

## Explaining the Faculty of Intuition as the Objective Ego

### Abstract

Kant's main idea about the faculty of intuition entails a knowledge of space and time but does not explain sufficient reasons that show there are no innate ideas. In "Some Consequences of Four Incapacities" (1868), Peirce explains that there is no intuition to understand God. I aim to show that innate ideas are transcendental beliefs that correspond to an abstract conception of the personal identity, which creates intuitive space for understanding why there are no innate ideas. This method for constructing rational ideas will provide reasons that explain how substance, in particular, the monad, can have the existence to separate action from the conditions of the world. The utility of objects must be measured in an intuitive sense, a method that determines how there are effects that enable the mind to become aware of the physical relations with the objects of reality. In order to understand how thought exists independently from sense experience, as an abstraction that determines the relations between objects and ideas, it appears we will have to construct a philosophy that justifies the content of beliefs within a pre-established harmony.

### **Section 1: No Evidence of Innate Ideas: The Causal Relations Between Objects and Ideas**

In *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, Locke explains that there are no innate ideas or speculative principles. However, his argument requires more adequate support about how the blank slate transforms perception into the reality of objects and ideas. Locke does not believe that there is an innate structure in the mind and does not explain how extension is purely physical. Thus, the problem concerning extension and the qualities can be resolved through a Leibnizian perspective that the world exists as a pre-established harmony. This will unite the utility of matter, namely, that objects contain ideas which produce intuitive actions. As a result,

there are new inventions that stem from the existence of the monad, which is theoretical and justified by the effects of action and imaginative ideas that come into being.

Since the qualities are not observable things in experience, but are viewed as concepts or ideas, there would have to be abstract relationships introduced between ideas and the objects of perception in order to understand why rational beings are free and not subject to the experimental conditions of the world. Kant was certain that intuition could be proven through the pure reason, and his account of a priori knowledge created a foundation for understanding how objects are known according to the intuition. But he did not believe that God was a free agent that caused the real world to contain more validity than the transcendental world. Therefore, transcendental idealism explains that the utility of objects is intuitively given and produces true ideas about the origin of objects in the mind. This means that the soul is a geometrical property of space and time, and extends into the body, which allows us to determine mathematical ideas such as the relations of a triangle and a column.

Locke thinks that the qualities justify the causes of ideas, which makes him a different philosopher than Hume. The middle ground for the empiricist and skeptic is one that explains why there are concrete impressions that exist in the abstract ideas. For example, blue is a color that produces the idea of blue, but something that contains blue is subject to change because of the action that transforms its appearance. That is to say, "This wall has been painted blue." It is true that blue is and is not the property of this wall since it exists as a physical condition. Thus, space and time must be the source of something else that causes the reality of perception since matter is permeable and contains a property which we call 'change.' Hence, there is an objective ego that is separate from the reality of objects and the relations that exist between them. The ego's identity is manifest through associations, and these ideas give rise to volitional actions in

consciousness (van Fraassen, *How Can We Understand Transcendence of the Ego?*, The Non-Existent Knight, Princeton University Press). Since I know that I exist separate from other things, I understand other things must exist contingently to themselves.<sup>1</sup> In logic, "I exist" means that the ego is not a physical object, a mental substance, an abstract entity, or a compound. I am also not part of the matter in the world and understand that my thoughts and feelings are related to history, although it is not my identity. From the notion that I exist but am not a thing, it is clear that quantifiers such as 'something', 'there is such a thing as' or 'everything', the word 'thing' does not have substantive meaning but is a pronominal device (Logic: I exist). These statements demonstrate attributions that describe what something is and what it means. A proposition that explains how 'everything' contains a 'quality' means that 'All x' is true since 'x contains that quality.' Thinking in this way implies that all things that share that quality are real because something else follows that quality. There is a cause between 'it' and an item that is signified by the property so that categorical ideas differ from subjective impressions. The general form of unity between mind and object implies three different cases about existence. First, I am not an object. Second, the self is not an object. Third, the word 'I' does not refer to an object ('Thing' and 'object').

## **Section 2: Explaining Ideas as Subjective and Objective Intuitions**

Hitherto, it is clear that the ideas exist as objects of space and time and place the mind in a position to understand the contents of experience according to the intuitive relations between thought and action, such as goodness, beauty, and truth. Consequently, a judgment occurs when the mind decides about the future effects of the object onto the body. Ideas, then, are intuitions that form the concept of self in the abstract sense and from the relative angle of the observer. The

---

<sup>1</sup> Calvino's problem explains that the ego's identity connects to something that exists in the world but creates a predicament of existence concerning the knight because it is not a thing.

question, 'What is a self?' can be rephrased, 'What am I?' The answers that follow from these ideas are subjective and cause different answers that show how substances contain forms that refer to the objective ego. Therefore, there is a distinction between subjective and objective knowledge, which is determined by an intuitive notion of the mind. These complex combinations of ideas are mechanisms for change and determining the efficient processes that can be used for learning and making inferences about the nature of experience. According to van Fraassen, the self is not something, but it cannot be known as nothing. The belief that ideas are the objects of the person is the theory of a priori ideas, which Kant demonstrates in the *Critique of Pure Reason*. From this view, the meaning of objects is determined by how we perceive the world. An a priori idea exists independently from the existence of the material world but is known through reason.<sup>2</sup> Locke, on the other hand, believes that there can be no innate idea of 12 since it is only through reasoning that we come to know it. That is, innate ideas are from a different nature.

### **Section 3: Understanding How A priori Relates to Future Contingency**

In philosophy, pure thought is the concept that can supply intuitive ideas independently without sense perception. The benefit of the a priori concept is that it relies only on reason to understand how something can exist without a cause. In *The Monadology*, Leibniz thinks that substances must conform to the nature of God, that is to say, a being that must exist because humans are rational. Since the world contains rational beings, then there must be a God that created the universe in this way.<sup>3</sup> The monads exist as particular atoms of nature that make up

---

<sup>2</sup> See Kant (1781) *The Critique of Pure Reason*. The a priori idea of 12 is from the sum of 7 + 5. There can be no innate idea of 12 because it is only through reasoning that we come to know it. Innate ideas are from a different nature.

<sup>3</sup> See Leibniz, *The Monadology*. The monad is a simple substance without parts that makes composites. The monads are things that cannot be observed by sense perception but are known by the mind (130, 1).

the elements of things (Monadology, 130, 3). From this point of view, the simple substances exist because there are composites, which are collections, or ideas that exist as aggregates.

Leibniz justifies truths about the monads by explaining that there is no extension, form, or divisibility that shows their existences. Hence, they cannot perish by natural means. A simple substance cannot come into existence through natural means because it cannot be formed by composition (Ibid., 5). Their existence occurs simultaneously and must begin or end all at once, which shows that the monad only begins through creation and ends through annihilation. However, composites begin or end gradually. He says, “The monads have no windows through which anything may come in or go out.” (Ibid., 7). Therefore, it cannot be altered or changed in its inner being since there is no possibility of transposition within it. Further, there is no internal movement which can be produced, directed, increased, or diminished there within the substance, such as can take place in the case of composites where a change can occur among the parts. The relationship between monad and matter shows that attributes cannot exist separate from various substances. Hence, Leibniz thinks that monads must have qualities in order to exist. The theory of the monads also explains that they are ‘entelechies’ or souls that subsist by themselves and interact in order to create knowledge. Since a monad must contain a quality, the intuition can determine how the monad exists distinct from itself. Monads can be viewed as existing only in nature and are not contained in objects. In other words, if the monads exist as natural entelechies, they are foundations for true beliefs to develop because the individual is contained inside of the world and exists as collections of monads that produce cognitions, feelings, and complex ideas.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> See George Bealer and Ernest Sosa (2006) for an explanation that there is an intuitional connection to the truth. This relation takes the opposite side by suggesting that human intuition is analogous to sense perception, which is a faculty that delivers justified true beliefs.

In the *Theodicy*, Leibniz explains that truth is connected to the future and is known through a concept called ‘contingent futurities’ that are pre-determined. This pre-established harmony is a foundation for describing why Plato’s forms are different from empirical things. These truths show that they will happen as certainly as the past. Leibniz explains, "It was true already a hundred years ago that I should write to-day, as it will be true after a hundred years that I have written." (*Theodicy*, 437). Hence, the future does not affect what is contingent, nor does it decide that determination is incompatible with contingency. The certain and determinate are one thing because the determinate has the potential to be known. Therefore, a determination is an objective certainty (*Ibid.*, 437). These points illustrate that there is a nature of truth that cannot harm freedom. However, other determinations are taken from the intuition of God that some believe is the opposite of freedom. Yet, Leibniz thinks that what is foreseen does not apply to necessary truth.<sup>5</sup> Moreover, the consequence is necessary since it must exist and has been foreseen since God is infallible. Hence, foreknowledge does not make truth more determinate. Rather, truth is foreseen because it is determinate and true. However, it is not true because it is foreseen. Thus, the future must be part of the past or present. This idea might relate to the cause of the foreknowledge that makes it this way. Leibniz explains, "For it needs must be that the foreknowledge of God has its foundation in the nature of things, and this foundation, making the truth predeterminate, will prevent it from being contingent and free." (*Ibid.*, 440).

According to Hales, the rational intuition determines how ideas relate to perceptions and produce truths about justified beliefs (Hales, 2012, *The Faculty of Intuition*, Introduction, 180).

---

<sup>5</sup> See Leibniz, *Theodicy*, for an account of the meaning of necessary truth, which states that the contrary is impossible or implies contradiction. Future action is not necessary even if God foresees that it come to pass. Moreover, the consequence is necessary since it must exist and has been foreseen since God is infallible. This is what is termed a *hypothetical necessity*. Leibniz is more concerned with *absolute necessity* in order to say that an action is necessary, that it is not contingent, that it is not the effect of a free choice (pp. 439).

This view is contrary to experimental philosophers who argue that perception must prevail over intuition and say that intuition does not provide *ultima facie* or even *prima facie* justification. Hales also thinks that intuitions construct theories and contain cognitive or psychological qualities. The sources of perceptions are from noninferential, empirical knowledge, which is brought into reflective equilibrium, but it is possible that they can be errors and outliers. This results in them being discarded. Inferences about perceptions are not coherently integrated so that the inferential procedure is undermined. This area of philosophy studies how beliefs are part of networks that transfer among different faculties in the mind.<sup>6</sup> Sosa (2007, 106) thinks that intuition is analogous to observation. He explains that, “Direct intuition is a source of data for philosophical reflection” (2009). Thus, intuitions are considered as evidence, or reasons that defend a belief.

Intuitionists believe that the mind can understand actions according to the appearances of things. Naïve realism is the doctrine that things are what they seem (Russell, *An Inquiry Into Meaning and Truth*). “We think that grass is green, the stones are hard, and that snow is cold. But physics assures us that the greenness of grass, the hardness of stones, and the coldness of snow are not the greenness, hardness, and coldness that we know in our own experience, but something very different. The observer, when he seems to himself to be observing a stone, is really, if physics is to be believed, observing the effects of the stone upon himself. Thus, science seems to be at war with itself: when it most means to be objective, it finds itself plunged into the subjectivity against its will. Naïve realism leads to physics, and physics, if true, shows that naïve realism is false. Therefore, naïve realism, if true, is false; therefore, it is false.” (pp. 14-15). Thus, in *Ideas and Opinions*, Albert Einstein explains that there is a key difference between the mode

---

<sup>6</sup> See Hale (2012) *The Faculty of Intuition* for a foundational account of the role of intuition.

of thought in Berkeley and Hume, which contrasts with the natural sciences. This states that the physical mode of thought is a reliable foundation for understanding how the senses cannot grasp things in the external world, but that the world contains things which have causal relations and reach our sense organs (Einstein, *Remarks on Bertrand Russell's Theory of Knowledge*, pp. 21). Berkeley's theory about vision explains that the object and act of vision separates the subject from the object, which makes the problem about ideas explaining they exist separate from the mind.

#### **Section 4: On Locke and the Coming to Use of Reason: A Brief Consideration of Hume's Skepticism**

For Locke, the coming to the use of reason cannot prove innate ideas since it would be a false supposition because there is no logic explaining that there are observed impressions. Locke thinks that exercising reason does not give a precise time that indicates the origin of innate ideas. He justifies this by an appeal to abstract ideas and the understanding of names, which are actions that prove there is a concomitant rational faculty in us. These abilities are not in children until they apply reason in speech, discourse, and conversation. It is from rational understanding that innate ideas exist, and not by an original nature in our being. Thus, pure thought must establish necessary definitions about contingent ideas in order to avoid the empirical defeat over the rationalists, which states that the physical mode of thought translates into a more practical knowledge. If there is a causal connection between these essential concepts, we must identify how they are not acquired by material given to the senses. According to Hume, the raw material given to the senses could lead us to belief and habit but not to knowledge of lawful relations. Einstein concurs with this statement and explains, "As a matter of fact, I am convinced that even much more is to be asserted: the concepts which arise in our thought and in our linguistic



expressions are all-when viewed logically-the free creations of thought which cannot inductively be gained from sense experience.” (Ibid., pp. 22). The relationship between the pre-established harmony and the free creation of thought depicts an objective ego that must transcend habits that combine concepts and conceptual relations (propositions) together. This will separate the world of sensory experience from the world of concepts and propositions. For example, number can be explained according to its principles such as a series. This is a self-created tool that simplifies the ordering of certain sensory experiences. However, this concept cannot come directly from sense experience (Ibid., pp. 22-23). Number supports the idea that a priori must be explained as an abstract conception that justifies the existence of complexity and understanding of principles.

### **Section 5: Explaining the Objects of Thought in Relation to the Properties**

Knowledge of a property such as blue signifies the real existence of the object. In the previous example, a wall that has been painted blue. This relation between observation and conception is the root of science. Prior to the idea that perception contains meaning, there is a space that is undetermined because the wall exists as a thing in the coordinate plane that must have a conception applied to it. After it is painted blue, there is a specific relation between its appearance and reality. In general, the physical properties of a thing signify what that thing is, but do not explain what it means. That is to say, how we describe its meaning is dependent on the subjective interpretation, which we may call intuitive. The origin of an intuitive preference is determined by internal forces that are responsible for the ideas that guide thought and action. Therefore, an intuition is a guiding principle for the change of a habit so that the observation matches what is right.

Religion is the mechanism of a group that shares common beliefs about the objects of reality. It motivates the intuition to determine the differences between forms and actual things.

Humanity exists as a collective mind that defines values on the grounds of logic, love, and change. Since logic is a free creation of the will, it is necessary to explain substance in terms of human psychology. This is a subjective phenomenon that can be pursued by intelligence, truth, and effort. Before Leibniz, Descartes thought that the mechanical nature of substance was the cornerstone of science and explained the motions of bodies according to their intrinsic parts. Both Leibniz and Descartes are supreme rationalists, and their methods of science must be considered in order to see how substances change from internal compositions into external realities. At the root of the dispute between philosophy and science is the conception of the immaterial soul. The rationalists believe that the soul exists as a separate entity from the interactions with the physical environment. They explain forms of arguments such as the *reductio ad absurdum* to justify that the world must be created by God or else it would be impossible that humans could exist. In other rationalists' philosophies, such as Kant, the existence of the soul must exist in order to explain how the *a priori* justifies the totality of objects. Otherwise, it would be difficult to show how the complexity of conceptions makes objective relations possible in the subjectivity of experience. In order to show how the mind moves from an internal projection of the phenomenon of science into the external appearance between the idea and conception, it is necessary to reflect on the structure of experience and remember that how we form beliefs is dependent on our intention to know a truth. If there is knowledge of the distinction between what we perceive and what we understand, then we make steps forward into science and discover new principles that guide our actions.

#### **Section 6: How the Forms of Intuition Manifest in Reality: On Bayesian Inference**

Hitherto, it is evident that an intuition is determined by the perception of a real object, which is denoted by a process of logic that classifies its existence in terms of a future change.

Since there are infinite varieties among the combinations of objects and perceptions, the self must be viewed as a composite substance that creates the plurality of existences according to empirical intuitions. Kant made the distinction between judgment and reason to show that a concept could only be scientific in itself and must be placed separate from how the mind produced the concept of the object in experiments or mathematics. A belief is an internal mechanism that causes the relation between an idea and an object to change. It seems that because external things are necessarily the objects of thought, the truths that exist are pre-established according to the intuition, which causes a collection of substances to form.

While self-reflection and recognition create logical definitions, science produces facts directly relevant to the behavior we try to predict (Ellenberg, *How Not to be Wrong, The Power of Mathematical Thinking*, 165). If something is described in terms of its property, there are barriers between cognition and efficient systems. "We have a very good mathematical model for the weather, which allows us at least to get better at short-range predictions when given access to more data, even if the inherent chaos of the system inevitably wins out." (Ibid., 165). Thus, reliable patterns belong to things that are external to us, so that it makes sense to believe that the structure of the world is based on a scientific system that shows us what will occur in the future based on what we know from the facts.

Consequently, the intuition is an action of the mind that understands science, but it is not the essence of science itself. In science, the posterior probabilities are determined by degrees of beliefs in the various theories.<sup>7</sup> The construction of evidence from the past relies on Bayesian inference, which relies on an old formula in probability called Bayes's Theorem. It shows that

---

<sup>7</sup> See Ellenberg (2015), *How Not to Be Wrong, The Power of Mathematical Thinking*, Are You There, God, It's Me, Bayesian Inference. The *prior* describes beliefs before we see the evidence, and the *posterior* describes our beliefs afterwards.

incontrovertible truths are certified by mathematical proof. Bayesian inference limits beliefs and causes us to know what they mean from a qualitative lens (Ibid., 180). In *Natural Theology; or Evidences of the Existence and Attributes of the Deity, Collected from the Appearances of Nature*, Paley explains, "There is a difference between touching a stone and a watch. While the stone might be there forever, the watch might have always been there. We can believe that the watch had a maker that must have existed at some time and some place, or an artificer who formed it for a purpose which we find it actually to answer, who comprehended its structure and designed its use." This is a *reductio ad unlikely* that states if there is no God, it is improbable that complexity, such as the evolution of human beings, is real. Thus, since we are complex and developed, it is unlikely there is no God. We can look at the argument in the opposite way, which states, if there is a God, it is probable that such complexity is real.

How we know what ideas mean is derived from the intuition faculty and its various kinds of abstract relations to material conditions. This is clear when we reflect on the inner contents of mind and observe that the materials of dreams and reality are different. The contents of each part of reality cause intuitions to manifest in certain forms that change our beliefs about experience. Descartes' reconstruction of philosophy showed that the extension of material things could be distinguished from immaterial substances. Therefore, it is clear that the mind is an intuitive faculty. But, a problem with an intuitive concept is that it cannot provide observable evidence because it only supposes that the facts meet the conditions. This separation between mind and actual truth is the origin of error between the subjective aspect of experience and objective truth. Consequently, the intuition is regarded as the faculty that infers truths from reason. An idea is separate from an object of the world. The objective ego is created through the intuitive concepts

that establish certainty. Thus, the essence of the intuition is to determine truths that explain why something exists independently from sense perception.

There is intuition of things external to us and also intuition of things internal to the mind. If God is an intuitive truth, then there must be abstract concepts that justify such existence. The rationalists consider a priori knowledge to be a collection of ideas that demonstrate proofs which show that reality contains properties that can be identified external to causal relationships. As a result, the particular existences of things that are denoted real are subject to critique since they require logical principles that determine concepts of substance and essence. A priori principles are invented by the human mind, which means that understanding their objective applications depends on principles that relate to things in themselves. Descartes did not think that it was necessary to be aware of the innate ideas. On the other hand, Locke appealed to experience to explain that complex ideas must be created by experiencing the certain parts of a substance. In this way, a substance that is imagined gives us the concept that can be applied to its name. For example, we know that the attributes of a horse will resemble a unicorn because they are the same kind of animal. Locke says, "We need not experience a unicorn to have an idea of it but must have experience of the constituent parts of that complex idea." This is the "historical, plain method" of knowing the mind and its contents. Thus, human knowledge is limited to the ideas we receive from sensation or reflecting on what passes in our minds. Moreover, the "mechanical philosophy" cannot show the "real essence" or nature of things.

Baxter (2012) explains that Hume's problem of identity refers to abstraction. For Hume, objects have inseparable natures that impress ideas upon the mind, which separates their logical

meaning into abstract concepts.<sup>8</sup> Similar to Peirce, Hume thinks that we cannot conceive of the impossible. Locke traditionally views innate ideas as things that all minds assent to from moral principles and rational truths. Since abstraction separates something mental from itself, it entails that the conception is distinct from itself. However, something cannot be different from itself, and thus it is inconceivable (Ibid.). For Hume, the identity is one thing that can be viewed as two distinct things. Thus, it is necessary to understand how intuitions change the identity of the self.

### **Section 7: Locke's Theory of Identity and Person: How Intuitions Change**

Locke explains that something must make the same person and claims that it is possible that the same substance is not always thinking in the same person. Also, different substances can be contained in the same consciousness and united into one person in a similar way that different bodies are united into one animal, whose identity is preserved in that change of substances by the unity of one continued life (Locke, *Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, Book 2, Chapter Twenty-Seven, Of Identity and Diversity). Therefore, the continuity of space and time contains elements in experience, such as the motion of bodies and changes in substances that illustrate how matter impresses effects on the senses, which cause ideas to form about the functions concerning material things. This leads to the notion that consciousness is created through the interaction between the self with belief, a series of processes that change the appearances of the intuitions. An intuition appears as a judgment of experience, which is observed to have unique consequences that manifest as certainty, ratiocination, and knowledge. Even if logic can prove that ends in reality are justified through objective principles, it is in the human condition to understand by means of abduction how the propositions are related by perception.

---

<sup>8</sup> See Baxter (2012), *Hume on Abstraction and Identity*, Oxford University Press. There is a difficulty concerning identity since there is not one source for ideas to enter the mind. Abstract thinking makes the nature of impressions inconceivable unless there are relations between unobservable items in the mind that are determined by separation.

Thus, Locke thinks that personal identity depends on consciousness only and may be related to one individual substance or continued in a succession of several substances. This statement explains that past actions can manifest in the present and future. As a result, it is apparently true that all adequate ideas must belong to a corporeal substance. That is to say, human beings are cognizant through the body and its intelligence, which is conceivable in chemical and physical processes. A conscious self can know meaning through intuition since it is a sufficient way of understanding what we cannot know in the present moment. For example, in deduction, the combination of two ideas will demonstrate the validity of a substance, such as the wax that changes from a solid state into a liquid state. The deduction cannot show if there is an essence in the wax that remains the same since its property contains a different nature in the past and present instances. When we apply this reasoning to human cognition, Locke explains, “But the question is, whether if the same substance which thinks be changed, it can be the same person; or remaining the same, it can be different persons.” (*Essay*, 267, 14.). From this view of the self, Locke supports Descartes’ idea that the mind is an immaterial substance that contains properties that are analogous to physical things. For instance, while the wax changes, the mind is cognizant of the transformation, and understands through reason, what occurs in the wax.

Descartes’ philosophy explains that the intuition is conceived through substance, which is the essence of the mind that connects the mind to the object. In the *Introduction to Discourse on Metaphysics, The Monadology*, Paul Janet provides an account of the Peripatetics’ interpretation of the theory of substantial forms. He explains that the changes in substances indicate different existences in terms of the individual entity and the motion of the parts. For instance, fire and water are different substances because of their color, elements, and sensible effects. Although both substances exist as independent things, they undergo states such as liquid, solid, and gas

that show their particular existences. This means that new forms imply new bodies. Thus, the substantial forms are primary entities that explain the differences in substances in reality (Janet, *Discourse on Metaphysics: The Monadology: Introduction*). Descartes separates those extended substances from thinking substances. Bodies signify particular forms of motion, divisibility, and rest. In the soul, things can be reduced to various forms of pleasure, pain, affirmation, reasoning, and will. Nature exists separate to the soul and manifests through the intuition. The independence of the soul is determined by the consciousness of its thinking. Thus, the identity of a substance is individual or a collection of things. In regard to human substances, there is both spiritual and corporeal substances. Locke believes that the personal identity is something that can be analyzed in terms of the identity of substances. In fact, he separates the identity from the substance. He says, “Personal identity is preserved in something else than identity of substance; as animal identity is preserved in identity of life, and not of substance.” (Ibid., 267). This preservation exists in consciousness, which is not a constant entity, but rather a continuous stream of ideas that manifest in the mind and create beliefs about particular material things and their relations.

If there are valid forms of substances that indicate particular truths such as “This is the deduction of a clear and distinct intuition” then there is a concept that justifies an impression, such as hot signifies a fire and water quenches thirst. Also, “This is a justified true belief that explains why two events are causally related to themselves.” For example, the purpose of sign A is to demonstrate how the conditions in sign B indicates the substance A, but the substance is only conceivable through motion. If A can be known without explaining B, then B must still exist because to eliminate B would be an error concerning a natural law. The intuitions are what necessarily follow from the causes since we cannot understand how the ideas are causally related unless we make any deduction. This principle remains unclear since the existences of the things



are reduced to efficient causes that abstract their characteristic natures and make us interpret the meaning of objects according to their possible mechanisms, which is subjectivity in esse. The sign is meant to act as a formal agent that causes the efficient condition to manifest, and lead to the final cause. However, the intuition changes this threefold relationship so that the person interprets the object and causes different signs to represent the meaning of the reality. This logic can be applied to the comparison between two different identities and must lead to alternative ways of viewing the self so that it is an objective ego that participates in language exchanges.

Hitherto, it is clear that the distinction between the identities of two different people is known in terms of personal identity and consciousness. Since the body and mind contain their separate functions, it is difficult to explain why thought necessarily belongs to one corporeal substance and is not produced in the mind of another person. That is to say, ideas signify a thinking substance, but do not indicate a corporeal substance unless through a reference. The immaterial substance is a being that is identified through the name of the individual, such as, 'Socrates', 'Nestor', and 'Thersites.' (*Essay*, 269, 16.). Since all three men are conscious of their actions, it is clear that they occupy their individual bodies and thus can be known by that name. For Locke, the personal identity is necessarily connected to the consciousness of the individual, but it remains possible that the thoughts of one man can exist in the thoughts of another through the association of ideas, beliefs, and effects of experience. Hence, substance exists in the mind, but it is not a pre-existent soul that precedes experience since concepts about the soul can only be generated through the construction of adequate concepts that make ideas true on the grounds of reality, which is through perception and interpretation. Locke's comments suggest that the conscious knowledge of past duration in consciousness references a source that does not necessarily know its past existence and can begin a new account from a new period to remain

there in time permanently. Locke's idea about pre-existence is that the soul must not need a consciousness to relate to this state because it is separate from the body.<sup>9</sup> For example, my personal identity is separate from Socrates, Nestor, and Thersites because I do not have their experience. Hence, the thinking substance stays the same while the body changes.

This shows that the nature of souls is separate from matter yet makes it not an absurd supposition to believe that I have the same soul as Socrates, Nestor, and Thersites even if our actions or consciousness are different. It is possible that I can conceive of myself as the same person while consciousness extends into actions for others that make our spirits uniform. But there is not a self even if the same spirit informs different agents about the contents in ideas. Locke's theory about identity explains that there are separate causes between names, ideas, and experiences. As a result, there are intuitive possibilities that develop from the relations between mind and matter.

### **Section 8: The Intuitive Method**

The intuitive method analyzes the linguistic forms of words in order to develop the parts of language that require a different level of analysis which cannot be understood by pure logic. This means that spiritual concepts can evolve in relation to objectivity. However, since they are known a priori, the grounds for knowledge are subjective and known independently from sense perception. The function of perception emerges through the mind's conceptions that are seen through the processes of experience, which must show why a priori confirms truths that appeal to ideas that indicate separate existences.

---

<sup>9</sup> See Locke, *Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, for the reasons how personal identity and consciousness can demonstrate the thoughts between two different people. He claims that one person cannot occupy the soul of another person because it is not conscious of its actions or thoughts.

Locke explained that infinity was the abstraction of a thing from its concept that could be enumerated by its properties. Thus, all perception is justified by ideas that relate to the subjective interpretations about substances. On the other hand, ethical propositions are produced by the relative contexts that bring them to ideal situations, such as the idea that ‘transcendence’ is a property of soul. “Cogito ergo sum” is the expression of a thinking substance, yet Descartes did not account for the reasons that there is a sufficient explanation for the transmigration of souls. Pythagoras used mathematics to explain that there were certain principles about mathematics that demonstrated the soul must have a particular shape that resembled the properties of geometric figures. Otherwise, how could it put deductive truths together to understand the principles that relate to the image of a triangle? Since the ancient Greeks, philosophers want to denote concepts and explain why they are utterly related to the properties of the thinking substance. Likewise, Plato thought that the principles of geometry were demonstrable by the existence of the soul, and as a rationalist, he validated the contents of reality by describing the rules of reasoning that were discovered by truths about memory.

The purpose of the intuitive method is to understand that intelligence must only be given through a pre-established harmony that makes thinking substances understand corporeal things. When reason cannot demonstrate why something is evident, the idea is confused and obscure, and therefore the mind refuses to change its contents from the intake of sensory stimuli which can change why the new truth is correct and replaces the old truth. In general, intuition is the agreement between two clear and distinct ideas or reconciling two confused and obscure ideas into their right form. If there is certain knowledge to abstract a corpuscle from its possible combination, then we have a new principle that shows how consciousness is responsible for the development of intuitive truth. The intuitive method takes a form that is inherently logical since

it is aware of the context that is given, but then changes the objective validities that manifest through internal dependences. In psychology, this is the origin of why our ideas make sense. That is, if something seems true, I can see that from the objects of my reflection. But, the truth about the forms is dependent on the interconnectedness of the ideas, which are independent from the corporeal substances. Even if I can discover that something is absolutely true, my concept is separate from its possible reality. A significant truth about reality is that there is sensation which determines how we understand the contents of a posteriori ideas. An experience of truth is the mutual agreement of a cognition. During this chance, the mind discovers a new reason to understand a future idea coming into existence. Therefore, the creation of logic determines a reality that appears infinite but whose substance, or totality, is produced by the inner contents of the mind.

## Bibliography

Baxter, Donald (2012). *Hume on Abstraction and Identity*. Oxford University Press.

Descartes, Rene (1641). *Meditations on First Philosophy*, The Philosophical Works of Descartes. Cambridge University Press.

Einstein, Albert (1954). *Ideas and Opinions*. New York: Three Rivers Press.

Hales, Steven (2012). *The Faculty of Intuition*. Analytic Philosophy Vol. 53 No. 2.

Kant, Immanuel (1781). *The Critique of Pure Reason*, New York: St. Martin's Press.

Leibniz, Gottfried (2005). *Discourse on Metaphysics: The Monadology*. Dover Publications Inc. Mineola: New York.

Leibniz, Gottfried (1951). *Theodicy: Essays on the Goodness of God and the Freedom of Man and the Origin of Evil*. Routledge & Kegan Paul Limited: London.

Locke, John (1689). *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, Barnes & Noble, Inc.

Van Fraassen, Bas (2019). *How Can We Understand Transcendence of the Ego?* Princeton University Press.