Yumed Text
OPEN ACCESS JOURNALS

Journal of Anxiety & Depression

Research | Vol 8 Iss 2
ISSN: 2582-3264
https://dx.doi.org/10.46527/2582-3264.176

# Structure of Consciousness; The Five-Four-Three (5,4,3) Theorem of Consciousness

**Frank Asamoah Frimpong***

PhD, Department of Psychology, The Chicago School (Los Angeles), United States

***Corresponding author:** Frank Asamoah Frimpong, PhD, Department of Psychology, The Chicago School (Los Angeles), United States, E-mail: frank.frimpong2012@gmail.com

**Received:** July 01, 2025; **Accepted:** July 26, 2025; **Published:** August 10, 2025

## Abstract

**The structure of consciousness starts with some unidentified innate capabilities of consciousness which consists of the five physical sense organs, four faculties of mind, and three types of knowledge known as, perceptual knowledge, conceptual knowledge and intuitive knowledge that together form knowledge of the human mind and consciousness. These three-tier levels of conscious activities of the human mind and consciousness is postulated as a "five-four-three" (5, 4, 3) Architecture of consciousness. The "five-four-three pathways of consciousness" means that these are the three conduits for the acquisition of knowledge about all phenomena and objects of the external world that the human mind and consciousness can be aware of. The digit five (5) stands for the five physical sense organs of seeing, smelling, hearing, tasting and feeling, that report sensations of objects of the external world to the human mind and consciousness. The digit four (4) stands for the four different faculties of mind known as the Perceptual-mind, Imagination, Reason and Superego/conscience that constitutes the four voices (4-faculties of mind) that human beings think with. The digit three (3) stands for the three types of knowledge known as perception (from the perceptual-mind), conception (from both the Imagination and the human Reason), and intuition (from the superego/conscience) that constitute the human thinking system. Hence, five physical sense organs, four faculties of mind and three categories of knowledge form the total capabilities of the human mind and consciousness. In other words, this five-four-three (5, 4, 3) architecture of consciousness is like the DNA of the human body. Nothing outside the DNA can be found in the human body that is not already part of the DNA. In the same way, no human awareness or intelligence can exist as part of the human mind and consciousness without it already being part of the five, four, three architecture of consciousness. Thus, the five-four-three (5, 4, 3) architecture of consciousness indicates that consciousness is not monist but consciousness consists of different faculties of mind, each with different abilities for acquiring knowledge. This means the structure of the human mind and consciousness laid out in this research forms the compendium of human awareness and human knowledge of the world in general. There is nothing more or less beyond the structure of human mind and consciousness.**

**Citation:** Frimpong FA. Structure of Consciousness; The Five-Four-Three (5,4,3) Theorem of Consciousness. J Anxiety Depress. 2025;8(2):176.

## 1. Introduction

*Class:* This analysis of the human mind is the most interesting thing to know about consciousness. This research thoroughly explores the question of consciousness is monist, a monad, or dual, or a multiplicity of faculties of mind? How do scientists account for self-doubt in their definition of consciousness? Is there an "I" versus a "me" in the definition of consciousness, or the "I" versus the "me" within the human thinking system hinted at by philosophers (William James) and psychologists a farce, or just a semantic play of words? Do you think that every person is aware of the "I" versus the "me" in their individual thoughts? Do people really think that their mind is divided against itself, or do people think their consciousness is monist in spite of their self-doubt which often bring anguish in time of crisis in people' mind and consciousness? (William James. The divided self of the "I" and the "m" 1895).

Next, what is the meaning of the words; perception and conception? What is the difference between the word perception and the word conception? Are both words, perception and conception opposite or synonymous? For the purposes of clarity, this research uses the two nouns; mind and consciousness as interchangeable synonyms and mostly uses them together with regards to the explanation of the words; perception and conception as specific processes within human thinking system for the acquisition of knowledge about the world. This is because neither the word mind or consciousness has been correctly defined by science or philosophy.

*Student A*: There seems to be many questions about consciousness with regards to words such as mind, consciousness, perception and conception. Please Professor, are you going to explain all these questions about consciousness to prove that consciousness is not monist?

*Professor:* Exactly, that is why I have stated that this analysis of consciousness is the most interesting part of the nature of consciousness as a multiplicity of faculties of mind in the human thinking system. In fact, this research into the multiplicity of faculties of mind within the human consciousness is only the first step to unravel consciousness as a conglomerate of different faculties of mind as well as different processes of thought that indicates that consciousness is not just a single monist phenomenon.

*Professor:* So, without beating about the bush any longer, let us start this analysis of consciousness not with an assumption as scientists usually do, but let us start with the fact (already proven) that consciousness consists of four faculties of mind usually divided into two opposing camps that have created the phenomenon of the "I" versus the "me", or the divided mind within the human thinking system. To do that, this research starts with some basic natural facts or intrinsic facts about the number of faculties of mind that comprises the human mind and consciousness. To begin with, we have to define what is natural or intrinsic fact to differentiate from everyday regular facts of incidents that occurs daily.

Intrinsic or natural facts are facts and things in nature that we cannot change. For example, the human hand has five fingers. Human beings have two eyes and one head. These facts about the human body are natural facts that are perceivable, countable, and unchangeable. These natural facts about human beings are not concepts analyzed by scientists or conceived by philosophers. On the other hand, Plato wrote his philosophy of mind in 400 BC, while Hume wrote his theory of mind in the 19$^{th}$ Century, and Freud wrote his theory of mind in the 20$^{th}$ Century. These are historical facts or incidents that occurred in the

past. This research is being written in the 21st Century which is also a factual-incident different from a natural incident.

*Professor:* So, Class, you have a clear idea of what an intrinsic or a natural fact is or is not right? Here are some intrinsic and natural facts about consciousness and the human mind. *Natural fact number one:* The human body has two hands and two legs as natural facts, in the same way, the human mind and consciousness consists of four faculties of mind as a natural fact. *Natural fact number two;* the four faculties of human mind and consciousness are; 1) The Perceptual-mind, 2) Imagination, 3) Reason, and 4) Superego/conscience in that natural order.

It would be recalled that Plato first wrote his philosophy of mind as four faculties of mind four namely, reason/dialectic, understanding/mathematics, belief/perception, and conjecture/imagination. But Plato later changed the four faculties of mind to The Tripartite Soul of Man as three faculties of mind due to metaphysical considerations arising out the importance metaphysicians placed on the number three. Freud just adopted the three faculties of mind established by Plato as id, ego, superego. (TZ Lavine, 1984).

It should also be noted that the theory of three faculties of mind by Plato and Freud have been improved from three faculties of mind to four faculties of mind in this research (refer to my earlier Paper titled: "Breaking down consciousness into its four constituent parts of the human consciousness, (FA Frimpong, 2025). Proof of the fact that the human mind and consciousness consists of four faculties of mind can also be seen in the four different ways the human mind and consciousness acquires knowledge about objects of the external world in the form of 1) perception, 2) conception, 3) imagination and 4) intuition.

Out of the four ways the human mind and consciousness acquires knowledge about objects of the external world, perception by the faculty of perceptual-mind and conception by the human reason stand out as the two main ways of acquiring knowledge by the human mind and the thinking system. To understand how the human mind and consciousness work in acquiring knowledge about the world, one must thoroughly understand the different methods of perception and conception work in the human thinking system.

## 2. Perception versus Conception: What We Perceive; We Do Not Conceive and Vice Versa

*Professor:* To understand how the different faculties of mind work within the human thinking system begins with knowledge of the specific abilities of each of the four different faculties of mind that provide ideas and knowledge about phenomena and objects of the external world to the consciousness of each person. To explain the special abilities of each faculty of mind, we first need to explain the human mind and consciousness' two most prominent methods of acquiring knowledge and ideas about the world namely, perception of objects of the external world, and conception of ideas and phenomena in the external world. Perception and conception are the two specific and special abilities of the two faculties of the perceptual-mind and the human reason, *where the perceptual-mind perceives objects of the external world and human reason conceives ideas and phenomena.*

In other words, the perceptual-mind perceives objects of the external world, but the perceptual-mind does not conceive ideas. On the other hand, the human reason conceives ideas about phenomena in the external world, but the human reason does not directly perceive objects of the external world. Objects are obviously different from ideas and phenomena. Objects are concrete things we can touch, see, smell, taste, and feel such as an apple, a chair, a dog, a tree etc. Ideas are phenomena that we can

think up or conceive, or imagine such as ghosts, spirits, the force speed of light which Newton postulated a theory for as; force is equal to matter time acceleration (F=MA), or the molecular composition of water which consists of a specific number of hydrogen and oxygen molecules known as H2O.

For example, we see water, we drink water, we use water all the time, but we do not readily perceive water as consisting one hydrogen atom and two oxygen molecules. So, the idea of the molecular composition of water is our conception of the elements of water because we cannot perceive the molecular composition of water with our naked eyes, or by smelling, or tasting water (until we use scientific instruments to separate the hydrogen atom from oxygen to find that water contains two hydrogen atoms and one oxygen atom to form H2O). The same thing applies to all the numerous ideas we have acquired through chemistry, physics, biology, mathematics, and the social sciences that we have to conceive because we cannot perceive them.

So, what we perceive, we do not conceive, and we conceive the things that we cannot perceive. This is how the human thinking system of our human mind and consciousness work to give us knowledge about objects of phenomena and the external world through perception and conception because of the different abilities of the two faculties of 1) perceptual-mind and 2) human reason. Of course, we can imagine things, and we often do through our faculty of imagination. But we will discuss how we imagine things (that may not exist) unlike perceiving or conceiving things that exist. But perception of objects of the external world and conception of ideas and phenomena in the external world are the two main ways the human mind and consciousness acquire knowledge of the external world on which our life depends.

The difference between perception and conception cannot be any clearer. Perception of objects is different from the conception of ideas and phenomena. This is why it is imperative to understand the two major ways the human thinking system work. In other words, to have any bit of understanding of how the human thinking system acquires knowledge about objects of the external world, it is imperative to know the difference between perception as one way of acquiring knowledge, and conception as the other way of acquiring knowledge the external world. The first major fact about the difference between perception and conception is that these two ways through which the human mind and consciousness acquires knowledge within the human thinking system are directly opposite to each other.

We perceive objects but we conceive ideas and phenomena that we cannot perceive. In plain English, perception is the opposite of conception. This means what we perceive, we do not conceive. And what we conceive, we cannot perceive. This also means that objects of the external world that the faculty of perceptual-mind can perceive, the faculty of human reason does not have to conceive them. And the corollary or opposite is that ideas and phenomena that the human reason conceives, the perceptual-mind has no way of perceiving them. Furthermore, what makes perception the opposite of conception is that the human reason conceives only ideas and phenomena, that the perceptual-mind cannot perceive. This further means that the human reason developed later, to conceive the phenomena and ideas the perceptual-mind could not perceive.

This is how the human reason gradually acquired the ability of conception, the ability to conceive what cannot be readily perceived. This is how the division of labor, between perception and conception sets the line of demarcation between the faculty of perceptual-mind the faculty of human reason, so that the human reason conceives only those ideas and phenomena that the perceptual-mind cannot perceive. Thus, so long as the perceptual-mind can perceive an object of the external world, the human

reason need not conceive it, because it has already been perceived by the perceptual-mind. And what has been perceived no longer remains a phenomenon because it has been already objectified and known.

There is no hint of confusion between the different abilities of the perceptual-mind and human reason within the human mind and consciousness. It is now clear that the human thinking system consists of two main faculties of mind whose different means of acquiring knowledge for human beings work in opposite ways essence of perception of objects, and conception of ideas and phenomena. Objects are perceived; ideas and phenomena are conceived. This the underlying principle behind the opposite mental activities between the faculties of the perceptual-mind and the human reason. It makes the difference between the mental activity of perceiving objects and the other mental activity of conceiving ideas and reasoning. The opposite abilities of both the faculty of perceptual-mind and human reason create the divided mind in human thoughts.

Simply put, what you perceive, you do not conceive, and what you conceive, you cannot perceive. You resort to conceiving something or an idea because you could not perceive it.

*Professor:* So, when the perceptual-mind of a person is busy perceiving objects of their environment, the person's faculty of reason becomes inactive, and redundant. But when the perceptual-mind of a person cannot properly perceive and interpret an object or idea, that is when that person's faculty of reason spring into action to conceive and construe what the fuzzy idea or spooky phenomenon might be. Until any scientist, philosopher, physicist, neuroscientist, or anybody else understands the difference between the mental activities of perception (by the perceptual-mind) and the different mental activity of conception (by the human reason), he or she does not know anything about how the human mind and consciousness acquires knowledge and information about the world.

It must be emphasized that the difference between perception and conception, or better still, which faculty of mind perceives objects of the external world, and which faculty of mind conceives ideas and phenomena, was the great argument Hume raised against Plato that nearly destroyed Plato's theory of mind. Plato incorrectly stated that the human reason perceived as well as conceive both ideas and objects of the external world. Hume on the other hand, argued the faculty of human reason had nothing to do with perception of objects of the external world. In other words, according Hume, the human reason cannot perceive objects of the external world. So, Hume separated perception from conception. And Hume was right. Got it Class?

Furthermore, the mental ability of perception is innate and intrinsic to the faculty of perceptual-mind, so is the mental ability of conception is innate and intrinsic to the faculty of the human reason. The fact is that the way the perceptual-mind acquires knowledge about objects of the external world runs opposite to the way the human reason acquires ideas and knowledge of the external world is natural and innate with each of these two faculties of mind. It is innate and natural for the faculty of perceptual-mind's perception of objects of the external world to be different from the human reason's conception and apprehension of ideas of the external world.

It is hereby pointed out that the faculties of perceptual-mind and human reason cannot both provide the same knowledge about objects of the external and phenomena world to the human mind and consciousness. That would be a repetition of the same information about objects of the external world which would make one of these two faculties of mind redundant, since nature

arbores redundancy. Some objects are too tiny or too far away and therefore too hard to be properly perceive by the perceptual-mind. This is why the faculty of human reason evolved to conceive ideas and interpret phenomena for the human thinking system.

And when the human reason could not conceive ideas about the phenomena that are too far away or too tiny, the human reason in conjunction with the faculty of human imagination conceived scientific instruments to aid the conception and interpretation of phenomena. On the other hand, the very obviousness of some phenomena to the perceptual-mind resulted in the wrong perception of such phenomenon that we may perceive them wrongly. A famous example of a phenomenon ill-perceived is the earth-centric revolution of the Sun around the earth known as the Ptolemaic earth-centric planetary system for two thousand years until Copernicus replaced it with his concept of a helio-centric solar system that is now taken for granted.

The one big difference between perception and conception is that regardless of how difficult or easy an object appears to our perception, or how hard or easy an idea can or cannot be conceived, (and this was Hume's genius) that all concepts must take a cue from perception. In other words, all conceived ideas must be related to an image or some form of an object that has been perceived before. That, ideas and concepts cannot be conceived out of the blue (with no basis in reality), or without any part of an object already perceived in mind. This means that, for any ideas conceived by the human reason to be factual, or authentic, that idea must be based on some perception already known, to separate it from surrealism created by the human reason.

The problem is that the human reason does not have the ability to imagine ideas or things out of the blue. Only the human faculty of Imagination has the ability to imagine fantasies out of the blue whether they are true or not. And when the human imagination imagines fantastically false things that are obviously false, we do not hold the imagination accountable for creating falsehood and fallacies, because that is the domain and special ability of the human faculty of imagination alone. This is why whenever the human reason attempts to conceive a false idea, we are quick to hold the human reason accountable for creating fallacies and falsehoods.

On the other hand, the faculty of mind we call the human reason has two huge limitations. 1) The human reason cannot perceive objects of the external world because the ability to perceive objects of the external world belongs to the faculty of perceptual-mind. This is why the human reason cannot never perceive objects of the external world. 2), the human cannot imagine false fantasies that are obviously false. The human reason cannot create falsehoods, because the ability to create fantasies and falsehoods belong to only the faculty of imagination. So, the human reason is boxed in left and right. The human reason is boxed in when it comes to the perception of objects of the external world. The human reason is boxed in with regards to the conception of false ideas and fantasies by the faculty of imagination.

*Student B*: Do we have any analogy in nature where any organ of the body is boxed in left and right by other organs similar to the human reason being boxed in by other faculties of mind?

*Professor*: Yes, take the human eyes for example. The eyes being one of the five physical sense organs brings us so much information about objects of the external world. But while the eyes have the ability to see and make us aware of anything and most things around us, the human eyes cannot smell, or hear anything close by. This is because the human eyes have no ability

to smell or hear any noise nearby. Those abilities of smelling and hearing belong to the physical sense organs of the nose and the ears. The eyes cannot usurp the abilities and functions of the nose or the ears. This is how the human reason is boxed in by the faculty of perceptual-mind and the human imagination.

Do you now see the genius of Hume in challenging Plato's assertion that his theory of forms should be taken as ultimate truths? On the other hand, Hume rejected Plato's theory of forms as baseless fantasies without any trace in reality. Therefore, to understand how the human thinking system works within the mind and consciousness, we have to accept the natural fact that the faculties of the human mind and consciousness consists of four faculties of mind known as the perceptual-mind, imagination, human reason, and the superego/conscience. We have to understand also, that the human mind and consciousness acquires knowledge of objects of the external world through the perceptions of the perceptual-mind as well as the conceptions of the human reason, as the two prominent ways the human mind and consciousness gain knowledge about the external world out there.

Therefore, it is now clear that each of the four faculties of mind have specific limited abilities and functions such as; the perceptual-mind alone has the ability and function of perceiving objects of the external world. And the human reason has the ability and function of conceiving ideas about phenomena of the external world. And furthermore, the human imagination alone has the ability of creating or imagining fantasies of ghosts, gods, and phantoms that are usually false. And the superego/conscience alone has the ability of intuition. More importantly, each faculty of mind cannot usurp the functions and abilities of any other faculty of the human mind and consciousness.

So, for anybody to claim that the human reason can perceive objects of the external world, or that the human reason can claim that ghosts, gods, and phantoms are real, would be going against the natural order of how the different faculties of mind within the human mind and consciousness works. This is because the division between the "I" and the "me" of the divided mind, represented by the division of labor between the faculty of perceptual-mind and the human reason, sets up the divided mind in the human thinking system within the human mind and consciousness, as a natural phenomenon that people are not readily aware of.

## 3. Maxim of Perception, Law of Knowledge: To Exist; What is Conceived must be Perceived

### 3.1 The maxim of perception

*To exist, or to be accepted as truth; what is conceived, must be perceived.* Conception must be grounded in perception. Perception grounds ideas, concepts, and theories in reality. Whether an object or a phenomenon, if it exists, show it. If you cannot show it, it does not exist.

*Professor*: This part of the research starts with a natural law that has been operating unnoticed and unrecognized among scientists, theorists, discoverers, students and professors in antiquity long before Plato opened his Academy in Athens, Greece. It is the law and maxim of human knowledge, the law of the human mind, the law of consciousness, and the maxim of how the human thinking system works. It is the maxim of authenticity and validity that underlies the findings of any study and research. This maxim of authenticity is innate, immutable, and unchangeable. This maxim is simple and straight forward. It states that: *To exist, what is conceived must be perceived.* It is a command, an edit of the human mind and consciousness.

This is the law and maxim of how the human thinking system works to acquire ideas and knowledge about the world. It commands that any idea, concept, theory or any scientific discovery that people cannot perceive with their five physical sense organs directly, or indirectly through scientific instruments cannot be accepted as a fact or as a thing that exists. This means; *for any idea, concept a, theory or a discovery to be accepted as ultimate truth, it must be brought to the level of human perception*. It also means that an idea, concept or theory cannot be accepted as true if it cannot be perceived by people. This means that conceptions of ideas and phenomena must be grounded in perception for the human mind and consciousness to understand what was conceived. In other words, what was conceived needs to be perceived, or it would not be reliable and valid, it will not be able to stand the test of time.

*Student C*: Professor, can you please give an example of an idea, concept, or a theory that has been accepted or rejected as ultimate truth based on this maxim, based on people's perception of the facticity of such a concept theory or discovery?

*Professor*: Sure, have you heard about Darwin's theory of evolution? Einstein's theory of relativity? Newton's theory of action and reaction are opposite and equal? Have you heard about Pythagoras' theorem of the sum of the angles in a right-angle triangle are equal to 180 degrees? Do you know that Copernicus' (heliocentric) theory of the Solar System replaced and earlier Ptolemaic geocentric theory of the planets that was found to be false? Have you heard about Plato's theory of forms that was famously rejected by Hume? Do you know that Freud's theory of instincts has not been accepted as ultimate truth? Do you know that even Einstein had to accept Niels Bohr's theory of quantum mechanics? Have you heard that Galileo's discovery of mountains on the moon through his telescope has been proven correct? Let us see which of these concepts, theories, and discoveries have been accepted as true and which have been rejected as untrue? Let us see which of these theories and discoveries has been controversial, and which is slowly being accepted? What's the criteria for the acceptance or rejection of any of these concepts, theories and discoveries?

*Professor: Which concept, theory or discovery has been accepted as ultimate truth? Student D*: Copernicus' heliocentric theory of the Solar System.

*Student E*: Einstein's theory of relativity, and $E=MC^2$

*Student F:* Newton's theory of actin and reaction are equal and opposite and F=MA *Student G*: Pythagoras' theorem of the degrees in a right-angle triangle.

*Student H*: Niels Bohr's theory of quantum mechanics.

*Professor: And which concept, theory or discovery has been rejected as untrue?*

*Student J:* Plato' theory of forms was rejected by Aristotle, Hume, and later philosophers *Student K:* Darwin's theory of evolution was rejected at first but it seems to gain traction.

*Student L:* Freud's theory of instincts has been rejected. But Freud's theory of anxiety, neuroses and depression are accepted.

*Professor:* And what do you think is the criteria for the acceptance of the concept, theory or discovery that has been rejected as untrue or invalid?

*Student M:* The concepts, theories and discoveries that have been accepted have been clearly demonstrated to our understanding to the point that we can see the results of such theories and discoveries.

*Professor:* And the criteria for the rejection of some of the concepts, and theories?

*Student N:* The concepts and theories that have been rejected are rejected because they have not been clearly demonstrated to our understanding, and besides, we cannot see such concepts or theories in action, or we do not see the application of such concepts. So, people have no way of proving their validity as eternal truths. For example, how do you apply Plato's theory of forms?

*Professor:* Your answers about the ideas, concepts, theories and discoveries that have been accepted or rejected support the maxim: To exist, to be accepted as ultimate truth, conception (new ideas, theories, and discoveries) must be grounded in perception, or what is conceived must be perceived. This boils down to the two main ways the human mind and consciousness acquires knowledge about ideas and objects of the external world through the two major faculties of perception by the perceptual-mind, and conception by the human reason. For example, Pythagoras first drew a right-angle triangle in the sand to show clearly to the naked eyes that the sum of the angles in a right-angle triangle amounts to 180 degrees (before his theorem of right-angle triangle was ever written on paper). In other words, Pythagoras obeyed and conformed to the maxim of perception which states that; ideas conceived by the human reason, must be perceived by the faculty of perceptual-mind in order to be accepted as truth.

We can see the straight lines of a right-angle triangle and each of the three angles of 60 degrees that adds up to 180 degrees which high school students have no problem understanding and learning. In other words, Pythagoras made sure that his conception of the sum of angles in a right-angle triangle, are grounded in human perception of seeing, which is one of the five physical sense organs. The same grounding of conception in perception can be applied to the concepts and theories that according to this Class has been accepted as fact and ultimate truths. And the corollary is also true that ideas, concepts, and theories that were not grounded in perception were rejected as having no basis in reality and therefore, invalid as ultimate truths.

Thus, the acceptance and or rejection of some concepts and theories as valid and true were based on being clearly grounded in human perception has actually been known to all true thinkers, theorists, discoverers, as a law that they must obey. *Every theorist or discoverer of an idea, or concept know in their heart that for their idea to be accepted as truth, it must be perceived by the people. And that is the criteria that all thinkers go by without the masses knowing it.* In fact, the maxim; to be accepted as truth, it must be perceived is what good old Archimedes strove to prove through his theory of buoyancy.

And when Archimedes found out that he had discovered the method of showing the difference between the forged ring and the pure gold ring which was no small feat, see what cry of joy leapt out of his mouth Eureka! Eureka! I have done it. I have obeyed

the maxim: to be accepted as truth, it must be perceived by the observer. Well, by now, it is clear that concepts and theories rejected as having no basis in reality are the quintessential proof that to exist; what is conceived must be perceived. That conception must be grounded in perception, or it does not exist. Except theorists, scientists, and discoverers of principles and facts, people do not realize the power of the maxim of perception; that anything that has been accepted as existing has been made perceivable to the human perceptual-mind through at least one or more of the five physical sense organs.

And the corollary is also true that anything that exists but is beyond perception by our five physical sense organs can be conceived by the human reason and be accepted as ultimate truth, so long as it is made perceivable to the faculty of perceptual-mind of the human mind and consciousness. In other words, the maxim of perception applies to everything including the conceptions of the human reason as well as the conceptions of the human imagination. For example, the maxim of perception applies to the imagined idea that there exists a supreme being who supposedly created the world and the entire universe. The maxim of perception challenges the concept of the parallel universes, or String Theory, none of which have not been made perceivable to the faculty of perceptual-mind. These theories about the world and the universe by religionists and some physicists cannot escape the test of truth by the maxim of perception.

Needless to say, it is clear that the maxim of perception started operating as an inescapable natural law the morning Adam, or the first human beings opened their eyes and saw the world, the horizon, the foliage, mountains, valleys, seas, and rivers in plain view as far as the eyes could see. Further exploration of the world revealed more of the existence of nature to the physical sense organs of hearing, smelling, eating and tasting of the fruits of the earth. Then, when the first human beings looked up at the night sky and saw the Moon and twinkling stars above, the faculty of perceptual-mind wondered about what was not readily perceivable far away in the sky. That was when the faculty of imagination conceived the idea that the Moon and stars far away in the night sky that the perceptual-mind cannot have a good perception of them was the realm where gods, spirits, and genie lives.

So, the human imagination conceived the idea that heavens above was the presumed abode of the gods, and the earth below as the abode of human beings that lasted for thousands of years. But when Galileo pointed his telescope to the skies and saw mountains on the surface of the Moon, Galileo fulfilled the maxim of perception that disproved the fantasies of the imagination. and affirmed the maxim of perception that; what is conceived (by the imagination or human reason, must be perceived by the perception of the perceptual-mind, to true.

Thus, the maxim of perception reminded Mankind that things and phenomena beyond the ability of the perceptual-mind to perceive must still obey the law of nature operating as the maxim of perception. That the maxim of perception still applies to anything that either the faculty of human reason or imagination ever conceived; to wit; anything that can be conceived, must be made perceivable to the human faculty of perceptual-mind. With regards to mathematics, the fulfillment of the maxim of perception is that all mathematical concepts were made perceivable through the representation of mathematical symbols, numbers, geometric diagrams and algebraic equations to in order to fulfill the maxim of perception that; what is conceived must be made perceivable (with numbers, letters, and symbols) to the understanding of the faculty of the perceptual-mind.

It can be seen that it was the requirement of the maxim of perception to clearly show ideas and concepts conceived by the human reason to the perception of the faculty of perceptual-mind that led to the development of representing things that were not readily available, by using numbers and letters to express those ideas in mathematics. That it was the need to represent objects that may not be present with symbols that led to the first notions of writing down numbers and symbols in clay tablets, then writing numbers and symbols on animal skin parchments, and carving drawings in stone as a way of writing down ideas and concepts for the purposes of recollection.

In short, it was and still is, the imperative of the maxim of perception, to show letters, numbers, and symbols, (all of which are conceived phenomena) to the perception of the faculty of perceptual-mind that led to the development of writing. Writing was a way of showing what was conceived that became perceived at specific periods of time in history. In mathematics, the need to comply with the maxim of perception by showing that what conceived, was also made perceivable through drawing led to the development of drawing geometric diagrams as a specific branch of mathematics. Furthermore, to obey the maxim of perception that what was conceived must be shown in order for it to be perceived alphabets were developed to represent sounds of speech of languages that can be written down on paper.

This was how alphabets formed letters and a group of letters were combined to formed words represented that formed language and speech. Modern people have forgotten that representing sounds with alphabets, and letters and grouping words to form pattens of speech as well as the writing and printing of books, were all developed slowly with meticulous care to conform to the requirements of by the maxim of perception since ancient times. Such is the scope and power of the maxim of perception that was so inescapable that it acted as unavoidable law of nature that underlies everything that Man has created as objects that did not exist before.

Class: Take a look around you, what do you see that cannot be verified by the maxim of perception? What do you know or are aware of, that escapes the maxim of perception? In other words, what do you know or aware of that was not created according to the demands of the maxim of perception that; what is conceived must be made perceivable to the faculty of perceptual-mind? Nonetheless, in spite of the power of the maxim of perception that underlies the certainty of human knowledge, the limitations of the perception of objects of the external world by the perceptual-mind through the five physical sense organs (without the assistance of scientific instruments) is indisputable.

## 4. Why was the Maxim of Perception not Mentioned Until Now?

*Student P*: Professor, if this maxim of perception which amounts to a law of human knowledge was known to all thinkers, theorists, inventors, scientists or discoverers in history, why is it that this is the only time this maxim of perception is being mentioned by this research?

*Professor:* This question is one of the best questions ever thrown to any Professor. First of all, to think that thinkers, theorists, inventors and anybody who discovered anything known in history did not know about the maxim of perception (because nobody ever mentioned it) is a false assumption. In fact, everyone who has been known as a thinker, inventor, theorist, or discoverer of any law, formula, theorem, or anyone who has ever postulated a hypothesis for a new concept, have known about the maxim of perception. More importantly, all thinkers, theorists, inventors and discoverers of anything accepted as good or true have

been pressured and felt the pressure of the maxim of perception to make their theories, inventions, and discoveries perceivable not only to scientists and philosophers, but to the rest of the world.

The early Greek thinkers such as Thales and Anaximander, who in trying to explain what the world was made of, said that the world was made of four elements namely, earth, air, fire, and water because they thought these four elements were plain to see everywhere one looks. From Plato and the rationalists to Hume and the empiricists, from Archimedes to Pythagoras, down to Darwin and Einstein, and everyone else, all of these people felt that they had to obey the maxim of perception for their theories and discoveries to be accepted as truth. Everyone who has ever thought of presenting a different view of reality or some new knowledge about reality has felt the presence and pressure of the maxim of perception.

Student Q: But if any discoverer or theorist felt the presence of the maxim of perception why has nobody ever not mentioned it?

*Professor*: For your information and analytical consideration, according to legend, Archimedes showed the pressure of the maxim of perception he felt not in so many words, but in the most dramatic demonstration by running through the streets shouting Eureka! Eureka! I have done it. I have achieved what looked so impossible. After Archimedes, why would any inventor, discoverer or theorist dramatically proclaim that they made their theory or discovery as perceivable as possible because they felt the pressure (of the maxim of perception) to make their discovery or theory perceivable to the masses (which is indeed what usually happened with all of them, scientists, philosophers), and others?

Think about it. Think about the trouble any thinker, theorist, inventor, or discoverer went through to prove the validity or facticity of their theories or discovery to be accepted as true and perceivable, not only by scientists and philosophers, but by the masses of people. Why would any scientist, discoverer or theorist go through the trouble they actually went through in making their theories and discoveries acceptable as true and reliable, if it were not out of the pressure they felt from the maxim of perception?

The second reason why inventors, discoverers and all the theorists who went to the trouble of explaining their ideas in detail in order to make their theories and discoveries as perceivable and understandable as possible to the masses, said nothing about the pressure of the maxim of perception they felt was that (none of them thought they needed to show that they had to obey the maxim of perception which states that; (“if you think you have discovered something new, show it”). It made no difference whether a theorist or discoverer of some new idea was aware of the structure of consciousness and the opposition of perception to conception of ideas, the pressure of the maxim of perception was always present in the thoughts of all thinkers.

The third reason why discoverers of new theories, succeeded in making their discoveries perceivable and understandable is that they were not concerned with the limitation of their faculty of perceptual-mind’s perception, or the limitations of their faculty of human reason’s conception of ideas. To theorists and discoverers, they used their reason and imagination to conceive new ideas and discoveries, while inwardly, they felt the need to make their theories and discoveries as perceivable and understandable as possible, because they knew they had to obey the maxim of perception which states that; for their theories and discoveries to be accepted as truth, they must explain it and show it as truly valid as possible. With this explanation and

understanding of how inventors, theorists and discoverers of ideas felt and strove to obey the maxim of perception.

Let us see if Einstein and Darwin actually showed any sign of their awareness of the maxim of perception which states that "if you conceive something new, some new idea, or concept, you must show it". First, let us peer into Darwin's mind to see if Darwin felt the pressure of the maxim of perception in his quest to show that his new idea of the evolution of species including us human beings can be true and valid. Darwin might have asked himself; where can I find creatures that show evidence of change in their original characteristics to new characteristics? Not here in England or Europe. Here in England, I have looked around. What I seed is the practice of the breeding of horses, dogs, pigs, etc., that bring about new and different species but that is natural. What I need to show that some creatures have evolved into something different should be natural change to show that evolution has taken place naturally, or that nature itself has enacted evolution in this or that species of animals.

Where can I find such naturally evolved species of animals? Oh, the Galapagos Islands! But why the Galapagos Islands? It would be places where the animals there would be untouched by human beings, so that any change of characteristics of any species of animals found on the Galapagos Islands would be clearly natural. Galapagos Islands would showcase nature's own handiwork of the changes of the characteristics of the animals found there as having evolved according to selective pressures of natural selection by their specific environments. So, Darwin told himself Galapagos here I come. Let us see what you got. Different and diverse species of birds of the same genus but with different beaks, and so on and so forth.

After finding the right creatures that showed characteristics of natural changes, or change by nature based on the specific environment namely different species of finches of Galapagos Islands, Galapagos tortoises, and fossils of giant ground sloth, then Darwin had to propose a rational explanation for why the changes he observed in the different types of finches and tortoises constituted specimens of evolution of different species. In this case, Darwin was able to show why the concept of evolution makes sense to a reasonable degree. Darwin was able to argue why his idea of the evolution of species should be accepted as facts that have been made perceivably clear with examples of specific creatures on the Islands of Galapagos.

*Class*: See what lengths, what trouble Darwin felt he had to go through to obey the maxim of perception that "if you say that you have discovered some new idea or concept to be true and valid show it. Make it perceivable to our own eyes, and to our own minds and consciousness. State why your idea of the evolution of all species in a simple clear maxim or in a simple clear axiom, or in clear logical terms. Incidentally, it was this boundless pressure of the maxim of perception that weighed on the mind of Darwin that hit Darwin in two words like a thunderstorm; "natural selection", and boom, Darwin nailed it. And like Archimedes, (though unlike Archimedes, Darwin did not run out the door to shout I have nailed it. I have nailed it), but with the idea of natural selection as the underlying principle of his concept of evolution, Darwin breathed a great sigh of relief.

Now, back to Einstein's proof of his theory of relativity, gravity. In each of these concepts and theories Einstein strove to give examples of how each of his theories would work that made them as perceivable as possible. For example, with regards to Einstein's theory of general relativity, 'Einstein postulated three ways this theory could be proved. The most dramatic one (which was a prediction that was proven later was that) of observing the stars during a total eclipse. The Sun is our closest strong gravitational field. Light traveling from a star through space and passing the sun's field would be bent', if Einstein's theory were true. So, the 1919 solar eclipse at Soral, Brazil and Principe, W/Africa showed that light from the Sun to the earth

was bent as predicted, that was Einstein's proof of the maxim of perception which states; that if you conceive something that is not readily perceivable to the naked eyes; make it perceivable to the naked eyes, or it does not exist. Thus, Einstein's eclipse example scored a direct hit. And nothing could be more sensational than seeing a thing that was not readily perceivable with the naked eye made perceivable by a scientific prediction.

With regards to gravity, Einstein showed how gravity operates in his theory of general relativity that makes the theory of general relativity 'essentially a theory of gravity. The basic idea is that instead of being an invisible force that attracts objects to one another, (as Newton had said earlier), gravity is a curving or warping of space. The more massive an object, the more it warps the space around it'. For further explanation, Einstein showed the difference between general relativity and special relativity which was that Relativity is two related theories: special relativity which explains the relationship between space, time, mass, and energy; and general relativity which describes how gravity fits into the mix. Einstein proposed these theories starting in 1905. By the 1920s, they were widely accepted by physicists. This is how the imagination works with human reason to conceive realistic ideas (https://www.physics.com).

## 5. Three Limitations of Human Perception: 1) Phenomena, 2) too far away, 3) too tiny to see

*Class*: here is a question: What, if an object is so far away that we cannot see it? Does it cease to exist because we cannot see it? What if an object is too small to be seen by the naked eye? Does it cease to exist because we cannot see it or touch it? The questions of an object being too far away to be seen or properly perceived, or an object being too tiny to be seen reminds us of the limitation of our human faculty of perception that produces our human reality. Philosophers first asked the question; what is reality? And scientists have been trying to explain what reality is without much avail. The question of what reality is, and the difficulty of discovering what reality is, points to the limitations of the faculty of perceptual-mind and its five physical sense organs of human perception.

This means that if we base our knowledge of reality on perception alone, our human knowledge of reality would be very limited to the point of being false. To have true knowledge of reality, we must go beyond the perception of objects of the external world, and revert to the use of conception of ideas and theories to gain knowledge of phenomena that are not perceivable. But the maxim states that anything (including ideas, concepts, theories, phenomena, objects too tiny to see, as well as objects too far away to see) that cannot be perceived do not exist. In other words, or nothing can exist or nothing can be accepted as existing that cannot be perceived.

Is the maxim wrong? No, the maxim that for a thing to exist, it must be perceived, or if a thing cannot be perceived, it does not exist is as certain as the maxim of the speed of light; which states that no object in motion can exceed the speed of light. The best part of the maxim emphasizes that; if you say a thing exists, show it. If you cannot show a thing that you think exists, it certainly does not exist, or you would be able to show it, and if you cannot show it to us, how does it exist? On the other hand, the inability, and inadequacy of the human mind and consciousness to perceive phenomena, or objects too far away, or objects too tiny to see with the naked eye (without scientific instruments) makes the limitations of perception as a measure of existence or truth (according to the maxim of perception) outstanding.

Here are examples of phenomena that we could not perceive with our naked eye if we depended on human perception alone to recognize them as existing. The heliocentric Solar System that shows the eight planets revolving round the Sun, the speed of light, circulation of the blood, germs, quantum mechanics, the theory of evolution, or any theory at all. For the purposes of clarity, our human perception of objects of the external world involves our five physical sense organs of seeing, hearing, smelling, tasting, and feeling. If we can perceive an object with one or two physical sense organ that is enough for the human mind and consciousness to acquire a good idea of what the object is, depending on how far we probe the object. For objects that are close enough for us to see or touch, our perception serves its purpose adequately.

The problem with perception arises when an object is too far away to perceive clearly or too tiny to perceive at all. The other problem of perception is phenomena other than objects that elude perception So, with human perception of objects, so far so good. But what about phenomena that our perception cannot ordinarily help us acquire knowledge of them such as the speed of light, quantum mechanics, or the motions of the Solar System? This is where the second part of the maxim operates inexorably well namely: If it exists, show us, or if you cannot show it to us, it does not exist. The certainty of the maxim that if you say an object exists, show it; reminds us of some outstanding historical figures such as Copernicus, Galileo, Descartes, Darwin, Newton, Einstein, Niels Bohr, The Apostle Paul, etc. The discoveries of these individuals and many more prove that the maxim – to exist, it must be perceived, and what cannot be perceived does not exits; works immutably well all the time.

The limitations of the faculty of the perceptual-mind for human perception based on the reports of our five physical sense organs is made clear by the fact that human beings need the assistance of scientific instruments to perceive phenomena, objects that are too far away, as well as objects that are too tiny for the naked eye to see. So, to perceive phenomena and objects to far away or too tiny to see we have to go beyond the perception of the perceptual-mind to the conception of human reason in addition to the use of scientific instruments. Let us start with Copernicus' cosmology of heliocentric theory that the Sun sits at the center of the Solar System and the plants (including our planet earth) revolve around the Sun.

What high school student has not seen a picture or video of the Solar System? The Solar System as seen on paper is so clear and understandable that people take for granted that that was how the world was created or evolved. Nobody questions the veracity or validity of the Planets moving around the Sun in their orbits in circular motions with such precision and beauty. But what people forget is that for many centuries and millennia humanity's view of the night sky consisted of the Ptolemaic earth-centric planetary theory that was very complicated to understand or explain. So, why did the scientific community change from the Ptolemaic earth-centric planetary theory to the current Copernican heliocentric Solar System?

Here is what happened. First, we had the Ptolemy's cosmology of Ptolemaic earth-centric planetary theory because that was how the faculty of the perceptual-mind of early cosmologists perceived the world when they looked. up the sky in the night. Early cosmologists saw the Moon and numerous stars that made those people wonder quietly but say aloud; 'twinkle, twinkle little Star, how I wonder what you are?'. So, the Ptolemaic earth-centric planetary theory of the universe represented what our ancestors saw or could see in the night sky with their naked eyes for centuries. The Ptolemaic earth-centric planetary universe was our ancestors' perception of the starry skies at night that we human being could perceive with our naked eyes as far as our faculty of perceptual-mind was concerned.

The question is; was the earth-centric planetary theory that Ptolemy devised right or wrong? As far as our naked eyes could see, Ptolemy's planetary theory where the earth was the center of the universe while the Sun and stars moved round the earth was right until Copernicus showed up. Copernicus thought deeply about the motions of the planets and realized that the opposite of Ptolemy's cosmology where the Sun stays put at the center and the earth joined the other planets to go around the Sun would be a better idea. What? But do we not see the Sun up in the sky move from east to west each day, from Sunrise to Sunset every morning and evening? Do we not sometimes see a star shoot from point A to point B in the night sky? Are these not movements of the Sun and stars that we see with our naked eyes?

How could Copernicus say that the Sun stays put and that it was the earth that in conjunction with other planets go around the Sun? What was Copernicus' proof of evidence that our earth – this stationary terra firmer hard-rock-earth we live on actually move in space in its orbit around the Sun? How did Copernicus' helio-centric Solar System theory comply with the maxim of perception that; "if you think the Sun sits at the center of the Solar System show it"? Well, Copernicus could not show any proof of evidence that the Sun sits at the center of the Solar System (as we know it today) but someone called Galileo later bailed Copernicus out with his newly invented telescope that complied with the maxim; "if you say something exists, show it" and vindicated Copernicus as conceiving a better cosmology of the Solar System than our naked eyes perceived about celestial motions.

So, the human conception of Copernicus namely, (our human reason, that unlike our perceptual-mind, has no physical contact with objects in the sky such as the planets), corrected what our faculty of perceptual-mind (that has contact through our eyesight with the moon and stars in the sky) perceived wrongly? The answer is yes, in this instance and in the case of an object in the sky that is too far away or too tiny to be properly perceived, the human reason does a better job than our faculty of perceptual-mind, in giving us information about far away objects and objects too tiny for our naked eyes to see. What about abstract ideas of phenomena that our perceptual-mind has no contact with and that are within the confines and conception of the human reason, does the human reason's concepts prevail in this area too? This is a stark reminder of the limits of the faculty of the perceptual-mind versus the range of human reason to give us knowledge of the external world.

So, Plato was right after all for declaring in his theory of forms that the unperceivable forms of objects are real and the perceived forms of objects are the mere shadows of reality? Not exactly, Plato would have been right if he had grounded his theory of forms in perception by showing the forms of objects or the forms of numbers in drawing which he did not. Remember the immutable maxim of perception? If you think an idea, a concept or phenomenon should be accepted as existent and or as eternal truth, show it to our perception, it must be perceived or it does not exist and cannot be accepted as truth. Did Copernicus ground his conception of the Solar System in perception? The answer is no, Galileo grounded Copernicus groundbreaking heliocentric concept of the Solar System in perception for him and for us with his newly invented telescope remember? The maxim of perception work without exception, always.

Einstein also did what Copernicus had done with regards to things and objects in the sky that are too far away for us to properly be perceived with our naked eye with his theory of relativity. In Einstein's case he was able to ground his conception of gravity (unlike Newton's concept of gravity which Newton failed to ground in perception, which is why Einstein called Newton's concept of gravity 'that Einstein called spooky action at a distance') in perception in obedience with the brutal maxim of

perception namely if you think something exists, show it. So, Newton failed to ground his concept of gravity in perception and this is why Newton's concept of gravity failed the test of validity as ultimate truth, while Einstein who grounded his concept of gravity in perception was accepted as eternal truth.

This is why when Plato failed to ground his theory of forms in perception, Plato's theory of forms failed as the test of being ultimate truth. What does that say about the innate value of the maxim of perception. It says that the maxim of perception is as consistently immutable as the law of the speed of light which says that nothing can exceed the speed of light at least on earth which is also an immutable law of motion on earth.

*Class*: Consider the list of examples here; Plato's theory of forms, Descartes' theory of substances, Hume's theory of perception, Copernicus's theory of heliocentric Solar System, Einstein's theory of relativity and gravity, Niels Bohr's quantum mechanics, Darwin's theory of evolution, Freud's theory of instincts. All of these theories and concepts are phenomena that the human faculty of perception has no contact with, although all of them have to obey the immutable maxim of perception. Then we have Pythagoras' theorem of the angles of a right-angle triangle consisting of 180 degrees, Archimedes theory of buoyancy, *Maxwell's equations* and Faraday's theory of magnetism that led to the invention of the electric motor.

Thus, to obey the inexorable maxim of perception, all discoverers of phenomena, theories, ideas, concepts, have had to ground their discoveries, ideas, theories and concepts in perception through drawings, illustrations, demonstrations, with the assistance of scientific instruments or equations to achieve the quality of validity and acceptance that they enjoy. Equations are a mixture of letters, digits and mathematical symbols that represent specific conceived ideas. So, if Plato had represented his theory of forms in an equation or some formula like Pythagoras' theorem, Plato's theory of forms would have acquired the status of eternal truth.

## 6. Contents of Human Knowledge: Objects versus Phenomena

All the objects we see in the natural world, such as lands, seas, mountains, the sky, moon and stars, the atmosphere, air, water, and living organisms such as plants and animals, as well as concepts, religion, science, and philosophy we know about the world indicate that our human knowledge about the world consists of two main items namely, objects in the world that we perceived, and ideas, concepts, and phenomena that we have conceived about the world. In other words, the compendium of human knowledge is dual consisting of objects and phenomena. These dual forms of knowledge are known as perceptions of the faculty of the perceptual-mind and conceptions of the faculty of human reason.

In other words, the bulk of human knowledge about the world consists of perceptions and conceptions that are knowledge we have perceived as well as knowledge we have conceived. This proves that properly speaking, human knowledge about objects, and living organism in the world consist of the dual natures of what we perceive with our faculty of perceptual-mind, plus concepts and phenomena that we conceive with our human reason. This is why, human beings developed two major faculties of mind. Human beings use one major faculty of mind called the perceptual-mind to provide us with knowledge about objects of the external world through perception. Then we developed a second major faculty of mind known as the human reason to provide us with ideas, concepts, and phenomena, as knowledge through conception.

These two types of knowledge (about objects and phenomena) are recognized by the two main faculties of mind known as (perceptions) of the perceptual-mind and (conceptions) of the human reason. However, these two faculties of mind with their dual forms of knowledge are not the only faculties of mind of the human mind and consciousness. The human mind and consciousness consist of four faculties of mind namely, the perceptual-mind, imagination, reason and superego/conscience. So, if the bulk of human knowledge consists of the perceptions of the faculty of perceptual-mind and conceptions of the human reason, then what about the remaining two faculties of mind known as the imagination and the superego/conscience?

How does the faculties of imagination and superego/conscience provide human beings with knowledge about the world, and by what do we call knowledge provided by the two faculties of imagination and superego/conscience to the human mind and consciousness? These two other faculties of mind also give us knowledge about ideas and phenomena in the world in a different way that enriches the depth of human knowledge. The imagination, like the human reason, is also a conceptual faculty of mind that conceives ideas and phenomena. The imagination has the ability to conceive two types of ideas and phenomena as knowledge.

The first type of ideas and phenomena the imagination conceives is known as fantasy and surrealism that are counter to reality, such as imagining angels flying with feathers, Arabian knights flying on a piece of mat, or half-fish, half-human beings (mermaids) living in the ocean, ghosts and humanoid aliens that invade the earth in flying saucers, genie in a bottle, and others. Clearly, these fantastic images conceived by the imagination are counter to reality and are opposed by the faculty of human reason as unrealistic falsehoods that cannot be taken seriously.

At the same time, the human imagination can conceive realistic ideas and phenomena when it works with the human reason such as, Newton' imagination of gravity as action at a distance between two objects, Einstein's imagination of twin brothers where one flies off into space and thereby age slower than the twin brother on earth. The comparison of the curvature of space/time to the warping of the fabric of a trampoline by a huge object (physics.com). These imaginations by scientists and others indicate that human beings developed the faculty of reason to ground the imaginations fantastic creativity in reality in order to differentiate fairytales from logical concepts and theories of fact.

On the other hand, the type of knowledge the superego/conscience provides is the phenomena of morality that is exclusive to the guidance of human relationships and interdependence with our fellow human beings called intuition. It is the faculty of superego/conscience that provides intuition or intuitive ideas of good behavior and bad behavior, innocence and guilty feelings. The human faculty of superego/conscience also provides concepts of a soul that survives death, and consequences for one's actions in the afterlife that sustain religions, astrology, mysticism, and other mystical experiences (https://study.com)

## 7. Images of Imagination as Conception Versus Objects of the Perceptual-mind as Perception

*Class:* After examining human knowledge of objects perceived by the faculty of perceptual-mind as well as ideas and phenomena (that cannot be readily perceived), conceived by the human reason, it is time to examine the images and fairytales conceived by the human faculty of imagination, which also serve as part of human knowledge. We have learned how the perceptual-mind's perceptions and the human reason's conceptions together form the basis of human knowledge. Now is the time to find out about the type of knowledge that the faculty of imagination provides to the human mind and consciousness.

First of all, the faculty of imagination is also a conceptual faculty of mind that conceives ideas and phenomena as knowledge for the human mind and consciousness, just as the faculty of human reason conceives ideas and phenomena. But unlike the faculty of reason, the imagination uses the perceptions of the faculty of perceptual-mind to form fantastic images and fairytales such as a cow flying over the Moon, and a cat playing a fiddle (guitar), that are (clearly counter to reality) as a form of knowledge. The faculty of imagination's boundless abilities to create unrealistic images and stories of fairytales is the reason for the creation of cartoons (by adults for children) that infants and growing children love so much.

During the period when the perceptual-mind of children try to combine myriads of perceptions of objects of the external world together in order to have some understanding of their environment, kids imagination fills in the gaps with fantasies and fairytales with uncanny ability to create fantastic images out of the blue, or out of thin air for kids' perceptual-minds to assume as explanation of the phenomenon that kids perceptual-minds could not perceive. In other words, kids' imaginations offer fairytales and unrealistic stories as help to their perceptual-minds to cope with the struggle to understand objects and phenomena of their environment. This is how the kid's nursery rhymed: 'Hey diddle, diddle, the cat and the fiddle, the cow jumped over the moon, and the little dog laughed, to see such sport, and the dish ran away with the spoon', illustrate about children's faculties of imagination.

Adults remember how kids' faculties of perceptual-minds are enthralled with puns like "hey diddle, diddle… and the white bearded father Christmas with his troupe of reindeer coming through the chimney with Christmas gifts for them. To the perceptual-mind of kids, father Christmas and his reindeer troupes coming through the chimney into their living rooms, and cows jumping over the Moon ('and the cow jumped over the Moon') makes perfect sense as great stories. As for the last part of the kids' rhyme; viz., and the dish run away with the spoon'. A dish running away with a spoon also makes sense to children's imaginations because the story is connected with food. And infants are all too familiar with "the dish and the spoon".

As toddlers, kids have just graduated from being spoon-fed to spoon feeding themselves. So, imagining that a dish runs away with a spoon falls easily into infants' imagination. This shows how powerful kids imagination affect their perceptual-mind's perception of reality in a way that makes kids assume that fairytales are real, without realizing that it is their imaginations that create the impossible and fantastic images to fill their consciousness. Therefore, the human imagination's ability to conceive fantastic but unrealistic images for the consciousness of kids to assume that fantastic stories are true starts in infancy.

In the early days of human development, the human imagination expanded its ability to create images beyond what is visibly possible without limit. In fact, the human imagination tried to overcome what the faculty of perceptual-mind considers as impossibility. To the human imagination, one-eye giants can walk on earth, and long snake-like dragons breathing fire can come out of the seas, and many-armed gods can rule the earth. To the faculty of imagination nothing was impossible to conceive, so long as the image or story contains piece of objects perceived by the faculty of perceptual-mind. For example, human beings have two hands, so the human imagination created gods with multiple hands to make gods different but comparable to human beings. Human beings have two eyes, so the imagination created one-eye giant gods.

That was a terrifying period for the developing mind and consciousness of early homo erectus, homo habilis, and the Neanderthals. The early homo sapiens began to arrive at the end of this terrifying period of the struggle between the human

faculty of perceptual-mind and the imagination in separating fact from fiction, or the real from the unreal. It was a long-drawn struggle, the perceptual-mind had to reevaluate what moved such as animals and rivers, and fish in rivers, and what stayed put such as plants, rocks, boulders and mountains. For the purposes of survival, the human perceptual-mind needed to make sure that what was certified as staying put in their place such as trees, stayed put and rivers that flowed kept flowing and more importantly, what was not supposed to move did not move, unless somebody pushed it.

It was a fearful period of time for the early homo sapiens. That was the time the sensation of fear in the form of anxiety entered the calculus of the developing mind and consciousness of the early homo sapiens. The human imagination supplied answers for the source of any type of fear the perceptual-mind experienced such as unseen powers gods, genie, and monsters lurked among the things that stayed put but when enraged by human misbehavior suddenly moved the things that were not supposed to move. And the first most obvious unseen power was the wind. So, the wind became the first unseen and hidden power that moved rocks trees, and forests out of anger at human beings as demonstrated by hurricanes, tornados, and even earthquakes.

The human imagination gave names to mysterious unseen powers as gods and goddesses, the devil, genies, ghosts, demons. And the human imagination made up rules for appeasing the gods which human being have to obey to avoid angering the gods. Next, the imagination provided the reasons why the gods sometimes suddenly moved things that naturally stayed put and were not supposed to be move when the gods got angry. This was the basis of sacrifice to the appease the anger of the gods. Thus, the gods supposedly moved things that stayed put with the force and fury displayed by earthquakes, tsunamis, tornadoes, hurricanes and the most terrifying of all, volcanoes that spewed fire and brimstone from the underworld into the sky when early homo sapiens supposedly made the gods angry.

The imagination's attribution of the anger of the violence of "mother nature" to the anger of the gods seemed perfectly obvious and even reasonable, since anger evokes violence in both human being and even animals. So, when the gods became angry, they got violent and displayed the fury of nature, through forest fires, volcanoes earthquakes, tornados, and rainstorms. Thus, the human imagination became the problem solver for the faculty of perceptual-mind of the human consciousness. That is how mysteries of phenomena that the perceptual-mind of early Man could not understand got solved by the human imagination of the early homo sapiens. So, the perceptual-mind of early homo sapiens assumed as fact, any fancy, myth, and fairytale the imagination offered as an easy solution to any phenomenon or problem that the faculty of perceptual-mind of early human beings could not readily perceive.

This was how many misunderstood phenomena were assumed to be true without any basis in reality by the evolving perceptual-mind of the early human mind and consciousness. The prevalence of assumptions, fantasies, and fairytales, of the imagination that were taken for granted as facts overwhelmed and undermined the perceptual-mind's perception of objects of the external world as factual knowledge. Thus, in the developing human mind and consciousness of early human beings, their perceptual-minds could not distinguish between facts and fiction, or phantom from reality, where ghosts, witches and genie roamed freely among village people.

On the other hand, the distinction between objects and images, what was real and what was not real was very deemed important by the faculty of perceptual-mind for the establishment of factual knowledge for the developing mind and consciousness of the maturing homo sapiens.

That was the right time for the development and emergence of the human faculty of reason in the human mind and consciousness to sort out the difference between what was fact from what was fiction, to differentiate zombies from normal people, objects from phantoms, and what was real from what was unreal. And when the human reason with its ability of logical analysis was able to separate facts from fiction, and assumptions from truth, the human reason established the maxim of perception for the faculty of perceptual-mind within the human mind and consciousness. This was how the faculty of perceptual-mind established the maxim of perception as a strict inescapable law, to challenge the human imagination to wit; for any idea or phenomenon to be accepted as factual or truth, what was conceived (by the imagination and human reason) must be made perceivable to the perceptual-mind in order to clean up the confusion created by the human imagination.

Thus, whenever the human reason became lazy and complaisant in assuming ideas, concepts and theories as facts, the maxim of perception reminded the human reason to prove beyond reasonable doubt that what the reason conceived was perceived and understood by the faculty of perceptual-mind, or it does not exist. This was the basis for the development of the faculty of human reason as the third faculty of the human mind and consciousness. Therefore, the human mind and consciousness developed the faculty of reason (as the third faculty mind), to separate facts from fiction, and to clean up the confusion that the faculty of imagination had created for the faculty of perceptual-mind.

The need for the human reason to distinguish facts from fiction led the human reason to develop the ability of skepticism against the credulity of the faculty of perceptual-mind. The human reason developed the ability of strict logical analysis of facts that separated truth from assumptions, and facts from fiction to replace the imagination's fantasies and fairytales. Thus, the human reason's logical analysis became the basis of the maxim of perception for all ideas theories and concepts conceived by either the imagination ore reason accepted as factual. Thus, the human reason emerged to lay a strict line of demarcation between facts and assumptions so that nothing could be assumed as fact without proof of scientific or historical evidence.

Therefore, the human reason established the law of knowledge known as the maxim of perception to bind all three faculties of namely, the perceptual-mind, imagination and reason, which stated that whatever idea, story, or concept conceived by either the imagination or human reason must be explained and made perceivable to the perception of the perceptual-mind in order to certified as real or as objective reality. This was how the maxim of perception got permanently set as a frame of reference for the validity and reliability of knowledge for philosophy and science in all fields of inventions, discoveries and theories underscored by the scientific method.

So, are images real? As representations of actual objects that makes it possible to think about objects in the absence of those objects, images are real. After all, images of objects in our minds and consciousness is the only knowledge we have about objects of the external world. But the images of the fantasies and impossible fairytales woven by the human imagination such as ghosts, and spirits, and gods, and demons or 'a dish running away with a spoon, those images are not real when cast against

the maxim of perception. In short, all images, ideas, concepts, theories and discoveries by both the faculties of reason and imagination must pass the criteria of the maxim of perception to qualify as true knowledge.

## 8. Intuitive Knowledge by the Superego/conscience versus Perception by the Perceptual-mind

Whiles the faculties of perceptual-mind and human reason serve as the sources of knowledge about objects and phenomena of the external world, the human imagination and the superego/conscience, serve as the sources of human fantasies, morality, and personal relationships with each other and with all other living organisms. The faculties of perceptual-mind and human reason are the two major faculties of mind. On the other hand, the human faculties of imagination and superego/conscience are the two minor faculties of mind that are the sources of our fantasies and morality. It is somewhat like in sports, where we have the big leagues and little leagues, the main players and the supporting players.

With regards to knowledge from the faculty of superego/conscience, the human superego/conscience neither perceives nor conceive knowledge for the human mind and consciousness. The faculty of superego/conscience has its own method of acquiring knowledge about objects and phenomena of the external world within the human thinking system. The special method by which the faculty of superego/conscience provides the human mind and consciousness with knowledge is known as intuition or an intuitive ability. The superego/conscience provides knowledge about objects and phenomena not only to human beings, but the superego/conscience provides knowledge about objects and phenomena to plants, animals as well, (refer to my research articles about plants consciousness and intelligence from The International Journal of Social Sciences (IJSS) , September, & October, 2024 and The International Journal of Clinical Psychiatry (IJCP) July and August, 2024.

This is because the superego/conscience acts as Cosmic Consciousness that underly all intelligence found in all living organism. And as the underlying intelligence Cosmic Consciousness of all living organisms, the superego/conscience's method of providing knowledge to all forms of organisms of plants, animals, and human beings is the same method of intuition. And as explained in my early writing on plants' consciousness, intuition is sudden and unthought of. Therefore, *the source of human morality is the superego/conscience, and the source of human comedy and fantasy is the human imagination.* Now fantasy and comedy exists in phenomenal world, while morality of the relationship between human beings and other living things (that form objects of the external world) exist alongside with the knowledge of the objective world in general.

## 9. The Maxim of Perception: Underlies Science & Philosophy versus Religion based on Faith

The need of scientific instruments to increase human knowledge.

Class: What is the need of scientific instruments? Why do we need scientific instruments to help us know what is far away and what is too tiny for our eyes to see or our ears, to hear? The human need for scientific instruments to assist us to peer deeper into reality boils down to two limitations about the human mind and consciousness namely, 1) the inability of the human perceptual-minds to perceive phenomena as well as or objects too far away or objects too tiny to see with our naked eyes. And 2) the maxim of perception which states that what is conceived must be perceived to be accepted as existent or it does not exist.

Hence, the only sure way of showing that phenomena exists is often through scientific instruments. Hence the invention of telescopes, microscopes, thermometers, stethoscopes, telephones, radios, cars, airplanes, missiles, and thousands of gadgets and instruments and ultimately artificial intelligence (AI). What needs to be emphasized is that all the phenomena that cannot be perceived by the faculty of perceptual-mind are conceived by the human reason and human imagination. In other words, it is because of the inability of the perceptual-mind to perceive phenomena that the human mind and consciousness developed the faculties of reason and imagination to conceive unperceivable things for us with the aid of scientific instruments.

What this means is that it was because of the inability of the perceptual-mind as the first faculty of mind to create images that the human mind developed the faculty of imagination with creative abilities. And it was because of the human imagination's excessive creation of unrealistic fantasies which undermined the stability of the perceptions of the perceptual-mind (about objects of the external world) that the human mind and consciousness developed the faculty of human reason (as the third faculty of mind) to differentiate the fantasies of unrealism by the human imagination from perceptions of objects of the external world of the faculty of perceptual-mind, for the validity and confidence in human knowledge.

In other words, the human reason developed after the development of the faculties of perceptual-mind and imagination, with the ability of logical analysis to assist with the certainty of knowledge between objects perceived by the perceptual-mind, and the unrealistic fairytales created by the human imagination. Thus, it became a struggle between the human reason's control of reality and the imagination's excess fantasies that led to the establishment of the maxim of perception to wit: what is conceived (by either the reason or imagination) must be made perceivable to the perceptual-mind in order to be accepted as part of reality.

After the development of the faculty of human reason, the faculty of mind known as the superego/conscience developed as the last faculty of mind that was concerned with concepts of good and bad, right and wrong, guilt and innocence in human relationships that made the difference between human beings and their animal cousins complete. This is the complete picture of the development of the four faculties of mind namely, the perceptual-mind, imagination, reason, and superego/conscience that provides the human mind and consciousness everything human beings can know about reality.

## 10. Recommendation for Further Research

The next area of research to expand the academic knowledge into the human mind and consciousness requires highlighting how the human thinking system (involving the four faculties of mind) work to produce the phenomenon of good people, bad people, good behavior bad and behavior that affect the lives of all peoples in the world. The specific problem to be analyzed relates to the questions: How do people actually think? What is the mental source of human behavior? How do the four faculties of mind influence the behaviors of good and bad people?

## 11. Conclusion

Class: Here is an intriguing thought: The fact that without the assistance of scientific instruments, human knowledge, whether perceived or conceived would be hopelessly limited and inadequate to give human beings complete knowledge of reality, suggests that there is something fundamentally inadequate about the ability of the human mind and consciousness to know the true nature of reality. What seems wrong about the human mind and consciousness (in spite of having four faculties of mind

and the establishment of the maxim of perception) is in one word, limitation. The limitations of our five physical sense organs, as well as the limitations of the four faculties of mind to know the true nature of reality.

The structure of consciousness consists of two main parts in the form of the "I" and the "me" of the human mind that is not always apparent but undeniably present in the thoughts of. Also, not obviously known is the fact that both the "I" and the "me" are part of the four faculties of mind that make up the human mind and consciousness. But among the four faculties of mind within the human mind and consciousness is the phenomenon of a divided mind in the form of the "I" and the "me" that oppose each other whenever people weigh the consequences of their actions in times of serious cases when faced with life and death, or profit and loss situations.

Therefore, awareness of the "I" and the "me" within the human mind and consciousness is not just a philosophical nicety or semantic play of words. The "I" and the "me" of consciousness represent the two biggest faculties of mind namely, the faculty of perceptual-mind and the faculty of human reason, both of which give human beings ideas of perception and conception in the human thought processes.

Furthermore, what is not always clear, which must be made crystal clear at the end of this research is the answers to the questions; 1) which faculty of mind represents the "I" of the personality, and 2) which faculty of mind represents the "me" of the personality? And the crystal- clear answer is that the "I" of the personality represents *the first faculty of mind called the faculty of perceptual-mind* that you are now hearing about for the first time. In plain English, whenever a person says "I do" (for example in marriage vows), or when a person says; I will…, or I can…, that is the faculty of perceptual-mind of that person speaking. That means that the perceptual-mind is the first singular noun "I" and "my", of each person in the world.

That is why every person young or old, stupid or wise invokes the singular now "I" to represent themselves in any speech. For example, I said that… I did that… I will go… I am the owner of this and that. I own that etc. People use the "I" to be the center of a room full of people, to be the initiator of action in any gathering. People use the "I" to draw attention to themselves regardless of their status so long as they can find the opportunity to be the center of attention.

However, the faculty of perceptual-mind that craves the use of the "I", is not a new faculty of mind, but the old faculty of mind that gives human beings *the ability of perception* (which is why it is called the faculty of perceptual-mind), that David Hume fought so hard to establish it (the perceptual-mind as the most important faculty of mind) for the scientific method, and not the human reason proposed by Plato. It was perceptions of the faculty of perceptual-mind and not conceptions of the human reason that came to be known as *the empirical method for the validation of social science research*, remember? This is because it is the faculty of perceptual-mind is the only faculty of mind that acts as the conduit to the five physical sense organs that directly connects each person to objects of the external world.

Now, the "me" of each person is the reflective part of the personality represented by the faculty of human reason that has the ability to conceive ideas and make logical inferences and propositions to consequences human actions that was recommended by Plato to guide all human interactions. The "me" of the personality is not the aggressor, the "me" of each person is the sufferer, the avenger, and sometimes the forgiver. Take a look at the "me" in this interaction with another person; "you told

"me" that you loved "me", when you did not. You disrespected "me" and took "me" for a fool. Now you want me to forgive you? No, you must apologize to "me".

It is clear that in this example, it was "you" acting as the aggressive "I" of your personality that did something to "me" as the sufferer. I was not the first-person aggressor. You were the first-person aggressor who took center stage to hurt my feelings. This is why I will not forgive you. When an aggrieved person says; I won't forgive you until you apologize to me, what it means is that my "I" which is my perceptual-mind as the aggressor faculty of mind within me, has taken over the interaction from the "me" (which is the sufferer) of my personality to avenge or retaliate the hurt "you" inflicted on me.

The best analogy is the computer keyboard. There are two delete buttons on a computer keyboard namely, backspace button, and delete button. They both delete a written mistake. But the backspace button is the aggressor delete button that strikes to delete the wrong word, while the delete button is the avenger delete button that does not strike, but pulls in the wrong word to delete it. So, the backspace button is the aggressor delete button while the delete button is the avenger delete button. In the same way, both the "I" and the "me" faculties of mind represent the same personality. But one is forward going, while the other is a layback faculty of mind.

In human relationships and in normal speech, the domination of the "I" over the "me" is so rapid, natural, and overwhelming that the "I" aggressively pushing over the "me" is hardly noticeable. But in times of crisis, in times of regret, when admission of guilt or an apology is needed, that is when the aggressive "I" of the personality backs down to allow the "me" of each person namely, the human reason to analyze the situation, to reason with the perceptual-mind of each person, to reflect on the gravity of the situation and propose an amicable offer of settlement.

Now, each of these two big faculties of mind known as (the faculty of perceptual-mind and faculty of human reason) has its close associate or assistant which it usually works with that together takes an opposing position during decisions of a person, that leads to the phenomenon of the divided mind or As William James put it; the divided self of the "I" that often opposes the "me" of the human personality. Thus, within the divided mind of human consciousness, the faculty of perceptual-mind is often the protagonist with the faculty of imagination as its close associate and loyal assistant. And the faculty of human reason often turns out to be the antagonist with its close associate and loyal assistant namely, the superego/conscience.

This is the layout of the phenomenon of the divided mind or the divided self of the "I" and the "me" among the two major faculties of mind, each with its close associate that portrays the constant internal mental conflict of thought so plainly described by Shakespeare through the words of Hamlet; 'to be or not to be, that is the question'. The phenomenon of the divided mind in the human thinking system constitutes the highly complex and unfathomable nature of the human mind and consciousness, which this research has surfaced as the underlying structure of consciousness that indicates a well-balanced human consciousness under normal circumstances.

## 12. Dedication

This research is dedicated to Plato and Freud; as the only two thinkers who established the theory of faculties of mind for the human mind and consciousness as the starting point of the study of human knowledge and behavior. This research is also dedicated to all the Fraters and Sorors around the world.

## REFERENCES

1. Bernard GR. Copernicus' and the Origin of his Heliocentric System. J Hist Astron. 2002;33(3):219-35.
2. Einstein's Theory of General Relativity: Space/time example of 'the trampoline and big bowling ball on it. Planets do the same thing in space. Study.Com (https://study.com/academy)
3. Freud's Theories of id, ego, superego: The superego is the ethical component of the personality provides the moral standards by which the ego. The superego's criticisms, prohibitions, and inhibitions form a person's conscience, and its positive aspirations and ideals represent one's idealized self-image, or "ego ideal Britannica (https://www.britannica.com)
4. Lutz J, Sylvester K, Oliver K, et al. Discovering Newton's Laws of motion: For every action there is an equal opposite reaction. Phys Teach. 2017;55(3)149-51.
5. Lavine TZ. From Socrates to Sartre: The Philosophic Quest. New York City: Bantam Books, USA; 1984.
6. James W. The theory of the self: The Divided self, the "I" and the "me". 1895.