

Subjective Experience and It's Revelations.

(I call first intuition the immediate datum of my consciousness - as an intimate feeling unshakable by any possible doubt - which constitutes the undoubted witnessing of my own self. This datum may be only a feeling, and not an idea or a notion; these I call the secondary intuitions (see my marginal notes on Webb's H. Phil.)

Experience, the only criterium of truth; yet experience must be interpreted in order that we may grasp the true signification of the facts, which constitute the subject matter and the ground of experience. This may be only possible by the active intervention of the intelligence which operates according to the natural succession of the facts observed^(*). That is what we call (*la logique des faits*) and that is the very basis of any scientific method of investigation. (*La logique des faits*) which I may call (the pragmatic logic), differs not fundamentally or formally but only in its proceedings from the formal, deductive, rational, a priori, aristotelian system of logic, for it's being subjected to the facts themselves, allowing strictly their consideration in the course of their natural manifestation. The only rational principles the pragmatological logic is compelled to accept as axiomatic and transcendental truths^{as they are considered} are the principle of causality, the principle of contradiction, and the principle of the excluded middle etc. As everybody knows these principal axioms are common to both kind of logics.

But the greatest and the surest criterium is neither syllogism, nor the material object, but the witnessing of our conscience which is the first and the last term we start from and we come to, in all our discursive operations. What we call evidence is simply the witnessing of our conscience acknowledging a fact observed. No skepticism is possible on this subjective ground of observation unless we fall into the absurdity of denying our own self.

Yet evidence is neither truth nor reality from the philosophical point of view; it is only a given problem which begs a solution; for what we take as a fact at first sight may be an error of observation, and what we believe to be a reality may prove to be a mere illusion. The history of philosophy and psychology is the history of such errors and illusions illustrated by facts.

We must try first to discriminate between truth and Reality. The only way our inquisitive mind, being led universally accepted as the unshakable pillar of the logical reasoning, like the principle of causality, that the excluded middle etc.

Subjective Experience and It's Revelations.

I call first intuition the immediate datum of my consciousness - as an intimate feeling unshakable by any possible doubt - which constitutes the undoubted witnessing of my own self. This datum may be only a feeling, and not an idea or a notion; thus I call the second intuitions (see my marginal notes on Webb's H. Phil.

Experience, the only criterium of truth; yet experience must be interpreted in order that we may grasp the true signification of the facts, which constitute the subject matter and the ground of experience. This may be only possible by the active intervention of the intelligence which operates according to the natural succession of the facts observed^(*). That is what we call (*la logique des faits*) and that is the very basis of any scientific method of investigation. (*La logique des faits*) which I may call (the pragmatic logic), differs not fundamentally nor formally but only in its proceedings from the formal, deductive, rational, aprioric, aristotelian system of logic, for it's being subjected to the facts themselves following strictly their consideration in the course of their natural manifestation. The only rational principles the pragmatological logic is compelled to accept as axiomatic and transcendental truths^{as they are considered} are the principle of causality, the principle of contradiction, and the principle of the excluded middle, etc. As everybody knows these principal axioms are common to both kind of logics.

But the greatest and the surest criterium is neither syllogism, nor the materia fact, but the witnessing of our conscience which is the first and the last term we start from and we come to, in all our discursive operations. What we call evidence is simply the witnessing of our conscience acknowledging a fact observed. No skepticism is possible on this subjective ground of observation unless we fall in the absurdity of denying our own self.

Yet evidence is neither truth nor Reality from the philosophical point of view, it is only a given problem which begs a solution; for what we take as a truth at first sight may be an error of observation, and what we believe to be a reality may prove to be a mere illusion. The history of philosophy and psychology is the history of such errors and illusions illustrated by facts.

We must try first to discriminate between truth and Reality. The only^(*) our inquisitive mind, being led universally accepted as the unshakable pillar and excluded middle etc. the inextricable nexus of the phenomenal world by some general principle of the logical reasoning; like the principle of causality, that the

distinctive and essential characteristic of reality, of any reality, is to be existing independently, I mean to say out of our conscience, our knowledge or our ignorance of it does by no means affect it's being existing. This is the objective Reality, while subjective Reality depends absolutely on our being conscious of it's existence within our own mind. So the famous dictum (*esse est percipi*) formulated by Bishop Berkeley is only true for subjective realities and not for the objective ones.

The characteristic of truth is to be rational, I mean logic, but this ^{does} not require it's independent existence absolutely. All the mathematical truths are rational truths but not realities, because no one of them can be realized in the material world as it is theoretically stated and defined.

We must discriminate also between the intellectual or rational evidence and the psychic one. The rational evidence is a truth which stands by itself, without being in need of any logical proof and argument. All the analytical propositions of Kant and the aprioric truths are illustrations for rational evidence. Their essential characters are coherence, necessity, and generality. We must not confound the general definitions and the axioms with aprioric and rational truths. They are simply postulates for our intellectual convenience, only. (Poincaré pretends they are purely conventional)

The subjective evidence is the expression of the witnessing of our conscience without the shadow of the slightest doubt. Every thing in order to be accepted as a truth must rely upon such a subjective evidence. By consequence the ultimate criterion of truth is the subjective evidence as I have described it. The question of the taste of truth was - during the last half of the 19th century - the object of a memorable controversy, and the question was fully discussed between the most notable and genial thinkers, like Herbart, Mill, Spencer, and Whewell etc. ^{of that century}

things are objective things.
*) constituting • altogether a very complicated phenomenon, so difficult to be disentangled in order to determine positively their real causes or motives; we must have known before hand that what we call causes or motives or ~~real~~ natural laws are not included in the category of things which exist by themselves, in the external world, and apart of the phenomena. They are some parts of the phenomena which we try to analyze. By consequence in such a quality and from this point the

40
of them being unconscious and unknown to us. There is no need to say that under some peculiar conditions of social life which ^{may} give a different attitude of sentimentality to our relations with other people, changing our common character, (as it happens always in times of war), our passions are polarized and become much more vivid and conscious, and our observation and our judgment is deeply influenced by such an exceptional and emotional disposition of mind. This is the most unfavorable time and disposition for social studies. That is the reason why the French Revolution was so differently judged and considered by the leading historians of the time, ^{like Heinrich von Sybel and Michelet} and I suppose that the actual writers who have written the history of the mondial war ~~have~~ could never have been absolutely impartial in their considerations. The only reason of this is that our sentimentality is not yet quite settled for permitting us to make true observation and to draw out of it sound conclusions and to bear impartial judgments upon such considerable facts and events which have so deeply disturbed the peaceful life of the world altogether. Some body ought after a ~~some~~ generation or two re-write this history with a better disposition of mind, I expect.

In one word it is impossible to make quite an objective study of the politico-social facts, notwithstanding the reiterate recommendations of the leading sociologists and philosophers.

Why the great scientists are so much keenly interested to recommend us the objective method and to reject the subjective one.

The only reason of this is that the subjective observation is 1° susceptible of many errors and illusions. 2° that the subjective facts are not always common. 3° that they are not easily ascertainable by a common positive standard. ^{and measurable}

All these accusations are more or less true, but it does not logically follow that we must neglect such observations and such facts, which are revealed to us by our daily experiences even. It does not mean also that we must neglect altogether the study of such important facts, which in some extraordinary

32
conditions and circumstances reveals us some of the darkest corners of our unconscious self so accurately, so faithfully; when for instance our superficial, monotonous, easygoing and automatic life is fundamentally disturbed by a serious moral revolution, and gives us the most happy opportunity of experiencing some very deep and extraordinary emotions which helps us so much to discover and to know our own selves.

As to the errors of observation, it is very common; the history of Sciences is full of illustrations showing us how the greatest scientists even ~~he~~ could not help falling unto such errors when observing the simplest and the most evident physical facts; but errors may be corrected and rectified by a cross examination and by varying the form of experience as the scientist does always; so there is no reason to neglect the facts for that.

The most important condition required is - according to the advices and opinions of the philosophers and the sociologists - to secure the independence of the intelligence when proceeding to the methodical study of social facts, without being influenced by our sympathy or antipathy which quite certainly distort our judgment. It means to say that we must be good observers, honest thinkers and impartial judges in order to discover the historical truth through the study of the social facts which happened in the past time. The scientist - it is said - ought to be devoid of any sentimentality, and avoid any kind of emotion when studying social facts and phenomena, which are, in reality the most vivid expression of human emotions, and emotion is life. To confine the scientist task to a strict intellectual activity, is ~~not~~ only true - as a method - in mechanical, mathematical or physical phenomena, which have no connection whatever with human sentimentality or life. But when we wish to understand the real meaning of social phenomena which are - as I said - the most vivid and the most faithful expression of life of our predecessors, we must be able to grasp through the facts, the breath of life which animated them and which was the real source

of emotions and passions which produced such facts and phenomena. If we can not grasp the thrilling expression of life which is lying beneath the ruins and the legends we can never understand what was the kind of life whose manifold manifestations we are trying to study; and we can not understand the life and the emotions of some other people if we can not find the way of sympathizing with them. So sympathy is - according to my fruitfull experiences - the essential condition and the only short way of succeeding to understand the life which is the real subject of worth studying in sociology.

The classic philosophers and sociologists recommending strictly what they call the objective method say: Confine your attention and care to the mere facts, avoid any passion, any sympathy or antipathy, follow the object in it's manifestations through the time and space; etc.

I recommend much more emphatically the pragmatic method, viz: the objective method; but I say do proceed to the study of the facts, but study as an integral man, not as a thinking machine, study the ~~facts~~ social facts which are of quite a different nature in comparison to the so called natural ones (like geological or mechanical phenomena), try to sympathize with by getting the same emotions wherefrom all such event have sprung up, if not you will never be able to understand the very meaning of life and you will simply anatomize a dead body without being able to grasp the breath of life which once animated it.

The old alexandrian philosophers use to say: to know something is only possible by being identified with it. This opinion was found ridiculous by our modern thinkers who have very fiercely criticised it. But yet - I dare say - it contained and contains a great truth, and I am sure our contemporary thinkers have very badly misunderstood it. It would be certainly ridiculous for instance, to suppose that in order to know what an animal or something else is, we must be an animal or must be identified with the thing we want

to know, this is absurd, because a horse for instance can not know himself better than we can know him, and the inanimate things can certainly never have any knowledge. We must understand the true meaning of the celebrated old dictum otherwise. I suppose it means to say that unless we have experienced and felt the same feelings and state of mind we can not understand verily the others feelings and states of mind. Then if we interpret the meaning of the Dictum in this way there is no doubt that it expresses a great truth, and this truth is sympathy. To know something only intellectually is not a true knowledge. It is simply a knowledge of definition — if it is possible to say so! — Real knowledge consists in the personal experience of the fact. As a medical doctor I know — by definition only — what is a goutte and it's pains; but this is a kind of knowledge I have got in the book in the College and the greatest part of our knowledge is of the same kind, and most unfortunately we judge and act according such a false knowledge. But when a man even a physician becomes an arthritic and suffers of the same pains that his patients were suffering and complaining to him, then he gets — through his personal experience — the true knowledge about goutte, that is what I call sympathy, and without this important feeling we can not understand anything truly. that is the reason why in ancient times so many people have been martyred for their religion and belief, in the beginnings of the Christian era because anybody of those who were among the ruling class had not experienced that extraordinary state of mind which gave rise and form to what we call Christian Religion. (other examples are to be given).

You may easily understand of what I say so clearly that in the study of sociological facts particularly, I am radically opposed to what is called the objective method and the exclusively intellectual guidance. on the contrary I recommend the guidance of sincere emotions and sympathy. the great danger of this method may be the aberration of romanticism.

our imagination

What we call Romanticism is indeed the idealization of the now dead world of the past by rebuilding it anewⁱⁿ and insufflating our own soul for reviving it. This error, which is so common and so human, which gave rise to a system in fine arts, is certainly the greatest inconvenient to make a successful study in order to ~~grasp~~ grasp the historical truth, though it is so favorable for poetical fancy. It is quick naturally born of the exclusive activity of our imagination. What I recommend is not this. I recommend to every student of sociology to rely not only upon material documents in studying the so called facts; the real facts, the ever living facts are - as far as human beings and acts are concerned - the emotions, which have produced the religions and the arts and everything which has ever since contributed to the establishment of civilization in this world. So without neglecting the slightest, the most valueless material document for the study of social facts (because all these things symbolize some idea or sentiment or intention), I recommend I say - the most sympathetic attitude for studying the past, and this can only be possible by a deep emotion, something the same as the people we try to study their works and deeds have felt before; so we come to be really encadré, and perfectly adapted to feel actually as they had most probably felt in the past. This psychic and intimate experience which provides for us the exceptional chance and the most favorable opportunity to identify ourselves with others, is not something fanciful, the imagination having nothing to do with it; it is the surest standard the most certain Criterium of a true knowledge; for the truest knowledge is the very subjective one, which is the faithful expression of the witnessing of our Conscience, and there is no possibility to doubt of the veracity of our Conscience, unless we fall on a general Scepticism and nihilism denying anything without being able to prove by any means such an absurd assertion. All the philosophers pretend in a common accord that the immediate knowledge, is certain; and that all we know in a discursive way must rely ultimately

9
on subjective certitude or evidence, which means to say on the witnessing of our
Conscience. We can not go further. Subjective truths are - according to the statement
of Spencer - analytical; they can not be reduced to further simple elements.
For me and for everybody of you all a feeling or an emotion is the most
certain reality, and the reality of the matter in the outer world is a mere
shadow so soon vanishing under the light of critical analysis; while our
intimate feelings are not only irreducible, but unshakable by any kind of
doubt and they are indestructible even. A real poet - for instance - a poet
who was the faithful and eloquent interpreter of the deepest emotions of
the human soul, can very easily communicate me the very thrillings
which had inspired him an epigram, when I read some words of it on a
tomb stone even three thousands years after his death. Real human
emotion which is the true expression of life as art understands it, is
certainly a sacred fire which never dies out. Then if we wish to know
through our sociological inquiries and studies, what was the life of our
predecessors, how we can confine our views and studies to the inquiry
of the material documents, which are only the works of antiquity symbo-
lizing in some cristallized form the very passions which produced them.
And if we understand the very meaning and value of such documents,
how we can neglect the study of the everlasting soul of humanity thrill-
ling beneath the ruins of the old glorious cities, and written documents, or
institutions or works of art? How can we have the same feelings, which can
reveal to us the peculiar state of mind which was the unexhaustible source
of all these works of civilization, if we try to kill deliberately our passions
and emotions, forbidding the noblest human sentiment, sympathy, to ani-
mate our intelligence in the study of social facts which are in reality pure-
ly emotional events. Pure intelligence has no way, no capacity no power
to understand feelings. All our life is dominated by feelings, intelligence
being a simple light to clear up the way (as Bergson says), but the real

motive and motor power is not the intelligence but the emotions. We act according to our unconscious self, which does not conform absolutely to the actual conditions of our surroundings, but reacts all the time and this struggle between the past (I mean our accumulated emotions which constitute our unconscious self) and the present (which is the totality of the factors surrounding us and acting continually upon us) constitute the very meaning of life, which is a tragic activity. All the works of civilization Political and social institutions, artistic productions and our moral character and psychic temper, are altogether the result of this activity of life. True social scientist is the inquirer who can have an insight of this activity and goes - in it's investigations - so deep as to catch a glimpse of it's secret proceedings. We can not succeed and never succeed in getting unto touch with the reality of life, if we are easily satisfied with superficial study of the mere material document and their classification in the name and for the sake of a so called positive science. After all even we can ask with Prof. Huxley, is there any positive science?.. can we call by such a name our conjectures?..

(11)

Genrich Vou. 2. bel. (de la Rev. de la science)

The logical process of the inquiring intelligence organized and systematized, is what we call (method) in general.

The more we get into intimate touch with Nature pushed on by our inquisitive mind to inquire into the continual course of events all around us, we discover a regularity in the succession of phenomena, and we acquire the conviction that the world's activity is subjected to order, that there is nothing hazardous in it's manifestations. This conviction becomes a firm belief for those who discover a constant and uniform relation between two

(12)

(2) Knowledge.

What the word Knowledge means in it's broadest (psychological!) ~~and~~ and it's narrowest (scientific!) acceptance. the essential

(1) Introduction will come first and after the usual
Ch. I. (Discussion on methodology.)

The question: method. In general. In sociological inquiries. What is the distinctive character of the so called scientific method. Inductive and deductive methods both scientific, but each one of them appropriated to a special department of knowledge. Empiric ^{and rational} methods; ^{intuitive and} experimental methods. Is there any difference between the two? What is the distinctive character of the so called objective method? What is the subjective method. What is the scholastic method. Where lies the principal errors & aberration of this method, ^{carefully} which is the most characteristic peculiarity of the medieval ^{system of thinking?}

Let us determine and define clearly the meaning and the bearing of the principal technical terms we are compelled to use frequently in this discussion. There is no doubt that the ambiguity, or equivocal meaning of the technical terms capriciously or uncarefully used by the scientists and philosophers has not only been the real source of ^{everlasting} verbal controversies and useless ^{and tedious} discussions, but gave also birth to some fictive questions which have no standing ^{footing} on the real and solid ground of facts; and the neglect of a fair definition is at least the cause of unhappy (faehuses) misunderstandings.

18

between two parties.

gifted, the most wonderful and genial nation ever lived in the world.

The word (φαινεται) = (phanomai) where our technical term (phenomenal)

came from, means (appearance) in greek. So (the world of phenomena) means

(the world of appearances), and we use this expression still in that sense ^{it is the plural form of (*) phenomenon.}

only. But there is a ^{something} ~~very~~ remarkable ~~point~~ in the signification of this

word which ^{attracts and holds,} detects our attention; for every word is created by the impe-

rious necessity of ^{either} naming a thing / ^{percieved by the senses} or expressing an idea, ^{concieved by} born ~~in~~ the mind

~~of man.~~ On the other hand ~~nearly~~ there are ^{fully} In all civilized and ~~well~~ deve-

loped languages, ^{there are} quite a lot of words ^{of this kind} expressing some ^{definite} ideas ^{definitely} and yet

implying some other ^{ideas ones} ~~ones~~ ^{to them.} undissolubly correlated ~~with the first ones.~~

Let us consider ^{this statement illustrating it by} these very simple examples: When we say ^{for instance} (large), (beauti-

ful), (infinite), (sick) ^{(short), (heavy)} etc, we understand very clearly what ^{to these words} they mean; and

yet we can not ^{help} thinking, ~~of~~ at the same time, of (small), (ugly), (infinite),

(healthy) etc. ^{(long), (light)} Perhaps one of the main psychological reasons of this ~~fact~~

^{connotation} (named (connotation) ^(*)), in scientific terminology, is the relativity of human

(*) برعاشيه تعاليم اولونوب و معر نقل اولونوب مقدر . association و denotation و connotation با شايه ميلاک منطقيه بيان اينهمه اولونوب ملاحظات

Knowledge ~~in general~~, as I presume it. Well!.. the word (phenomenon) ^{to be} which is one of the most ^{valuable} ~~important~~ technical terms, in philosophy and science —

is one of these connotative terms; for when we think of appearance we catch a glimpse ^{of} Reality in mind anyhow; ^{the idea of a certain} ~~It~~ seems quite evident that the old ^{the first word carries into our mind the second one inevitably.} greek philosophers — who had been obliged to ^{invent} ~~write~~ and use deliberately this

word — were in the same state of mind. the history of ancient philosophy relates indeed — as a matter of fact — ~~how~~ ^{and why} some of those original and inquisitive thinkers ^{of the old, had} begun to suspect the witnessing of the ~~external~~ senses, and

how this suspicion — as a peculiar disposition of mind! — led them (by ^{undoubtedly!} ^{certainly!}) a logical necessity to ~~believe in the idea~~ that (behind the veil of the world ^{get the conviction}

of appearances — ~~as they~~ to use their proper metaphorical expression! — there must ^{then, to how they have drawn out of this conviction the inevitable logical consequence} be certainly a Reality; ^{and} that this ^{visible} world (as we perceive it so evidently ^{around and within ourselves})

subjected to an everlasting and continual ^{our} change, is nothing else and nothing more than a fantastic illusion. (*) ^{By consequence,} ~~And then and there~~ To discover ^{of the universe,}

that reality supposed to be hidden behind the Kaleidoscopic appearances) was

اسکی پوزیشنوں کو فکری ریپی لرم با سٹو ریٹن تاریخ فلسفہ فلک و لائٹلہ ایضاح ایڈیوب حاشیہ تطبیقہ اولونہ جعفر

It is possible and it is better to

We can reduce - for convenience - all the innumerable kinds of phenomena we observe around us and within us unto five or six general classes which we call (categories) in philosophical language. (* مقولات تمیزینک، اربطوت طرفینہ وضع اولیٰ و ثانیہ ایسی)
و معنای حاشیہ در بیان اول و دوم .

Of kind and of undubitably convincing evidence,

thus for instance:

Space and time. Matter and energy and motion.

and then mind. (Materialist do not include mind as a distinct category because they deny it's independence. they consider the soul or mind of man which is ~~an~~ ~~dead~~ phenomena as the highest known form of energy and believe it is the result of the activity of the nervous system, so they believe it to be a functional phenomena absolutely inseparable from the nervous tissue which gives birth to it by it's mere functionment. This is one of the most seriously and vehemently debated theory among the philosophers and scientists as well. Read the letters of Sir Oliver Lodge, and the letter of Sir Keith in answer to him very recently printed in the No. . this two letters are the best possible and abstract exposition of the unconciliable views and opinions of the two principal schools. Spiritualism and naturalism.

2015! It seems that these categories are no more reductible to each other. An the most remarkable point here is that we can not think of any one without being compelled by a logical necessity to accept as a reality the preexistence of the space (in scientific language to postulate the Space!) Any effort of imagination - says the illustrious English philosopher ^{we say} H. Spencer) we can not annihilate the space even in mind.) Yet we conceive as a limitless absolute emptiness capable of measurement in three dimensions though we have never seen or realized the absolutely empty space. This is perhaps because we can by abstraction ~~and~~ annihilate matter and movement in our imagination and may conceive the space absolutely empty. The study of the real nature of space and time was the task of the metaphysicians. But the modern philosopher-mathematicians have done better in this respect. The original theories of the illustrious Prof. Einstein has totally revolutionized our old conceptions of time & space.

of the ~~world~~ Universe.

and indiscriminately

That is what we call (Nature) also; but this word suggests to the mind some ideas and convictions which are — for many serious reasons ~~respected~~ ^{which I will explain very soon —} repudiated systematically by the scientists ^{and banished} from the catechism of positive knowledge with contempt. It seems that the majority of men deprived ^{of human} ~~of any~~ scientific training, came by a long use ^{to mistake the very meaning of this word, and} to conceive nature as an almighty personality controlling the Universe ^{from} outside of it. The common ^{& mistaken} acceptance and conception of ~~the~~ ^{this} word proves fairly well that unscientific man ^{has} ~~has~~ ascribed to Nature, (after having personified it according to his own pattern and nature!) some of ~~the~~ the human powers and attributions, like, will, intention, love or contempt etc. When we say for instance: (Our benevolent mother-Nature), or (Nature revenges every misconduct in matters of ^{provides us with every thing we need for living} health) etc, it is obvious that we confound the human nature with the Universe (simply because they are bearing the same and one name!) and then we ascribe to the universe, so wrongly conceived, and represented, ^{something} our own will sentiments and intentions.

So in the first instance Nature is used as synonymous with Providence. In the second it is conceived as a severe judge or schoolmaster.

~~This very recurrent and persistent misconception is one of the most remarkable ^{and common} mistakes ^{from} which humanity has not yet completely rid itself. It is the result of a disposition of mind, even a persistent tendency so natural for unlearned man that is what we call in scientific language (anthropomorphism); this ^{compound} technical term is also formed (in the last century) by two greek words (anthropos = man) and (morfee = form), which is used to mean: (something conceived in human form).~~

^{error of}
 This ^{is a} very recurrent and persistent misconception. It is the result of a fallacious judgment based on the ground of a false comparison, between the proceedings of the Universal Nature and the very peculiar motives and ways of the human nature, as I have just noticed the ^{fact, at the end of the preceding paragraph.} ^{which is the characteristic way of} ^{It is evident that the metaphorical way of speaking (the poetical style) plays a great role here.} this remarkable and quite peculiar disposition of mind to estimate everything ^{according} (to our own pattern and measure is so deeprooted in our subjective being, ^{or} ~~our~~ unconscious ~~being~~ self,) that it is — I venture to say! — almost a natural tendency. This is what we call in our ^{philosophical} technical language (Anthropomorphism); which is again ^{another} a compound technical term (very recently

this manner of speaking is the preferred style in art, and it is allowed, nay it is required from the poet (who is an artist using as the only means of expression of his emotions, the words of his language) in a figurative *tourment d'idée*. Animisme though scientifically wrong is the spirit of art and the real source of metaphors and simile and other figures which an artist-poet is so much in need of, in order to give a vivid and coloured form to the expression of his emotions. The poet ascribes his own sentiments and states of mind to the surrounding world and describes not the things in themselves but his proper emotions thus reflected outside and around him in the world. The most illiterate and common man uses to do so, for every man is more or less a poet, because the emotivity which is the primary nature of man and very much prior to his rationality is a common gift ~~to~~ ^{to} mankind. In his every day speech the illiterate man feels and thinks and speaks ~~practically~~ ^{practically} I mean in a figurative way making admirable metaphors, and ascribing or reflecting to the inanimate and absolutely insensible things his own emotions and sentimentality. Such beautiful poetical expressions as (weeping willow) ~~and~~ (dormant waters) or (laughing stream) (melancholic moonlight) and thousand other of the same kind attesting the veracity of what I say, are not the work of a scientific imagination.

coined) being formed of two greek words: (Anthropus = man) and (morfee = form)
It is used to mean (the tendency to concieve every thing in human form or according to human Nature.)

Among the capital errors and misjudgments recorded by the history of our mental evolution and intellectual progress, (anthropomorfism) is justly considered ^{to be} the most serious and dangerous one for science. It is not only the ^{trifling} understanding.

unexhaustible source of many other unscientific misconceptions, but it is the denial of science; ^{in its real and modern acceptation.} ^{its viewpoint,} ⁱⁿ its very spirit, method and aim. And yet this men-

tal or temperamental infirmity ^{so akin to our human Nature,} was the dominant scientific spirit of the ^{on this subject when I shall open a discussion on the scholastic method.} times. The ^{some} ^{I shall give full information to} ^{successful} ^{to explain} ^{the facts in} ^{some} ^{way.} medieval schoolmen, ~~who~~ were always happy to ~~find~~ out of their marvellous

~~anyhow.~~ they were satisfied to find, had near at hand, imagination, ^{and satisfactory} an easy solution for ~~any~~ ^{every} perplexing question, simply, by ~~fol-~~

~~lowing the anthropomorphic way of interpreting the events and things, from the~~ ^{mere} anthropomorphic point of view. [thus for instance, when the illustrious ita-

lian experimentalist discovered the remarkable fact that ^{revealed the atmospheric pressure and it's possible} the column of mercury quantitative determination in comparison with the height of the ~~the~~ column of mercury in a tube of glass filled up with mercury and inverted in a bowl full of the same liquid, ^{ما يجره او رزق ذكرا و انثى و غير ذلك}]

but a work of the common man's imagination. the dialect of the american indians is richer in this respect than the ^{language used as a means of expression} ~~style~~ of the average civilized poet.

The man of science may be accidentally gifted with the highest degree of poetical imagination and creative emotion, he may occasionally write poetries as well.

There are a good many examples of such astonishing capacities given to one man.

But the creative imagination which we may call strictly scientific, is quite different in nature and disposition from the creative imagination of a poet.

So the scientist - being even a poet - must not indulge, when speaking on scientific matters, in poetical style. The fundamental qualities and conditions required for a true scientific speech are precision, nettely, and to banish abso-

lutely the metaphorical, parabolical and - in one word - the figurative way of

speaking. ^{great men of science} ~~Man~~ like Helmholtz, Tyndall, Ansdley, would never use such phrases as these:

Had their peculiar medical treatment of a special disease proved to be inefficacious and the sick ~~person~~^{man} recovered his health again, (simply perhaps because he had stoped using their medicine), the medical doctors of the time used to explain this marvellous fact simply by ascribing to the Providencial Nature a healing virtue, ~~without using any medicine~~; and they were very fond of expressing such interpretations in a ^{as a solemn dictum} ~~solemn~~ formula) as this: (Vis medicatrix Naturæ!)

Were they confronted with ^{discovering and detecting} the difficulty of an invisible cause, they used

1. personify it in the form of an entity (تصنیف و تزیین entitas, in ^{عربی}) to baptise it
 with a special name and then to explain the fact in question by ascribing
 to such an entity (in reality a mere problematic cause) a mysterious virtue
 capable of producing such a ^{an effect} fact. Thus the so called scientific explanation
 and the solution of a question consisted in moving in ~~such~~ a vicious circle:
 the fire had a ~~specific~~ specific virtue capable of creating the sensation of
 heat from a far in our body; the rose had a similar specific virtue of
 producing in our olfactive organ the sensation of a ^{peculiar fragrance} ~~specific~~ odour at a
 certain distance; while the opium had a dormitive virtue and the
 coffee an ^{exciting} ~~exciting~~ and awakening one. etc. and so on'. (مولیر بهائیه ایلی بوراده ذکر)
 ایویوب بو شیدله ناصلا شمه ایی دیکی قیسه جمللا تیله جوم. نو لدر بودا هیا. استهزا سیلا قیسه دورا بنه و حق استقال اولوی اولر و ایی اباتا شید. کزلک صبر

The experimental method of inquiry and the pragmatistical logic, which

(James Watt) حیوانش مکنه ایله نه بیله جتی دوو تاریخه اطلاتیقی زمانه. (او حلاله نه ایله ایله نه جکک)؛ سؤالنه ویردیکی جواباره نه قدر استقال اولوی اولر و ایی اباتا شید. کزلک صبر
 is the inseparable spirit and regulating principle of this method, is the only
 (دیمی. by bottled sunbeams)

~~light~~ searchlight to lead us in the right way of thinking for the true interpre-
 tation of events and things; I will deal with the question of scientific method in

a special chapter very soon, and with due consideration to it's capital im-
 portance. For the moment it is worth while to make this remark, that

۱۲۰
 قر

even in our own times some of the most respectable authorities in positive and experimental sciences seem — according their interpreting some natural facts — to have not yet altogether got rid of the mediæval mentality which is the proper object of our discussion now.

Let us ~~now~~ take some examples from the best scientific authorities:

Prof. Weisman, the celebrated author ^{of the epoch-making book} on (Heredity), when ^{discussing} ~~inquiring~~ in a special chapter of his epoch-making book about the causes of longevity of the birds says in substance:

The birds ^{are oviparous animals, (they} lay down eggs); ~~that~~ it means that the first period of their life is extra-uterine (out of womb!) the eggs are expounded to the influence of many destructive ^{natural agents} causes and ^{or destroy} factors like extreme heat and cold, or enemies who eat them, and to some accidents, as to fall down of the nest in a stormy wether etc... by consequence — he says:— Nature has gifted them with longevity, otherwise ~~that~~ this family of vertebrated animal would be destroyed.

This opinion given in answer to the question concerning the longevity of the birds, is obviously antiscientific one. Prof. Weisman seems to have viewed and considered

the problem of the longevity observed in the birds - with the eyes and the mentality of a theologian and not as a real scientist; for what we can clearly understand of his opinion is that Nature had in view to favour and protect as long as possible the life of this kind of animals, because they ~~are~~ were - I do not know precisely why? - created by the same Nature to preserve their posterity by laying down eggs and the eggs are expounded to many dangers.

Nature then is infinitely intelligent a providence and has a particular care for birds, Well this is a fair illustration of final cause, ^{which science} ought to banish from it's program before anything else and leave the care of inquiring about to the theologian.

This opinion is utterly unscientific for another reason also, and the reason is that not only give a solution ~~to~~ for the problem of (the longevity of the birds) which remains in the same mysterious position as before, but gives birth to another question, (a false and factitious one!) much more inextricable a riddle than itself.

It is this: (Why the providential Nature has such a notable preference for the life of birds only?). True science properly so called can not pay any attention

The logical fallacy which attracts the attention of the
cause (longevity) of the fact (survival) is ~~that~~ that the apparent
cause (longevity) is taken as a final cause, the primary and efficient cause being the
(Providence - Nature).

to such sophistical questions because it can not accept ~~the~~ intelligence and intentions ^{and acknowledge the idea of a nature gifted with}

Now the opinion of Prof. Weisman as mentioned above might have been more or less acceptable one if it was given as a plausible answer to the supposed question: (What is the reason of the survival of the birds though they are oviparous and their eggs are expounded to many dangers, they ought to be extinguished long since?)

then he could reasonably answer: (longevity and fecundity), and this answer would be absolutely devoid of the slightest bias of anthropomorphism and final cause. (^{حاشیہ اولیٰ قیصر} ^{بیانات عالمگیری کتابہ کریمہ} ^{مقالہ کتبہ جلد})

I do not want to give you more examples to illustrate the same kind of fallacious judgments, I could pick up a lot, chosen in the best scientific books, and I would be compelled to repeat ~~and~~ and to oppose the same critical opinion to each one of them. I need only recommend eagerly to the students of science to be very careful ^{for} avoiding any form of poetical or figurative style in scientific matters to be explained or discussed lest they ~~be~~ fall unconsciously to anthropomorphism.

(^{حاشیہ دوم حکمی، لکھنؤ، تیندال میل سینٹر} ^{بوضوح بہ وقتی ابدیہ درہ نزلہ جلد})

2012

90 ^{harg.} the universal fact of primary evidence ^{we} everybody can observe at once in the ^{universe} world is ~~strictly~~ the everlasting change in everything and in every respect. Within ourselves and without, there is nothing immutable in existence. Life also ^{consists in a ceaseless change, it} is a double process of assimilation and desassimilation of matter ^{with} ~~and~~ transformation and dissipation of energy going on at the same time altogether, within the limits of a ^{remarkable} pulsating harmony. It seems that life could not be possible without ~~change~~. Consciousness is nothing else ^{than} the perception of change as no ^{biologist} philosopher or ^{to day} psychologist can deny it. We can not see, ^{rather} ~~can never~~ ^{conceive} even an end to this universal, continuous and everlasting process of modifications.

This ~~is~~ general fact of primary evidence so easily observable was the starting point of all the old greek philosophers ^{in their different ways of} ~~for deep~~ speculations. The first ~~even the~~ idea that this fact had suggested them was the idea of an external Being. I mean to say: the idea of (some thing) which ~~must~~ is existing independently in the world outside ~~absolutely~~ unsubjected to our will. For it is utterly impossible to conceive any kind of change in nothingness. If there is a change, there must be absolutely something which is changing. ^{almost the first principle of belief} So this is the essential ~~and basal~~ ^{kind of} idea upon which all scientific inquiries are based. the observed universal change ^{matter of} observed as a fact of primary evidence is the

37 Paragraph 4. Ch. 1.

certainly

The most evident and universal fact observed in the World, is the ~~continual~~ ^{everlasting and uninterrupted} ~~change~~ ^{change} in every thing, as in our body also. Our life is ~~an~~ ^{a continuous} ~~uninterrupted~~ ^{change} ~~uninter-~~ ^{interrupted} ~~rupted~~, ^{apparently by ~~fact~~} which is the most important and mysterious ^{change} ~~change~~ ^{continually} to change as all other ~~process of change~~ ^{material bodies,} ~~eternal change~~ ^{eternally} ~~immutable~~ (we can ever observe. Yet there is nothing in existence. It seems that life could not be possible without change. The fact is so much well known and universally accepted as a primary evidence that it would be useless and tedious to insist upon the subject for more details.

(2) ^{Paragr.} the most evident and universal fact observed in the world is, certainly the everlasting change in every thing and in every respect. Within ourselves and without. [Our life, which consists - according to it's apparent physical conditions - in a double process of assimilation and desassimilation of matter and energy, so strictly and intimately is connected with the middle we live in - is nothing else than a process of a ~~very complicate and~~ continual change and a very complicate one, which oscillates within the limits of a certain pulsating harmony, if I may be allowed to say so. Every organic particle included in the constitution of our body is subjected

→ most convincing prove of the ^{outer} world existing ^{all} from eternity independently outside of our conscience, and uninfuenced by our own will, (*)

118

It is true to say that since the beginning of philosophical speculations amongst men many thinkers of the first rank^(*), starting from the same evidence have found some serious reasons leading them in a logical way to the denial of the reality of the ^{outer} world, but ~~no~~ no one single man of positive science, could ever suspect the reality of the Universe; the astronomer who is observing the evolution ~~and~~ of the celestial bodies and calculating with the utmost precision their motion, their weight their place in a given moment in the space; the chemist operating with the elements of matter following them in all their compositions and decompositions foretelling mathematically the result of such operations; the biologist preparing cultures with the microbes and healing many diseases, acquire at the same time the firm conviction that they are not operating in a world of illusion.

(*) Because they ^{have always} forget ^{to} take ^{into} account of the important fact that the changes of the world and the resulting phenomena have nothing to do with our own will. We can not at random modify our sensations. The modern idealists relying upon the results of analytical psychology pretend that our sensation of things depend strictly on the anatomical configuration of our sense organs and by consequence an insect and a man ^{can never} ~~ought~~ to see the same object in the same way and form. This assertion is quite true it can not constitute a valuable logical argument against the reality of the things outside; it proves only that our knowledge is relative and not adequate to the reality of things, that we can know the things only as they appear ~~to~~ to our senses viz: as they are given in perception and not as they are in Reality. There is no logical way in all this leading to the denial of Reality.

38
to the same continuous change individually, and by his own activity cooperating for the maintenance of the general ~~and~~ harmonious activity we call life. Life then is not an invisible intruder, a mysterious principle coming from outside to get into the economy of the body in order to organize and regulate the pulsative harmony of biological activities; it is that harmony itself always vacillating between two extreme limits until the ^{general} equilibrium is disturbed and broken down. That is what we call death, which seem to be the sudden interruption of life, and rather something as a terrible and very mysterious agent stopping the working machinery of the body.

عنه من غير ان يكون له وجود مستقل

This is another example of anthropomorphic misconception, and perhaps the most persisting of all other errors of the same category. It seems that long before the down fall of the human civilization, we have personified life and death as the two principal extra-phenomenal agents interfering with some particular ^{facts} phenomena we call organic;

It must be remarked here that the question of whether there is an independent reality behind the ^{ever} changing appearances of sensible things or not is a purely metaphysical problem and not at all a scientific question; ~~and the~~ ^{such} metaphysical problems have no ^{direct} concern with science; for science operates with the things, ~~facts~~ and events ^{and to begin with - as a matter of fact.} of the world as it is given us to observe ^{them} (1). There is not the slightest shadow of doubt that the ~~sensible~~ ^{world} ever present phenomenal world, ^{accessible to our senses} is far from being an illusion. A man of science may be ^{according to} his personal philosophical views, an idealist or a spiritualist, ^{(*) Sir J. Lodge, Hammarion Sir W. Crooks etc.} but when in ^{acknowledge} ^{within} ~~inquiring~~ the proper field of science in his laboratory, he feels obliged to accept and consider ^{matter of} the ~~facts~~ he is dealing with as the only reality it is given to him to observe, to know and to handle in his experiences. The belief that the sensual world is an illusion is utterly incompatible with the very spirit of science. Whatever may be the ultimate philosophical opinions or religious beliefs of a scientist as a man, there is no doubt that science itself, is based on the realistic and pragmatistic ground of conviction, that there are tangible things existing

outside of our conscience quite independent ^{from} ~~on~~ our own will or imagination.

This is the essential important idea which our observation suggests certainly to our mind when we look around us unto the world. But as soon as we inquire about the ^{successive} change ^{go on} following the course of events, we observe ^{first} and ^{then} we discover also an order in the ~~regular~~ ^{a regularity} succession of the facts and events. Later on we discover the same kind of regularity in the correlations of the phenomena as well.

There is no need to say here, that the observation of order and regularity in the course of ^{natural phenomena} ~~events~~ is an idea which can be justly considered as one of our primary acquisitions in true knowledge. ~~There is~~ no doubt that the ^{primitive} man ought to have observed ^{such} an order in the regular succession of the day and night, and the returning ^{of the} seasons more or less ~~regularly~~ ^{surely if not quite} ~~regularly~~ ^{punctually,} in a time he was very probably deprived of the faculty of speech; there is no doubt ^{also} that later on he ^{has been} ~~was~~ interested ⁱⁿ observing the ^{amazing} ~~dazzling~~ Panorama of the ^{wonderful} Skies and discovered the same regularity in the changing positions of the ^{moving} stars, many thousands years before any idea of science and

any vestige of civilization was possible. In reality science and civilization ~~were~~ the result of such observations. We know fairly well now that it was a question of life-interest for our primitive ancestors to make such observations and to take notice of such orders and regularities in the natural course of daily events; and we are continuing to make observations in the same way, but ~~aided~~ ^{1° some} helped by very ^{sensible apparatus so} ingeniously adapted to the minute observation of a particular class of facts, like microscope, telescope, spectroscope, and many other ... scopes etc. 2° Some of precision like thermometer, barometre galvanometer etc. then testing all our observations by variable experiences and cross examinations in our laboratories, recording the ascertained facts, for drawing out of them the most plausible signification revealed by the facts so meticulously subjected to experience

duely organized and conducted.

and their fixed correlations (viz: the natural laws!)

All the observed facts ^{weighed} ascertained by ^{measured,} experience, recorded and classified according to certain categories of phenomena ^{such a careful and methodic} (like ^{under such headings as} physical, chemical, biological, astronomical etc.) constitute the object of science generally speaking, and our acquisition in positive and true knowledge.

substance in

I must sum up what I have stated in the previous pages and to recall in mind some capital points of importance I must repeat:

1^o That the observation of the Universal change as the most ^{idea} evident fact striking our senses suggests ~~to~~ to the mind of the observer the ^{idea} ~~inte~~ ~~pendent~~ existence of some Reality existing quite independently outside in the world.

2^o The observation of some regularity in the successive course of phenomena ^{occasioned} suggests the ^{firm conviction in our mind} ~~idea~~ that the change is occurring according to an immutable order and not capriciously; that this tremendous change does not mean anarchy or chaos.

Now these two essential ideas ^{relying upon} animated by a firm conviction constitute the two pillars of the real scientific creed. I dare say that the progress of science in every ground of inquiry ^{and in every direction} has but ascertained this creed and no one ^{fact} exceptional could be detected until now capable of throwing the slightest shadow of doubt upon this ^{scientific belief.} ~~firm conviction~~. Every man of science is led on his way of discoveries by the light of this ~~conviction~~ ^{scientific conviction} and

I call it a belief, for it is ~~an~~ an essential and ultimate conviction at the same time, and because it is absolutely impossible for us to know certainly if this order and harmony will last eternally, as it is quite impossible to prove by any means the contrary. This belief is the result of a universal induction.

43
every new discovery brings a new prove of it's truth. This is the goal towards which ~~scientist~~ the scientist is tending through his inquiries.

Now it is well understood that science is the methodical study of all kind of phenomena and their correlations. ^{it means to say the things and the laws} As soon as a ~~constant~~ ^{uniform} and immutable correlation is discovered between two categories of facts and formulated mathematically, a natural law is discovered. So what we call ^a law is not a thing properly so called, nor something ^{existing outside as a palpable matter somewhere in the outer world} immaterial ^{as a} spiritual (being) regulating from an extraphenomenal sphere the general or particular course of the world's events. It is neither a force ^{call a} nor what we call a cause producing a change in the course of ^{the} phenomena. It is not even a principle. It is simply a ^{uniform and constant} correlation between two categories of phenomena only, ^{as I have defined it before.} but ~~it is a constant and uniform relation.~~

I will give a precise definition of all the technical terms I am compelled to use here (as principle and the like) as soon as I shall open a short discussion on causality; now I must resume my considerations on the notion of (law).

The most important idea to bear in mind side by side with the notion of law is

43

^{example of an}
^{natural}
that there is no absolute law in the world. Every law discovered by men of science is conditioned by some specific circumstances. Every law is relative, for it is the expression of a relation itself. Let us take some examples to illustrate and to explain fairly the meaning of these terms:

The propagation of light is an evident fact, a phenomenon, and a universal one. The special science ^{which deals specially with the study of this class of phenomena} ~~called~~ (physics), states

The laws of oscillation of the pendulum are true absolutely true for an ideal immaterial pendulum; but such a thing is ^{absolutely} impossible to be realized in fact.

The law of the transformation of energy is never totally realized in its practical applications because a considerable amount of heat is absorbed by the machine itself, and ^{through} ^{conductibility of the} ^{which absorbs and transmits} ~~is~~ a wasted also by radiation in the surrounding atmosphere. Even the Sun, which is for our certain quantity of heat all around. earth the real source of light heat and life is in the same case. Of the uncommensurable

of energy which radiates continually from that source ^{in the form of} ~~as~~ heat, light, chemical rays etc, the $\frac{3}{1000000}$ only is intercepted and absorbed by the earth and other planets of the solar system and the remaining part, ^{it which is an} ~~the~~ enormous ^{quantity} part of it is practically lost for ever in the cosmic ether by radiation. That is what the scientist in their own language call (dissipation of energy). [It is worth ~~it~~ while to remark the fact that there is no possibility, at all for us to detect and to concentrate the dissipated energy for further use. And yet we believe in the perfect accuracy of the mathematical formula which is the symbolical expression of a law. Why? Because we think that if it was possible to detect, to take account and ^{measure} ~~calculate~~ the ~~an~~ quantity of energy ~~lost~~ waisted by friction, radiation, dissipation etc, the amount of ^{power} ~~energy~~ lost, and the quantity actually utilised would certainly be equal to the units of calories disposed of. This is quite true but theoretically and mathematically true only. In practice it is not only unrealized, but it's full realization is quite impossible for the reasons explained some lines before. Then an abstract law capable of being expressed in a mathematical formula, is an

Biological morphological or —generally speaking— all organic laws are concrete ones and not abstract; for they are fully realized in facts; rather they are the result of induction from some observed facts really existing. As for instance when we say (all the mammals are viviparous, four legged and vertebrate animals) we formulate a law which expresses a general and constant similitude between some of essential organs duly observed in a ~~great~~ multitude of animals possessing them in common whatever may be their distinctive individual characteristics.

45 a French philosopher was quite right when he said: (une loi, est une courbe mal définie.

(Ideal). (*) We can approach this goal but never attain it; as in the case of the law of transformation of energy for instance, we can by more or less perfecting our machines, prevent as much as possible the loss of heat and economise some more energy, but we have no ^{prospect of} hope at all to transform all of ~~them~~ ^{the heat} unto motion etc.

There are some other ^{biological, morphological or generally speaking} natural laws ^{organic} which are not abstract but concrete ~~fully realized in facts~~. All the biological laws are of this category. As for

instance when we say: (All the mammals are viviparus, four legged and vertebrate animals) we formulate a law which ^{expresses} ~~acknowledges~~ a general and constant ^{essential} ~~similitude~~ ^{correlation} between all the individual animals possessing ^{some particular} ~~such essential qua-~~ ^{ties} in common whatever may be the classe ~~or~~ ^{and} order ~~of~~ family they belong to. It seems ^{after observation ^{a little} and reflexion} quite reasonable and ~~necessary~~ natural that there must be

some ^{natural} ~~necessary~~ correlation between the mammals, the womb ^{of an animal for instance.} and the vertebrae, and ~~and~~ But we do not know yet what is the relation of the vertebrae or the ^{four} cavities of a perfect ~~even the four cavities of the heart~~ ^{to the mammals} ~~or such animals~~ representing the highest degree of anatomical evolution. (*) But all these distinctive conditions which are

(*) For it would be absurd to think of mammals for birds which lay eggs; etc.

the common characteristics belonging to a certain number of animals and giving expression to the anatomical ~~law~~ law above mentioned is something concrete, palpable; you can see and realize it in every individual representing included in the groups of such animals.

So this kind of laws are not like the abstract mathematical ones. They are the ^{more or less} general ^{summing up} expression ^{formula} of some ~~one~~ characteristic organs seen in common in group of ~~many~~ individuals; such laws are the result of induction viz: of generalisation from ^{the observed} particular facts really existing; while abstract laws are the mathematical expression of mere ^{immaterial which are} relations. That is perhaps the reason why a single exception may invalidate a concrete law and prove it to be false; as we have many examples of the case in the history of natural sciences.

The concrete laws are not rational but experimental

47 The subject-matter of science is the phenomena of the world, considered as a matter of fact only, and nothing else. So ~~the~~ science is the pragmatic study of whatever happens in the world, in view of deriving a benefit for human prosperity and comfort.

What we call scientific method is a process of inquiring into the facts and events (the phenomena) of the world without leaving the firm ground of observation and experience. There are some important and essential conditions to be absolutely fulfilled and strictly respected in order to succeed in exploring something on this firm ground of inquiry. is to follow as far as possible the succession of the facts in ^{the} time and their ~~and their~~ correlation ⁱⁿ the space until a significative fact is found to explain rationally the facts actually under consideration as the problem to be solved.

Another ^{essential} condition not less important than the first just above mentioned is to try to explain the actual fact under consideration by some preceding ^{phenomena} facts and other correlatives ones, withough being obliged to refer and call on ^{to} some occult ^{power} ~~factors~~, ~~or~~ presupposed, imaginary factors which can never be detected by observation and discovered by experience in the whole series of linked facts which constitute the subject ^{matter} of science.

this pages thrilling with emotions
are something as the fallen leaves
of a fully grown up life.

dear reader unknown to me ^{only} it's pages the most striking and significant facts which
I had ~~the except~~ almost the exceptional chance to observe
I am submitting ^{this book} these pages to your impartial and disinterested judgment as a matter
of fact ^{of fact} I have written them down ^{it} during my short stay in New York, recording in ^{but}
~~long and hard experiences which cost me at least twenty years of my life~~
^{covering} ~~my acquisitions in true knowledge, I meant to say;~~
I have ^{these few chapters} condensed in few words as a matter of fact, not what I had learned in the school
and ^{the} University from the books, but what I have ^{acquired in the ground of continually} in the critical moments of my ^{without} tormented
^{and what I have} life ^{in the critical moments of my tormented life.} inquired and discovered within the unexplored and intangible realm of
my own Self. It would not be worth while to publish the result of such intimate

experiences, if I was not activated to do so ^{by} for two main reasons. the first is that
such an idea was suggested to me by some of my best american friends who had come

(in 9th april 1928) to Amman to pay me a short visit in my exile; had ^{we} been interested
I had something to say according to my ^{an interesting discus-} my emotional inquiries within myself ^{sion on some leading} questions for which
also in my psychic experiences. ^{duely confronted with historical facts} ~~actual~~ enabled me to elaborate some peculiar theories

for the ^{indubitable} ~~rational~~ reasonable interpretation of ^{such} ~~some very important social facts~~ like
the genesis of Religion, the origin of poetical, artistic or mystic inspiration and the like—
such facts which constitute, even to day, the perplexing riddles of our spiritual existence,
waiting yet for a definitive solution.

the peculiar circumstances which have surrounded and occasioned the genesis of this book.

had come in ⁱⁿ

I have written this book in New York in order to satisfy the desire of some of my ^{intimate} ~~best~~ american friends who ~~have~~ encouraged me to publish some of these very curious experiences I have been ^{quasi} fatally subjected to during the (two last) decades of my exceptionally tormented and adventurous life. ^{discussed on many important subjects} they have recommended me also to

give, in these pages, a full account of the significations I have been able to draw out of ^{my emotional experiences almost unprecedented in the course of my adventures} such states of mind ~~never experienced before.~~ ^{deep emotions rushing from time to time} I must rather say: of such waves of my unconscious ^{rushing} self appearing from time to time to the shores of my consciousness ^{dry}

I have been for long years ~~indeed~~ submitted to the hardest experiences ^{in life} ~~I must rather say:~~ of such waves of deep emotions coming from the unexplored dark regions of my subliminal self to rush ^{dry and silent} from time to time on the ~~dry~~ rocky shores of my consciousness, ~~and~~ to awaken me from my intellectual torpor.

I have observed them indeed with the candour and the simplicity of mind and ineffable childish joy of a boy who feels ^{with the} for the first time the awakening of a vague poetical sentimentality ^{in his soul} when contemplating from a lonely seashore the groaning waves of the limitless ocean.

But then I have recorded ^{in my mind} these ~~my~~ unprecedented ^{thrills} and studied them with my emotional experiences

(an expert) (simply marvellous)

the keen interest and the impartiality of a psychologist. The result was I ^{have} discovered my ^{own} real Self when ~~I~~ I was over sixty years old of age. ^{So} It seems that I had wandered until that time in the darkness without having the chance to ^{meeting} my real personality. ^{and yet I had ~~long~~ ^{had} long ago ^{won} when the reputation of being a well known man!} ^{not favourable} It is rather impossible to tell you by simple words, what a kind of wonderful emotion somebody feels when for the first time he comes face to face with himself, with his ~~real~~ true intimate self and makes acquaintance ^{with} of his true temperamental type. It is something like the unexpressible wonder of a savage who ^{has the chance of seeing for the first time} ~~sees~~ ^{and} ~~in a clean clear dormant water~~ his ^{own} ~~proper~~ figure reflected very accurately, in a clean, transparent, dormant water..... ^{clearly and quite} ~~with~~ with all its ^{attractive} beautiful or repugnant characteristics!..

ing sometimes in the atmospheric pressure and the ultimate factor in this change
heating rays of the
is the Sun etc. we can stop our scientific inquiry here. ^{because in this step of our} ^{investigation we reach to the satis-}
^{factory} ^{signification of the fact we} But when we are interest-

ted - as we ought to be - in inquiring unto the ~~real factors and~~ ^{efficient} causes of ~~such~~ ^{the} (emo-

tional - moral - intellectual ^{such emotional} storms which occasioned ~~such~~ tremendous Revolutions ~~and~~
stirring up ~~that Ocean we call~~ Humanity, ~~rather~~ ^{for the better or the worst} destroying and renewing the

work of many centuries of civilization, we can not be satisfied with following the
I do not want mean to say that we must or can neglect altogether the material conditions indispensable for the
~~superficial and mechanical concatenation of physical causes only.~~ (Social phe-)

^{possible occurrence of any phenomenon which finds its ultimate realization in the time and space, I wish to say that}
nomena are not - like the physical ones - one sided facts only. In these cases

(le revers de la medaille) is much more important, ^{than the other side: the obverse.} ~~for~~ there we ought to direct

our attention, ^{there to} ~~and~~ for there is the proper field of inquiry which can lead us to the

discovery of those ^{in one word, intangible} intangible moral, intellectual, or emotional motives which must be in this

case considered as the real causes, springing up from the unfathomable depths of our
unconscious being as the expression of our desire or will. All other material or mechanical

causes we can detect and discover in the outer world are - in comparison to the psychic

motives - some material conditions only. I must use here a well known expression

711
in philosophy and say that such material ~~causes~~ conditions are perhaps the occasional but not the real causes of those social ~~and~~ ^{such} overwhelming social troubles which are the precursor ^{usher in} ^{and herald} of a new era. All the steps of ~~the~~ the convulsive progress of human civilization are marked with such tremendous troubles ~~just~~ and determine the turning points of the history.

According to my long teaching experiences, the most regrettable misunderstanding amongst the leading thinkers arises up just when they ~~or~~ come to meet each other ^{in the ground} ~~when~~ (dealing with these) ^{of these} ~~complicate~~ social questions of ~~the~~ vital importance. The main reason of this is that they neglect most often to define clearly the meanings and the bearings of the technical terms they are obliged to use frequently in their discussions. They neglect to come to an agreement quite definitely in this basal ground of thorough understanding. There is no doubt that the ambiguity, or equivocal meaning of the technical terms so capriciously or uncarefully used by the scientists and the thinkers, has not only been the real source of everlasting verbal controversies

or tedious and useless discussions, but has ^{also} given ^{birth} ~~to~~ in many cases to some fictive ^{or. fustions} questions which have no footing on the solid ground of facts. Besides this the lamentable neglect of a fair definition of terms is at least the real source of unhappy misunderstandings between the scientists who ought to bear always in mind that one of the most convincing ~~to~~ prove of the scientific truth is the converging ways of ^{by a more comprehensive syn-} ^{thetic view} ~~researches~~ which come always ~~to~~ to join the ideas in one central point of the highest and fairest signification.

I have never failed - as far as I am conscious of my work - to observe this important point, and I have always taken care to respect this condition.

A very peculiar and significant religious experience.

My departure from Constantinople had been - as I have related it in the precedent chapter - precipitated by some imperious political circumstances, consequently I had no time at all to get money and to put in order my family affairs. My second daughter Selma, (the secretary of the Dean in the American college for girls) had come to see me with my wife and my youngest son Nazif on board of the steamer Egypt to bid me farewell. She gave me \$ 7.50. that was all the money she had saved. This was not sufficient to take my wife and son with me to sail for a foreign country where I had no friend and no job. I was then compelled to leave them to the mercy of God. We all were very sad.

We had been very politely received by the Ameer, and this gentleman - according to the Arab tradition - considered me and my family as his personal guests, for three days and nights. We had to live during this short time in the beautifully decorated little tent of Mohammed al Asbalee, one of the principal attendants of the Ameer. The Ameer himself was living in his sumptuous tent

(*) My proper way of speaking or writing on philosophical subjects, is to remember and to realize the wise recommendation and advice of Voltaire who said:
(*Bout d'abord, définissons bien les termes Messieurs!*)

So I use to proceed by the clear, precise and unequivocal definition of the principal technical terms I am compelled to use in the course of my lecture, or in the chapters of my book. This is the only condition to avoid the possibility of any confusion of ideas, confusion which is certainly the main source of useless and tedious verbal controversies in philosophical discussions.

(You can find the most remarkable and the most ~~clear~~ characteristic examples of this kind of verbal controversies in the critical writings of Sir William Hamilton, John Stuart Mill, Bain Spencer, Littré and other thinkers of the first rank against each other. I do not mention the lesser ones.)

Then, I do follow quite a peculiar method, or rather a simple logical process, (when lecturing or writing on philosophical subjects) as suggested to me by a long experience, and proved to be the most satisfactory one.

I can ~~explain it~~ ^{in few words} tell you in what a kind of (arrangement of ideas and succession of questions) it consists:

I have been (as a professor of philosophy in the university) in the most favourable position to remark and to ascertain the fact that the philosophical theories and ~~opinions~~ ^{systems have} intimately related to the logical succession of the problems - as a ^{concrete} ~~complete~~ ^{body of thoughts} ~~systems~~ - an organic character; its elements being intimately and harmoniously bound up ^{to} with each other by a logical necessity; that the same necessity is quite apparent ^{and} in the succession of questions underlying some problems or problems ~~to~~ ^{and} begging a solution. That these problems are borne from one another ~~and~~ successively either by the skeptical ~~and~~ disposition, or the constructive activity of our inquisitive mind. So the logical succession of these problems is the genealogical line along which they appeared.

So I was compelled - in order to avoid any misunderstanding and to make myself fairly understood by my readers of all classes - to give full explanation about the logical process which I have subjected my judgments to, and why I consider it as the spirit ~~of~~ and the characteristic of the scientific method, properly so called.

I have adopted (*la logique des faits*) or as I call it (the pragmatological logic, Pragma) meaning fact ^{in general} but not mere material ^{or} mechanical fact, ^{but} every kind of fact which ^{can} appear (as an object of study) in any ground of experience.

The distinctive character of this logical process lies precisely ^{in this peculiar disposition} that, instead of starting from (axiomatic truths) as ^{in geometrical deductions} they do in geometry etc, or from (commonly accepted but ^{uncontrolled} untested premisses), as the majority of mankind use to do, or else from some ^{and the false principles} prejudices as it is the common error of the narrow minded politicians, and superficial ^{or} formalistic moralists), following obediently the concatenation (of ideas ^{viz: the sequence}) only, I rely my judgment upon the evidence of duly observed facts and follow their fluctuating and far reaching correlations along one special line until I come as a consequence to a significant fact which answers ~~with~~ to the question born out of these ~~rich~~ researches in the ground of experience. ^{within or without my self}

So, it is to be fairly acknowledged that I do not start from anything which is not an observed fact, and ~~may~~ do not follow obediently the ~~con~~ sequences ^{viz: the concatenation of empty ideas} to draw out of this purely mental operation a formal or an abstract conclusion.

I am sure you will understand very easily and fairly my language, without being in need of any commentary. (*)
That is indeed the most difficult task I am confronted with, for I believe the simple presentation and enumeration of some facts - whatever ^{how} important they may be in themselves - can not be duly considered as a scientific work in the real acception of the term.

I am - as I have always been in my life - a fervent partisan of the experimental method, even trying to extend it to the ground of immaterial facts like ~~human~~ our emotions and (conative activities), viz: activities of Will. I am convinced after long years of experience that the so called experimental method of inquiry includes ~~in~~ our subjective experiences as well, ^{I confess and acknowledge that the subjective} ~~but ought to be~~ ^{method is} ~~the~~ ^{the most suitable among all others for inquiring} ~~into~~ ^{the facts concerning} matters of Aesthetics and ethics. But it must be definitely and rigorously ~~rejected out from~~ ^{repudiated and} the field of positive sciences, and natural sciences as well.

It is a very important point to be noted and emphasized here that ~~the~~ the opposite method of inquiry in opposition or in contradiction with the experimental method is not the subjective one, which may be experimental to the same degree as the objective ~~one~~ method. In one word (experimental) and (subjective) are ^{so called} not contradictory terms at all. The only ways of inquiry standing in opposition with the experimental method are the rationalistic and the intuitive methods.

It is to be remarked here that I am not taking at all into account the (Revelation) as a method, because it is a kind of ~~inspired~~ sudden inspiration, though it is the unexhaustible source of all ~~various~~ sorts of religious sentiments, and though the religious sentiments are - as a factor of civilization or as a cause of revolutions - ~~not~~ not less important and effective than any other social or moral force to be ^{worth} studied keenly, by the sociologists.

Then I must I must give you a clear idea of the logical process I have preferred and adopted as the real scientific one, for the judgment of the facts considered and studied in my book. He who ~~is~~ deals with method, inquires about the best possible logical process capable of leading the inquisitive mind to the truth in the proper field of a group of given facts.

[66 E. 56 Street N.Y.C.]

Letter written in N.Y. to Mr G. Stevens in answer
to his missive received to day (13 Nov. 1938). Central Park West
474. N^os N.Y.C.

Dear Mr Stevens,

from my window

This morning I have got up with a childish joy, contemplating the ~~so~~ glorious sun rising behind the trees of the rocky little hills of central Park. It was as an impressing Japanese tableau; it reminded me of the delightful early mornings of Arabia in Spring. Then after a while I received your letter, when I was setting down to write a bit.

It is so kind of you to have sent me this letter which encouraged me in my way and procured me a real pleasure. If I was, as many other orientals, or as the old romans a superstitious man, I would record the date and the day as the luckiest day of the year.

I was thinking to write you these days ^{quite long} a letter, but having personally ^{seen and} realized how much an American gentleman may be active and busy, I had no courage to disturb you. Your kind letter which reached me this morning gave me a real joy and the opportunity of writing you these lines.

I must, before hand ~~express~~ tell you how much I felt ^{happy} when in our first meeting at the Club, ~~when~~ I realized the fact that Mr Foreman and you were so quickly and so easily grasping the ~~main~~ ^{the} ~~my~~ principal ideas I was trying to communicate to you both, through my clumsy ~~exotic~~ english. This valuable experience of mine gives me the courage to tell you very modestly but sincerely, that in my long and wholesome ^{career} as a professor I had a great success to make ^{myself} understood - in my own turkish language certainly! - ^{when dealing even with} to every body the most abstract and complicate ^{problems} questions of philosophy ^{before an audience}. This was due to the fact that I was either in lecturing or writing - very careful to ^{realize} respect and realize some conditions which I had discovered during my long and ^{continuous} teaching experience. I must give you a slight idea of this conditions because they are the main pillars and foundation stones of the objective method I have ^{adopted} as the most suitable one, to inquire about the questions ^{which} constitute the subject matter of my book, as well as ^{for building it up}. I am quite sure you will understand my ^{the best scheme to build it up} these elements of ^{experimental} knowledge ^{harmonize and} into an architectural whole.

them on the way of my strictly personal experience?

There is no danger, I suppose, for positive science and the so-called objective method, to put forward such questions which beg for an answer; for they are much more important and serious than spiritism and telepathy with which many famous and strictly positivist scientists are dealing seriously like Sir O. Lodge, Sir William Crookes and all those famous men of science who are so keenly interested in (psychical researches).

Now my dear Mr Foreman, this letter so hastily written may - I am sure - give a fair opinion of the essential question I wish to inquire about, remaining always what I am, and what I have always been: a firm believer in the scientific method, who is very careful to prevent the immixion of any kind of sentimentality (adulterating our judgment!) in our scientific inquiries; but one who believes also in the possibility of studying everything in a scientific way, even our most intimate and fluctuating emotions.

I shall be very happy to talk a little more about this topic with you (I do not know if you have time to loose with me!) so keep please these scraps of paper until our meeting and accept the thanks of my wife and mine.

Truly yours
Dr. Riza Terzifik.

our emotions as a concrete and objective phenomenon, not less concrete and objective than the chemical combinations or physical or geological phenomena, for instance!

I am perfectly aware and conscious of the difficulty I am confronted with when proceeding to submit to the scientific (viz. the objective!) method of inquiry our emotions as a matter of fact! I know - as much as every other one - that they are not DIRECTLY communicable, because they are so intimate and so personal and not because they are IMMATERIAL! Our ideas are the only things we can directly communicate to others, not because they are something material palpable or palatable like an apple for instance, but simply because they are simply impersonal and common.

It is evident that the special science we call Psychology - which I believe with H. Spencer versus A. Bain is a concrete science! - deals with our ideas emotions, and conative manifestations, as concrete and objective phenomena, but in their general and common forms, eliminating everything which seems quite personal and uncommon in them.

Now I come to put forward my principal question. I have been subjected under some circumstances to make some experiences within my own conscience. Can I objectively and exteriorize them in a concrete and common form as to make of them the subject matter of objective psychology?

It is not to suggest to other psychologists at least the similar feelings, and to put

I am not even a religious man in the ordinary and common signification of the word. I had been imprisoned for forty-two days ^{being accused of} atheism and materialism when a student of medicine, and persecuted in my own country ever since for being a free thinker. I am imbued - if it is possible to say so - with scientific spirit. I had written and printed when I was younger than yourself a little book (influenced by Cartesianism I guess!) in order to generalize the mechanical determinism to every kind of phenomena (subjective & objective, social and moral as well!) as the only scientific method recommendable.

I am still to-day an experimentalist, a radical experimentalist, willing and wishing to extend the experimental method beyond the limits of the mere material and palpable facts. That is all! But I believe to-day that it is a great error to extend and

As to the emotional facts and phenomena, I believe them to be the very stuff of what we call our soul, or if you like better, our real personality (our feeling and willing, personality, altogether). I believe also that our emotions are the inexhaustible source wherefrom all sorts of religious and artistic and poetic spring out, and that we must seek the real and effective causes of every phenomenon, directly, in human will, in that essential source of our emotions, in passions (such as social, moral, religious, and artistic productions, etc!). I believe that the material influences coming from the outer world are regarded as (causes accessoires et modifiantes)

as a matter of fact to be regarded as secondary

The unshakable consideration of causal relations formulated as the principle of universal causality, is not applicable to psychic facts. Consequently, the generalization of Descartes, is wrong, and the limitation of that principle (so called scientific determinism) by Bergson is right. But at the same time I believe with H. S. Mill that the inductive process, will become deductive and by its side. Because, the measures of spatial phenomena, on these of time are altogether different.

Phenomena. (Bergson). Determinism, which is the very spirit of the mechanical method following. Generalize the mechanical methods to pure psychic, and subjective.

(From a letter to Mr. Foreman.)

Oct. 22 1928

It was an exceptional chance for me to meet you here as the first gentleman having a real philosophical training, and our short controversial discussion gave me the most useful suggestion for the preparation of the work I am determined to write, now I understood that the most important ^{point} condition to be considered and the first condition to be respected and fulfilled is to avoid the slightest misunderstanding even, in the question of method in scientific inquiry. That is the reason why I am determined - after our interesting and enlightening discussion - to begin ~~at~~ with a chapter on methodology, defining very carefully and precisely the meaning of the technical terms, so frequently used in scientific and philosophical literature, (like objective, subjective, experimental, empiric, intuitive etc), and to explain beforehand what kind of method I have been subjected to ~~apply~~ in the study of some emotions, and how I have drawn out ~~from~~ these peculiar experiences of mine, some ideas which can give a much more reasonable and plausible explanation for some very important social facts and events, like the birth and quick expansion of religions.

I must tell you here - because you are the only gentleman among all others I have seen until to-day in America, who can grasp at once the very meaning and bearing of the idea I am trying to express through my clumsy English - that I am neither a spiritualist or spiritist, or theosophist or christian scientist etc.