetic, it is necessarily without meaning. To give meaning to the aesthetic is to prostitute it into the non-aesthetic. Granted that the aesthetic can be, and often is, used as art education content and for the development of the intellect, but, and importantly, it thus becomes non-aesthetic.

In part, this is the problem with dance and music. Accordingly, in creating dance or music with meaning, the artist must presuppose much of the topological structure discussed in Chapter IV. Hence to teach these and other forms of art to students in the public schools without a strong background in the visual arts (image) would either presuppose its comprehension or end in failure. It should be re-inforced here that the adherence to presuppositions in the education context is the playing of Russian Roulette with the students' futures.

Albeit, the relationship and/or interrelationship of the arts themselves in the public schools is problematic. It is, however, more troublesome when something is or is not art or science. For instance, the function of many of the school bands in the public schools is simply not at all art, but rather science, since it is the development of skills and rote memorization of formerly created compositions. It is basically illustration, which is science and not an art.
Along similar lines, since it is possible for both science education and art education to teach, let us say design, it is imperative that each teacher of design be able to justify his or her involvement with it. That is, if the science teacher is teaching design then he or she must have a justifiable and workable understanding of its manifesto and its manifestation as science and not as art. The same holds true with the art teacher in dealing with design, or for that matter any other content. This necessitates a concern with the antecedinal, and in this case, the antecedinal of design. It is mandatory, if an explanatory justification is to be given by the art teacher, that two counter antecedents always be presented in arguing the results or the consequences of curriculum and/or policy in regards to both the general and the specific.

In regards to teaching strategy in the public school art class, it must be dualistic. This is necessary since a monistic student cannot have the same essential existence as a dualistic one. The same does not hold true with science education: first, since it is monistic; and second, since it is possible for the dualist to exist monistically. To accommodate both (the monist and the dualist) in the public school art class, the curriculum must also be dualistic. It is suggested that such a distinction might possibly be realized by way of the roles "producer" and "viewer." It is not that the monist shouldn't "produce" art, but rather that he or she is apt not to, whereby the process and the product is illustrative rather than creative. To expect and demand the contrary would be unrealistic. It is likely by the role of the "viewer" that the monist will benefit the most, that is, the comparative analysis, interpretation, appreciation, explanation of art and the artist's world as it relates to his or her scientific world. Accordingly, the role of "viewer"
is just as important for the dualist, and by the way, often overlooked by many art teachers in simply trying to make studio artists out of their pupils. It is, however, very important that in either role the dualist is not required to bracket his or her second self since this is necessarily a reality for the dualist in science education and detrimental to creativity.

This should not be confused with a discipline problem or an undisciplined child since such an individual, whether monistic or dualistic, is at such a point functioning within the social structure by his or her own provocation. Disciplining under Confrontationalism can be as sternly enforced as in science education since it is a social manifestation—an interrelationship rather than an intra-relationship—which therefore, and for other reasons as well, does not curtail or inhibit creativity since it has little to do with it, other than being counter to it. As a matter of fact, disciplinary policy should be even more strict and strictly enforced in art to prevent monistic behavior from curtailing creative conduct.

Conclusion

From the brief discussion of curriculum and policy it is hoped that the reader will at least, to some extent, realize that philosophy does have an effect on practical matters. Obviously, in the past the so-called Deweyian philosophy and its misunderstanding has effected the educational scene drastically. Other philosophies, as with Pragmatism, have shared in some of the restoration, but more so in adding to the ailments of the world at large. Their principles of human nature are basically misleading if not outright incorrect whereby destruction
occurs and education suffers tremendously. Some might argue that the educational situation is not really all that bad, yet, progressively and comparatively to the advances and accomplishments of other areas it would have to be viewed in a faulting light.

Many of the problems have arisen by the so-called philosophies not having addressed essence and truth, but simply common-sense facts. If they have not been practical and common sensical in their origin, then at least they have deviated little from it. Hence, they have been consequential philosophies without much of a concern for the antecedinal. It follows from this that little philosophical dialogue could have been expected, other than arguing from the consequential to the antecedinal— it being the "inductive process of reasoning" often noted as being logically flawed.

To prevent such a direction of interpretation or re-interpreta-
tion, the consequential content has been kept at a minimum in this dissertation in hopes that the reader will concern himself or herself with the antecedinal and its generality rather than its specificity. This is necessary if philosophical dialogue is to be an ongoing activity at the higher education level, and as well for curriculum developers to fully understand the various philosophical implications. Without such a reality it is senseless even to begin considering "accountability" much less the assimilation of empirical data for whatever reason such data is accumulated.
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