

01
Thesis
E 459

AUTHOR. *ELLIOTT, ALBERT LESLIE*.....

TITLE *Intellect and intuition*.....

Thesis *M.A. 1915*.....

*Master of Arts degree,
(in connection with Major in Fellen & Bergson)*

INTELLECT and INTUITION.

*Dep
-Lee
E 459
C. 2*

In dealing with this subject it is not my intention to critically examine the psychological processes subsequent to and connected with the development of either Intellect or Intuition. I wish rather to examine these faculties as we see them existing in action and to determine so far as possible their relative functions. In the present age the tendency is to over-emphasize the capacity of the intellect as an instrument of Reason. While we do not wish to suggest that man can not know and understand the problem directly connected with life, it is necessary to search for the solution by the proper means else our quest is sure to result in failure and discouragement. It is not reasonable for man to be constrained by the suggestions of his life in action to believe in the existence of spheres of knowledge and to have these closed to him as a thinking intelligent Being. Yet such is the case if we are shut up to scientific knowledge or to the conclusion of the intellect.

Intellect may be defined as a form of consciousness by which the mind is enabled to grasp reality outside of it but which limits both the extent and the character of the view which the mind takes. Just as the eye limits the light it admits and images of objects it receives so the intellect has been formed by concentrating of consciousness on a few things to the exclusion of others. It is fashioned for the needs of human action to be a light for our conduct, to make ready for our action on certain things, to foresee the events favorable or unfavorable that may follow our present action. It thus selects in a given situation what is like something already known, applying the principle that like produces like. Science excels in this faculty. But science is able only to work on what repeats itself. Anything that does not present some aspect of this repetition is outside the sphere of science.

Intellect likes to deal with solids and dislikes that which is fluid or flows. It seems to feel that it has a category in which to class everything, a frame or garment with which to surround every object presented to it, and in doing this it professes to "know" that object. When objects cannot be so grouped it is because Intellect has not found the proper category. Now

that which flows as "life cannot be measured, hence intellect cannot deal with life.

The nearest intellect can get to a flow is that which might be represented by the cinematograph. Just as the cinematograph can represent successive phases of a moving object in such rapid succession that by the persistence of vision it appears to the observer to be a continual sequence, so the intellect can pass over objects placing each in juxtaposition to the others to such an extent that they appear causally related. But science deals with these objects individually analyzing each part by part and the change from one object to another is a change from state to state, and not a flow. It deals with the states as they exist and not with the transition. The objects are to all purposes of science fixed, and movement signifies that one object replaces another, a succession of states rather than a continuous change. Its aim is construction. How can it put objects together so as to serve a purpose? How can it unify the material of the universe? This constructive activity is exercised exclusively on inert matter even to the extent that if it makes use of organic matter it treats it as inert without taking into consideration the life which animated it. Of inert matter it deals only with that which is solid. The rest escapes by its very fluidity.

The intellect in dealing with inert matter can regard each part as cut up into an infinite number of parts, but each part or element into which it is broken up is considered as a separate unit, e. g. a drop of water is broken in thought into innumerable molecules and each in turn into three atoms but each part becomes a unit. Thus in each part we postulate discontinuity with other parts. Hence in this we see clearly that intellect proceeds with the belief that discontinuity of matter is a fixed principle.

Now the important consideration of a mobile object to the intellect is whether it is going and where it is at any moment of its passage. That is, it is concerned with what will be its future position or what is its actual position and not with its progress or movement from position to position or from state to

state e. g. in the drop of water's transformation, it is the water or its elements that concerns the intellect and not the transition. Thus the intellect turns from mobility to the static or immobile of which alone it forms a clear idea.

Because intellect works on inert matter in this manner and makes matter its entire object of operation it thus indicates that matter may be carved into any desired form. It makes the world of matter appear to our thought as an immense piece of cloth from which we can cut at will and sew together as we wish. That is the intellect has unlimited power of decomposing according to any law and recomposing into any system.

Again man lives in society and so the human intellect works in conjunction with other intellects. It is necessary that there be an understanding regarding the various objects of the matter with which they work. Language has served this purpose and has made community action possible. But there are an infinite number of things while the terms of the human language are limited. Thus the terms or words by which objects are designated are mobile so that the same term can be moved at will from object to object. But this property of words by which they pass from one thing to another has been extended so that they can pass also from things to ideas. Without language and this mobility of words the intellect would have been riveted to the material objects with which it was interested, but by this means it has been freed so that it can pass from the perceived thing to a recollection of that thing, and from a recollection to a more fleeting image and from the image to the picture of the act by which the image is pictured, namely the idea. Thus by the means of language the intellect hitherto always attending to the external has opened to it a whole internal world. Thus the intellect has the external world to which it can cling and the internal, immaterial world of ideas by which it can penetrate to the inwardness of its own work. With these two worlds in which to roam it began to theorize. In theorizing the instrument or method by which it approaches ^{to} the problems is language. Now language was made to designate things and only things, but on account of its mobility the intellect has taken it from things

to ideas. When applied to things words denoted definite forms and now as they have been applied to ideas the same habit is adhered to in order to give distinctness and clearness. Thus in the realm of ideas we have discontinuity. Concepts are outside of each other and like objects separated in space. Only as they are taken together can they constitute an intelligible world. Thus in both the realm of matter and ideas the intellect represents things as separate units which assume successive states homogeneous with each other and not as a continued flow. Nor can we say that the attention is called to the internal change of any of these states, because as soon as we decompose it, it must reunite in the same state and should this go on ad infinitum we would note no internal modification, and if the elements unite to form a new state, it is not the becoming we noticed but the changed state. Hence the Intellect in its scientific analysis and synthesis, whether of the material or immaterial states does not observe the "becoming" the flow but only the fixed state.

Consider now the manner in which Intellect deals with Life in the organism. Can we think of the life of an organism as consisting of an infinite number of states? Can we fix life at any point so that Intellect can examine in and around it? It is true the organism consists of cells infinite in number each of which is in a sense capable of examination by intellect but separate cells do not compose the organism. There must be a unification of these cells not only in space and time but there must be interaction. The more science advances the more it sees an increasing number of these heterogeneous elements placed together outside each other to make up the living Being. This discovery does not bring it nearer to the understanding of Life. In fact the more minutely it analyzes in parts the further away seems the real life of the living organism. The truth is that Life, whether considered as in the cell or in the organism cannot be thought by the intellect while it follows its natural movement. It implies a multiplicity of elements and the continued interpenetration of all, by all the combination, which condition renders it out of the realm of intellect.

The Intellect is always trying to reconstitute and to re-constitute with what is given, and by this it lets pass unnoticed the new element in each moment of history. That a definite antecedent brings forth a definite consequent, that a definite end has required a definite means to attain it, is what satisfies intellect and sets it at ease.

But in this succession of cause and effect, the fresh and new is ever upspringing, the new form, when produced may be as an effect determined by its causes but in reality it is more. The new could not be foreseen. The cause and effect are not distinct and clear. They are intermingled. The cause is in some degree part of the effect which has come into existence with it. So that in the effect there is something old and something new, something the same and something changed, and it is literally impossible to arbitrarily separate one from the other as is the custom of the intellect. All this we can feel and divine by sympathy but not by a scientific analysis. We cannot express it as successive states in terms of pure understanding.

Again as intellect cannot grasp "Becoming" neither can it grasp a complete novelty. Explaining to the intellect is resolving it into elements old or known and arranged in a different order, to show its genera. If then in the transition from cause to effect there is a new element, a birth of something generically different, this new element is lost because of the habit of intellect being constrained to believe that the universe contains a constant quantity of all elements.

This brings us to the point where intellect fails absolutely in its scientific investigation. It is unable to understand Life. Whether it is the life of body or the life of the mind, new elements are constantly appearing of which intellect can give no explanation. Its methods are not adapted to such an existence. It cannot resolve them into any other forms. It cannot place them in any of its categories. It cannot find for them any genera. Hence the new element of life must be explained by something other than by intellect.

We have also seen that intellect's method of explaining is to

look at things in the static condition. Now life is never in this condition. It is always flowing, changing becoming something different from what it is, hence if we neglect the origin of life altogether and consider it only in its existent flux it is out of the realm of intellect.

Intellect thus is not able to consider the problem of Life nor the flowing but only the static, the moulding of inert matter into various instruments, tools and implements required by man, ^{and} analyzing matter into its constituent elements. In passing from matter to ideas it attempts to apply to the immaterial the laws and methods of construction and analysis that it applied to the material.

In the construction of instruments it makes them very imperfectly but is able to use them and adapt them to a great variety of uses. In the analysis of matter into elements cause and effect it considers it as fixed and not as a constant flux, and in the immaterial we found that it could not deal with the problem of life. Hence we must look at some other phase of intelligence in order to grasp the meaning of life.

We shall now turn from Intellect to Intuition, first looking at the immediate knowledge of the animal called instinct and then at the immediate knowledge of man called intuition.

The intelligent Being has been characterized as one that has the faculty of making tools, implements &c with which to construct; while the unintelligent animal or the animal guided solely by instinct has these tools or instruments given to it ready made and they form a part of its body. Instinct seems to consist in a natural ability to use a tool thus given. In the case of some larvae there seems no particular line of demarcation between the instinct of the animal and the organizing work of the living matter by means of which the tool or organ of instinctive use is formed. At least it seems to require some kind of initiative on the part of the larva. In fact it has been stated that instinct is only a continuance or consummation of the work of organization where the activity of the instinct begins, we cannot say, but it is certainly very closely related to the so called natural

evolutions of the various forms of life.

Instinct perfected may be defined as the faculty of making and using unorganized instruments. This faculty it performs without difficulty and with a perfection that is often wonderful. As a consequence the tool and in fact the species retains an almost invariable structure. Instinct is thus specialization in which the animal has practically a perfect instrument with perfect knowledge, and ability to use it.

This is not true of the instrument constructed intelligently. It is an imperfect instrument generally troublesome to handle but will serve a variety of purposes. The making of the instrument reacts upon man, calling upon him to exercise a new function. In it he has acquired the power of making an artificial organ by which the natural organism is extended. By means of this he is able to satisfy many needs but each need satisfied opens up a new need and there is opened before him an unlimited field of activity. In this he has a great advantage over the animal guided by instinct. Such an animal is shut up to the using of one tool for a specific purpose while the intelligent animal has an open field. When this faculty of construction was raised to a high degree it became advantageous, but at the outset it seemed to have as many draw backs as advantages.

The activities of instinct and intelligence thus seem to have had a common origin. The activity which became intellect in obtaining this freedom, this power over matter, goes further and further from its source, and ever acquires more constructive skill and more power to see ways and means of overcoming an obstacle. It becomes in a sense master of the world of sense. Instinct however never having the power of going abroad but closed up in its own sphere retains the innate knowledge of things in its own sphere. Thus we see that the Bee has a knowledge in its own sphere, the depth of which man with his intellect has not been able to fathom. The bee as soon as issuing from its cell takes upon itself the duties of its life without any apparent training or instruction. It seems to know completely and immediately its entire sphere of activity.

Its work presupposes the action and interaction of all the other bees of the colony, to such an extent that one is led to believe the Bee has a perfect knowledge of the Beginning and end of the Bee's Life. The Bee in its colony might well be compared to an organ or even a cell of an organism. In its setting it fulfils its function with an innate knowledge which is perfect indicating that it is in vital union with some source of knowledge unknown to intellect in the common sense of the word.

By means of memory, consciousness retains the past and pours into the present recollections which help it to meet the occasion. But this is always more or less imperfect. The knowledge of instinct suggests in its activity a similarity to memory but in a perfect state. This instinctive knowledge which one species possesses of another, not being acquired by experience or reason must exist on account of a unity of Life or a sympathetic union of itself with the whole of Life. Instinct seems to bear to intelligence a relation similar to the sense of touch, to the sense of sight. A blind man by touch can only arrive at a knowledge of a distant object by passing over individually all the intervening objects and thus reaching eventually the desired object, and reaching it then only if nothing obstructs his passage. But by vision we can neglect the intervening objects and reach at once the desired object. So intellect may be compared to the sense of touch, attaining knowledge step by step through a logical process while instinct is like the sense of sight attaining knowledge at a single step.

Thus if instinct had the scope, the power, if it expressed itself in knowledge instead of in action, it would undoubtedly be able, to give us the secrets of life. Though of common origin with intelligence they turn in opposite directions. Intellect turning to matter and instinct to Life in action. Intellect by means of science gives to us more and more completely the secrets of ^{the} physical operations of the material universe but when it touches life it translates it in the form of the static or the inert. It goes all around life taking from the outside the greatest possible number of view points but is unable to

enter into it and portray it to us as a continued flux. It must isolate it piece by piece and thus gives us no true view. But instinctive activity implies knowledge of it in its entirety, that is, within its own sphere.

Now have we not in man a means of attaining immediate knowledge similar to the manner in which the animal attains its instinctive knowledge? Is man obliged to resort entirely to logical conclusions following a process of empirical or intellectual deductions? Is he shut up to the process of intellectual analysis and synthesis in which he views things part by part as it appears at intervals in a fixed state? Has he not besides the organ of intellect a means of knowing which is like in nature to the means by which the animal acquires its instinctive knowledge. This means of knowing is Intuition.

Intuition is difficult of definition both concerning itself and its operation. Intuition is the consciousness of living. It is a power of knowledge which is as wide as Life. Even plants which struggle against all obstacles during their season of Life seem to be conscious of the fact that they are living; conscious that they must utilize the passing days to realize their Being and fulfil their purpose. This apparent consciousness of Living,- this knowledge of life in action is of the nature of intuition. Thus intuition is not something of the nature of a special sense which belongs to a few favored individual human Beings but it is a consciousness which is as broad as life, apparent in the plant as selective absorption so that it prepares for the special conditions of its own existence. It is apparent in the animal as instinct by which it naturally provides for its wants and guards against attacks from its enemies in a manner so perfect as to baffle our understanding, and it does so without having previously learned or met with a similar experience. It seems a perfect consciousness of its own existence and of the necessary conditions for sustenance. Again it is apparent in man as immediate knowledge of Life. It is not a new sense revealing to us unsuspected things or qualities of things, but a consciousness

of the existence of Reality by sympathy by means of which we seem to be at one with reality and live it directly in contrast to the scientific method of analysis and synthesis.

In feeling, in unreflecting sympathy and antipathy we experience in ourselves something of what must pass through the consciousness of an insect acting by instinct. Both in the care of the parent for the offspring and in attacking a foe there is an exhibition of this sympathy and antipathy. This knowledge comes not from without, but from within; not from direct past experience nor as a result of having learned it from its parents. The animal does not by examination determine the need on the one hand for the care of the offspring and the vulnerable point of its assailant on the other hand but it comes to this knowledge directly through some kind of an internal sympathy or feeling. It thus is quite evident that this immediate knowledge originates not in the intellect but from sympathy or feeling.

Now if this immediate knowledge as is seen in instinct could become capable of reflecting upon its object and its action of indefinitely extending its knowledge beyond its offspring or particular foe to suit every activity and circumstance, would we not in this sympathy and the activity find ultimately the secrets of life and the reality of existence? Such capability we believe belongs to man who utilizes his intuitive power and submits the knowledge thus attained to the illumination of Intellect.

To the instinctive animal its consciousness lights up the sphere of potentialities surrounding the acts. It fills the interval between what is done and what might be done. This consciousness of the animal is very limited as is also the sphere of activity, but as the consciousness ascends to higher levels both the sphere of activity and the range of vision is widened. We do not mean that between the psychical and the cerebral states there is parallelism or concomitance so that as the cerebrum becomes more elaborate in its structure, the psychic states automatically becomes extended but that there is an interdependence between them so that as the brain becomes

more highly developed as an organ of consciousness, the sphere of activity is widened, the degree of freedom extended and possibilities of more intimate and deeper sympathy greatly increased.

Although intuition is distinct and separate from intellect yet it is from intellect it gets its original push, by means of intellect such knowledge is put to the proof and translated into concepts which may be propagated to other men. This is not saying that intellect is superior to intuition but only that the knowledge acquired by intuition must be analyzed in order to become communicable by language to other minds.

Now if intuition could be sufficiently prolonged the philosopher would be consistent in his own thought and also with one another. It is so because intuition has the faculty of seeing what is immanent in the action by which the mystery of Life and the problems of philosophy may be solved.

Intuition and intellect may be pictorially differentiated by comparing intellect to a bright luminous centre formed from a narrowing and condensation of a kind of nebulosity surrounding it which is intuition. Thus intellect has been made from the very substance which we call Intuition and exists as a luminous nucleus complementary in its power to the intuition. The trouble has been that men have taken intellect entirely distinct and separate from the luminous nebulosity from which it is composed and which forms for a basis and a means of providing data for the understanding. The intuition viewed as vague nebulosity is infinite in its extension. It might be compared to ether in the physical world. As ether is considered to pervade all space so intuition may enter into and pervade all forms of life as existing reality. It is thus able to view forms of life as they exist and as they act and hence is thus able to know life.

All life is in action and only in action can it be understood. Intellect being able to understand only the static can not know life but intuition finds itself entirely at home taking cognizance of the mobile. Just as to understand an eddy of dust, we must view it in its whirling state, while if we surround it with a canvas to examine its nature, we can see the dust and learn of

it, but the eddy becomes a thing of the past and we can never know it. It is the process and not the thing in itself that is all important for the understanding of Life.

Again the love of a mother bending over her child divines by an inward sympathy or feeling the pains and aches, the joys and sorrows, the many causes of distress and requirements for happiness which are visible to none but the mother.

The relationship will not permit of analysis. Analyze it and the fact of the maternal love is lost. It must be viewed in the state of action. This mother bending over her offspring or the animal depositing its egg in the proper place to develop its offspring or a plant storing in its seed the latent life to be developed in a future day, gives us a glimpse of the fact that the secret of life is to be understood in the movement by which life is transmitted.

Intuition by the sympathetic communication established between the self and the rest of the living process is enabled by the expansion of consciousness to grasp life's process in its endless state of continued creation.

I do not mean to accept Aristotle's theory of life as being unilinear or a gradual ascent from the acorn to man, that the plant, animal and man are successive stages of the same development. We believe each of these orders is divergent development of life and their difference is not one of degree but of kind. So that man is distinctly different from the animal, different in that he is fundamentally a spiritual Being. Being of this order his cognizance is infinitely greater than the animal. Hence our supposition that as the animal in its limited sphere seems to have by the immediate knowledge given by instinct a complete comprehension of life, in his sphere, so man in his higher and greater sphere may by taking full advantage of the immediate knowledge given by intuition gain a complete knowledge of his greater sphere and so understand completely the secrets of life.

Intellect and intuition represent two opposite directions of the work of consciousness. Intuition going in the direction of Life and Intellect in the opposite direction, viz: of the inert and being hampered by the nature of matter.

A complete and perfect humanity would be one in which these two forms of conscious activity should attain their full development. In humanity as at present constituted, intuition to a great degree is sacrificed to intellect. In man's great ambition to conquer matter he made that his prime consideration, and has exhausted in it, the best part of his power. To gain a world he has lost his soul. Also in directing his attention so completely to this conquest man has more and more determined himself as an intellectual Being. Consequently intuition is but vague and discontinuous. But even in this state it throws light upon our personality, liberty, place in nature, origin and even our destiny. This life pierces the darkness of the night in which we are left by intellect and points to better things. If these intuitions can be sustained expanded and united together, in them we shall see the flow and unity of life. We shall recognize that the intellect is but a small part of the whole of consciousness. By means of intellect alone we can never attain to the comprehensive power of intuition. We shall see that intuition reveals the unity of the spiritual Life and the relation of the life of the spirit to that of the body. It reveals the fact that the spiritual life is not to be isolated from all other life and suspended as it were in the air. It is the characteristics of Intellect to suspend life in the air in this manner, but that is because being unable to comprehend it, puts it out of court entirely. It will not even acknowledge intuition, but this is because intellect is unable to understand it any better than the spiritual life which it reveals.

Intuition brings the totality of one's Being into vital union with the world-soul, the all pervading Spirit of the Universe, and reveals to man immediate knowledge of the secrets of Life.

But we have said before that Intellect cannot take cognizance of an entirely new element. Hence the possibility of direct union with the spirit of the Universe by means of Intuition is outside the sphere of Intellect; and truth derived thereby it considers as mere fancy. This fact should not discourage man in relying on the knowledge given by Intuition. In so far as it

can be examined and reduced to intellectual forms, Intuition is not at all contradictory to knowledge. In fact we are constrained by the great dissatisfaction and incompleteness of scientific knowledge to go elsewhere in quest of truth. Still the intellect is so bound to inert matter by law and prejudice that it cannot tolerate another faculty of consciousness going beyond its sphere.

This faculty of the consciousness is generally termed "soul" which makes Intuition to man possible. When a Being is ushered into the world and becomes a "living soul" the life as a whole from the initial impulse that thrust it into the world rises as a wave and is opposed by the movement of matter. In humanity alone this extended wave occupies a privileged situation. This wave is consciousness. It includes all potentialities which interpenetrate and to which no material category can be applied. The individuality of the consciousness is indicated more clearly by matter but nevertheless in a less distinct form existed before. Souls pre-exist but are rendered more distinct and separate by the corporeal embodiment. Thus soul life might be compared to innumerable little rills into which the great river of life divides itself. The stream is different from the river bed or channel yet the stream must adopt the windings of the channel. So also is consciousness distinct from the organism which it animates and in which it is embodied yet it must undergo its vicissitudes. The direction of its flow is determined by the organism.

The possible actions indicated by a state of consciousness are instantly being carried out in the nervous centres, thus we see the brain execute at each instant the motor indication of a state of consciousness. But this is the limit of the interdependence of brain and consciousness. Consciousness is essentially free and not bound up with the destiny of the brain. If the consciousness turns itself to matter it must adapt itself to it and become what is called intellectuality, but being essentially free, being freedom itself, consciousness is above matter, and need not be hampered by it. On one hand it may if *it*

chooses attend only to things of sense to matter and thereby become pure intellectualism. It may on the other rise above matter and things of time and space establish free passage between itself and the spirit of the Universe holding intercourse thereby as man with man. The immediate knowledge of such we call intuition.

It has been contended that human nature is too weak and fleeting and God too remote and vast to be accessible to man in this direct way. This would be true and the gulf would be unsurpassable if man were simply nature existing beside and in a world of other natures. But man is distinctly different from other natures in that in him wells up a soul and consciousness as a direct out pouring of the spiritual Life and which may return upon itself at any time, thus establishing this inner relationship between God and man.

By endeavoring to give intuition its proper place we do not in any way do injustice to Intellect. Intellect stands and holds its sphere the same as ever. Its realm is the inert the world of sense. By developing the other phase of consciousness we open an avenue to a new world, the realm of spirit. These realms are opposed to each other. Intellect and Intuition are two different phases of one consciousness. It seems that Intellect holds the fort and science culture and civilization have triumphed over religion. But having carried the victory it fails to give the satisfaction that it apparently promised. Its methods of procedure are not such as to permit it ever to give the satisfaction that our nature demands. Hence again and again man's inner Being, his consciousness, his soul goes out in deep longing for the something that the intellect could not find, that is God.

Thus by Intuition it is no impossibility to get to the principle of Life. When by intuition the principle of life is received, when the intricate problems are vivified, intellect certainly can serve a great purpose in putting them to the proof, in translating them in communicable terms. If it cannot understand them it more and more becomes able to see that the truth obtained by intuition is not contradictory to intellect. If we

could imagine a perfect Being intellectually developed to the highest degree and his consciousness or soul so intimately united with the spirit of the Universe that intuition would flow unobstructed, the voice of God would not be only to man but in man, and this voice would be made perfectly intelligible and rational and might even be communicated by means of language to other men.

However, this high function of intuition assisted by intellect is but our ideal, nevertheless it is one which seems not forever beyond the reach of man.

A. L. Elliott