



## A New Theory of Consciousness: The Four Constituent Parts of Consciousness

**Frank Asamoah Frimpong**

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

Citation: Frank Asamoah Frimpong (2025) A New Theory of Consciousness: The Four Constituent parts of Consciousness. J.of Psy Ins Review 1(3), 01-29. WMJ/JPIR-110

### Abstract

*The inquiry about the breakdown of consciousness into its natural elements starts by categorizing consciousness into two major types of conscious activities that are different from each other such as: Cosmic Consciousness versus brain consciousness. The second breakdown of consciousness is to separate brain consciousness to differentiate human brain consciousness from animal brain consciousness. The third breakdown of consciousness identified Cosmic Consciousness as a specific type of consciousness for trees and plants. The fourth breakdown of consciousness is the familiar breakdown of human brain consciousness that Plato wrote as (The Tripartite Soul of Man) which subsequent philosophers Hume, Descartes, Kant, and Freud argued about, and tried to change or improve upon, which is known as the three faculties of mind. Detailed definition of these four different types of consciousnesses began when this research asked the question; what is Consciousness? The findings of this research suggest that Consciousness consists of an initial Cosmic Consciousness that preceded brain consciousness, and gave rise to brain consciousness. That Cosmic Consciousness was the first original consciousness that emerged on earth and also gave rise to all living organisms such as; plants, animals, and human beings. That it was Cosmic Consciousness that give all living organisms a) sensitivity, b) sentience, and c) intelligence. In other words, Cosmic Consciousness infused and inhered all living organisms as the common denominator of conscious sensitivity, conscious sentience, and conscious intelligence. For example, the proof that living organisms such as trees and plants have Cosmic Consciousness is their ability to exhibit conscious sensitivity, sentience, and intelligence. Therefore, any living organism that exhibits conscious sensitivity, sentience, or intelligence that are characteristics of Cosmic Consciousness is proof that such a living organism has Cosmic Consciousness. The second major division of consciousness is the separation of brain consciousness into two different types of consciousness as; human brain consciousness from animal brain consciousness. The third category of consciousness is the specific consciousness for trees and plants that do not have brains namely, Cosmic Consciousness. Plants exhibit conscious sensitivity, sentience, and intelligent abilities. This indicates plant's ability to use Cosmic Consciousness. For example, plants engage in conscious activities of survival and perpetuation of their species. Plants germinate, grow, feed on nutrients in the soil, produce offspring, grow old, and die like humans and animals. Thus, all three categories of living organisms such as plants, animals, and humans, exhibit either attributes of Cosmic Consciousness or brain consciousness. Hence, neuroscientists, physicists, and philosophers, who define consciousness in ignorance of the existence of Cosmic Consciousness, have not done their due diligence of rigorous scientific inquiry about the full scope of consciousness (that definitely includes Cosmic Consciousness), as they should.*

**\*Corresponding author:** Frank Asamoah Frimpong, PhD, Department of Psychology, The Chicago School (Los Angeles), United States.

**Submitted:** 10.07.2025

**Accepted:** 17.07.2025

**Published:** 25.07.2025

**Keywords:** Polygamy, Rohingya, Refugee, Displacement, Social, Illiterate

## Introduction

**Class:** This academic research started with the determination to break down consciousness into its different categories or constituent parts. To do that, we asked a series of questions regarding the definition of consciousness. Obviously, the first question was; what is consciousness? This is the same question that Dr Lawrence Kuhn of (Closer to Truth) asked many of the smartest people on the planet that he interviewed. Some of the Academics interviewed by Kuhn's "Closer to Truth" include; philosophers, psychologists, theologians, atheists, physicists, mathematicians, biologists, zoologists, and neuroscientists.

That was basically anyone who was recognized as an academic, a thinker, and scientist. In his numerous interviews, Dr Kuhn received a lot of different definitions of consciousness, none of which seemed to be a definitive satisfactory answer to the simple question; what is consciousness? However, Dr Kuhn settled for answers that he called 'Closer-to-Truth'.

This research is determined to breakdown consciousness into its proper categories or atomic parts (a task that physicists have conveniently avoided to do), in an attempt to give a more scientifically definitive answer to the question of what consciousness is. This research has wondered why scientists, especially physicists, who have tried to define consciousness did not breakdown consciousness into its constituent elemental or atomic parts, which is the first thing physicists like do with the definition of anything they investigate. Therefore, the most important question about consciousness is about the breakdown of consciousness. In other words, to define consciousness, one must first breakdown consciousness into elements or its constituent parts.

To break down consciousness into any scientifically recognized definitive parts, we must first point out that breaking down consciousness to its proper cate-

gories is not only the duty of physicists, it is the fundamental and quintessential scientific method of properly defining any observed object in nature, any concept, or any idea of reality. Yet since the word consciousness was substituted for the word mind in the 1990s by physicists, the word consciousness, (which has become the name that has replaced words about the human mind, in all scientific analysis, and general usage), consciousness has never been broken down into its constituent parts by any scientist, philosopher, psychologist or physicist.

What is so difficult about breaking down consciousness into its constituent parts? The first obvious answer is that scientists, philosophers, neuroscientists and physicists cannot break down consciousness into any constituent part at all, otherwise physicists and neuroscientists would have broken down consciousness into its minutest parts as the first to do in defining consciousness. On the other hand, neuroscientists have broken down the human brain (which they equate with consciousness) into various constituent parts to show which part of the brain becomes active in use or is responsible for what feelings or sensation a person enjoys or suffers.

What about consciousness? And if physicist and neuroscientists are unable to break down consciousness into its constituent parts (as they have broken down the brain into its constituent parts), what does that say about neuroscientists and physicists' knowledge about consciousness?

On the other hand, neuroscientists who together are the cheerleaders of knowledge about human brain-consciousness, have broken down the human brain (which they closely associate with consciousness) into six sections or constituent parts that shows which part of the brain is active according to what a person was feeling or thinking about such as; the frontal lobe, occipital lobe, the limbic system, the

amygdala, the hippocampus, the hypothalamus, and thalamus, each with its own specific functions. The brain has also been divided into a left-brain, right-brain counterparts. Each part of the brain can be shown to brightly light up when that constituent part of the brain was activated when a person thinks about specific things in a controlled experiment. Northwestern Medicine [1].

Hence, why can't physicists break down consciousness into its elemental parts or its constituent parts? The same physicists who cannot break down consciousness into its constituent parts have broken down (the atom – a particle that nobody has ever seen with their naked eye) into its constituent parts of electrons, protons, quarks, and muons. So, what is so difficult about breaking down consciousness into its constituent parts? Physicists and neuroscientists should be able to break down consciousness into its constituent parts with no difficulty at all, if their knowledge about the definition of consciousness is scientifically vigorous and reliable.

**Student A:** Sir, without any further ado, let us hear the breakdown of consciousness. What are the constituent parts of consciousness that gives a good scientific picture of consciousness?

**Professor:** Consciousness has been already broken-down consciousness into its first major dual constituent parts in the abstract as Cosmic Consciousness versus brain consciousness. I also broke down consciousness into more constituent parts when I re-defined consciousness remember? (see the Paper on consciousness titled: Redefining Consciousness).

**Student B:** What was the breakdown of consciousness again?

**Professor:** If you can remember, since physicists discarded mind (as in the human mind) and replaced it with the word consciousness, consciousness was assumed to arise out of the human brain only and nothing else. Therefore, consciousness was presumed to be a monolithic monist phenomenon with no constituent parts just like a magic glass ball similar to a human brain that can be held in the palm of one's hand.

**Student C:** But you just showed that neuroscientists have not only broken down the brain into its constituent parts but neuroscientists have been able to show which part of the human brain was activated or dormant at any time. What about consciousness?

**Professor:** That is true about the human brain but apparently breaking down consciousness is seemingly impossible, and that is the question we face. Can you imagine the shock of physicists for hearing that a researcher has been able to breakdown consciousness into its initial constituent parts as consisting of; Cosmic Consciousness and brain-consciousness?

**Student D:** So, the breakdown of consciousness is just two or dual and that is it, or can consciousness be further broken down into smaller units down the line?

**Professor:** Of course, consciousness can be further broken down as this research is about to show. Long before this research attempted to break down consciousness into the first initial dual parts as Cosmic consciousness versus brain-based consciousness, the philosopher Plato had already broken-down consciousness into three constituent parts known as Plato's "Tripartite Soul of Man", remember? But Plato's breakdown of consciousness referred to human brain consciousness only. This research's breakdown of consciousness includes a new never-before known division and part of consciousness, called, Cosmic Consciousness as opposed to brain consciousness in the first proper division of consciousness into its natural constituent parts.

**Student F:** How does your breakdown of consciousness differ from the breakdown of consciousness by Plato?

**Professor:** Well, Plato's attempt to break down consciousness involved the human thinking processes that derives from the human brain consciousness only. Plato's division or categorization of consciousness (a.k.a. human mind) did not include Cosmic consciousness. Plato was only concerned with categorizing the human thought process (which was apparently presumed to be limited to the human brain) as arising from for example, the human reason, perception, and imagination.

**Student G:** So, why change it? Why challenge Plato? Where does Cosmic Consciousness come from?

**Professor:** This research is not changing Plato's breakdown of consciousness, nor are we challenging Plato's idea of breaking down consciousness into three aspects of the mind.

**Student H:** But you are. You are challenging and changing Plato's breakdown of consciousness by adding something else you call, Cosmic Consciousness.

**Professor:** The first thing one must remember about Plato's breakdown of consciousness is that, Plato did not consider his breakdown of the human thought process as breaking down consciousness beyond the human thinking processes. Plato broke down the human mind as consisting of three categories of the human thinking system. In that ancient time, Plato spoke about the human mind, not human consciousness. Thus, Plato first broke down the human mind into four categories as:

- Reason/Dialectic.
- Understanding/Mathematics.
- Belief/Perception.
- Conjecture/Imagining, which he later standardized as the Tripartite Soul of Man.

**Student I:** So, why are you adding Cosmic Consciousness which nobody has heard of as being part of the breakdown of consciousness?

**Professor:** The second thing to remember about why we are speaking about consciousness and not mind, is that in nature, as time goes on, new eras and new discoveries of new ideas emerge. The fact that Plato did not include Cosmic Consciousness in his breakdown of consciousness does not mean that Cosmic Consciousness could not be discovered and included later in new discoveries about the nature of consciousness.

**Professor:** The third thing to remember is that people discover new ideas all the time and a researcher who discovers a new idea or a new concept does not think in terms of challenging people who discovered old ideas. A researcher who discovers new ideas

thinks of challenging the old ideas and old concepts that have exhausted their usefulness and have become obsolete, but not the person who discovered the old idea or concept.

**Professor:** Thus, when Einstein wrote his theory of Special Relativity and General Relativity, he did not think in terms of challenging Newton. Instead, Einstein knew that he had discovered new ideas about Gravity, the speed of light, and Space/time etc., that needed to replace the old ideas of the pull of some mysterious thing at a distance called gravity. Got it?

**Professor:** So, this present breakdown of consciousness picks up from where Plato left off and actually attempts to improve Plato's theory of mind that consisted of Plato's Tripartite Soul of Man, in the same way Freud also tried to improve Plato's theory of Tripartite Soul of Man, which Freud standardized as the three faculties of mind.

**Student J:** So, let us hear the new breakdown of consciousness into all of its proper categories or its correct constituent parts.

**Professor:** Sure, Class: You will see as I have pointed out that this improved breakdown of consciousness that now includes Cosmic consciousness, elucidates the expansive nature of and analysis of consciousness beyond the human brain that is beyond any scientific doubt. By the end of this research, this Class will have a clear understanding of how factual and scientifically indisputable this breakdown of consciousness is. It will be clear why scientists especially physicists, find it difficult to break down consciousness into its natural, elemental or constituent parts. But to do that, we need to reference the historical literature in order to use Plato's breakdown of the faculties of the human mind or rather the constituent parts of consciousness to explain the present breakdown of consciousness between Cosmic Consciousness, human brain consciousness, and animal brain consciousness as well as plants and trees consciousness.

**Professor:** After Plato settled on his theory of the Tripartite Soul of Man or (the three types of men) as a part Plato's theory of forms, theory of ethics, and the theory of knowledge by the human reason, Plato's theory of mind took shape and became the standard



philosophy of mind for others to study. That was why the philosophers that followed Plato namely, Descartes, Hume, Kant and others after reading Plato's theory of mind wrote their own philosophies of mind, without directly addressing Plato's breakdown of the human mind into its three constituent parts, that turned out to be different theories of knowledge.

Instead, each philosopher for example, Descartes, Hume, Kant and Freud wrote their own theory of knowledge about everything else but the breakdown of the human mind into any specific constituent parts or categories of thought. It was the psychologist Sigmund Freud who attempted to duplicate and improve Plato's theory of the Tripartite Soul of Man with his own theory of id, ego, superego faculties of mind that the world is stuck with today.

Descartes whose philosophy followed right after Plato, wrote his own philosophy that barely touched on the human mind. What Descartes did was to merely affirm his awareness of the existence of his own mind based on the fact that he was keenly aware of his thoughts arising out of his own mind regardless of whether his opinion was right or wrong. Notice that Descartes veered away from categorizing the mind into faculties of mind as Plato had done. Instead, Descartes focused on the fact of being in control of ideas arising out of his mind. Hence, his affirmation that 'I think therefore I am...' 'I am a thinking person'..., I am a witness to my own thoughts about the mechanical nature of how the world works.

So, after Descartes had affirmed the certainty of his own mind and thoughts, he went on to propound a new theory of the mechanical universe that worked like clockwork.

Then, Descartes circled back to present his ideas about different substances of the mind versus the body which he assumed was quite apparent for everyone to see. For example, Descartes assumed that it was agreed that the human mind and soul was spiritual while the body was physical. Thus, the substance of the soul and mind being spiritual must obviously be different from the substance of the body which is physical. Hence, Descartes formulated his theory of different substances as an idea that was so apparent that it did not need any further explanation.

But Descartes soon found out that his idea that the mind and soul were composed of a different substance from the physical body was not "agreed upon by everyone" as he had assumed, when Princess Elizabeth asked Descartes to explain how the different substance of the mind could push the equally different substance of the physical body to action? For example, how does the mind of persons command their legs to get up and run? This now famous question from Princess Elizabeth who had been trying to follow Descartes' new philosophy has become the world-famous 'Descartes' body-mind problem' in philosophy. That was how Descartes theory of mind that sidestepped Plato's philosophy of mind ended. Descartes failed to write a real theory of mind. That is why Descartes is famous for a theory of the mechanical world.

### **Hume Versus Plato: The Perceptual-Mind Versus Reason, (Breakdown of Consciousness)**

When David Hume came along and read Plato and Descartes philosophy, he realized that the great truths that Plato, Descartes and the early Greek philosophers had propounded were not based on any observable facts or on any evidence that anybody could point to and say look at the evidence Plato or Descartes presented. Rather, Hume found that all the great philosophies that were regarded as eternal truths may have been based on reasonings, fantasies and abstract thoughts of the philosophers who propounded them without any factual basis. Therefore, according to Hume, the so-called eternal truths lacked the realism of being perceived by anybody except those philosophers. That the great truths were all in the heads of the philosophers. Nobody could fact-check what the philosophers proclaimed to be eternal truths.

So, Hume turned skeptic. He challenged the validity of the truth, or the validity of the theories of how the world was created and how life originated as unreliable proclamations pounded by the philosophers who came before him. Hume asked for any proof that anybody could perceive by their own five physical sense organs as factual evidence, or evidence based on any scientific instruments about the statements that Plato, Descartes and other early philosophers had proclaimed as ultimate truths. But there were no proof of evidence. Hume noted that none of the ideas and theories of earlier philosophers were based on any factual observation.

Hume discovered that through his skeptic questioning, he found that none of the theories of any philosopher was based on any observable proof of evidence by any human physical sense organs of seeing, smelling, feeling or tasting. Therefore, Hume declared that the ideas the philosophers proclaimed to be eternal truths had no validity to be regarded as ultimate truth in reality. Hume showed that any ideas or theories that could not be directly or indirectly perceived through the five physical sense organs was unreliable and therefore utterly useless as ultimate truth. The philosophers were stunned because they realized that Hume was right in pointing out the unreliability of the apprehension of the human reason, compared to observations of human perception of facts through the five physical sense organs or through scientific instrumentation.

The difference between the human reason's apprehension of ideas and theories of ultimate truth, versus perception of ideas through the five physical sense organs as factual evidence of truth was Hume's great contribution to philosophy that any person ever made towards the validity of any philosophical pronouncements. This difference between the conception or apprehension of ideas by the human reason versus the perception of facts through the five physical sense organs of seeing, hearing, smelling, tasting and feeling, is of the utmost importance not only in philosophy but in science as well.

The difference between human conception (of ideas) by the faculty of reason versus the perception (of ideas) through the five physical sense organs is of the utmost significance with regards to the breakdown of consciousness into specific categories or elements of consciousness. And the proper breakdown of consciousness into its correct constituent parts or elements cannot be overstated for the proper understanding of how the human mind or human consciousness works in directing the thoughts and actions of a person.

**Class:** Furthermore, Hume made two other major contributions to Plato's philosophy of mind 1), Hume's demand for scientific proof of truth through observation of facts by perception (with the five physical senses or by scientific instrumentation), led to the demand by scientists for rigorous scientific

inquiry of observation of facts that has become the fundamental principle of what is now called 'the scientific method'. Secondly, Hume's demand for proof of truth through observation by the five physical sense organs also became the equivalent of the scientific method for the social sciences (known as 'empirical proof') in all social science research.

Thus, Hume provided students, researchers and professors the best proof of validity of any findings of any research that any scientist of "the hard sciences" or social sciences, can use as reference to the validity and reliability of the results of any research. So, it was Hume and not Newton who laid down the true foundation of what rigorous scientific inquiry is in science. What Newton did in making the scientific method the preeminent basis of any scientific inquiry is that Newton divested 'the scientific method' from metaphysics. Newton scrubbed 'the scientific method' clean of any mention of metaphysical ideas of the soul, ether, and God.

Unfortunately, Hume missed a great opportunity to establish perception-through-the-five-physical-sense-organs as a specific faculty of mind (which this research Paper now calls the perceptual-mind) that is comparable to the faculty of reason. Such faculty of perceptual-mind represents the fountain of information received by the mind through the brain acting as the conduit of inflow of sensations from the five physical sense organs. This would have been consistent with Plato's modes thinking that consisted of

- Reason.
- Mathematics/Dialectic.
- Belief/Opinion.
- Imagination/conjecture, where the perceptual-mind would be responsible for the interpretation of sensations for the formation of opinion.

These three faculties of mind would have improved Plato's theory of mind, which would have established Hume's new theory of mind as great improvement of Plato's Tripartite Souls of Man, that would have been acceptable to the philosophers and scientists of that period.

Unfortunately, Hume failed to establish perception by the five physical sense organs as a specific, independent, faculty of mind (namely, the perceptual-mind)

to compete with the human reason that Plato relied upon for his ideas of ultimate truth. While Hume defended perception as a specific mental activity, he failed to establish perception as the specific faculty of mind that Plato downplayed in comparison to the human reason. But for some strange reason, Hume failed to argue for perception as a specific faculty of mind as explained herein by ScienceDirect as: The psychology of perception refers to the study of how individuals interpret and make sense of their surroundings through the computations performed by their perceptual systems, involving both behavioral and biological frameworks. (ScienceDirect. <https://www.sciencedirect.com>).

In spite of the absence of a faculty of mind (called the perceptual-mind) as the conduit for sensations from the five physical sense organs, this research has provided indisputable evidence of the fact that perception by the five physical sense organs flows into the mental cognition of a person through a specific faculty of mind known as “the perceptual-mind”. This is how perception of facts by the perceptual-mind has now become the benchmark of empirical proof of evidence for any research findings according to empiricism in the social sciences. This, in spite of Hume missing the opportunity to establish “the perceptual-mind” as the specific faculty of mind for the five physical sense organs based on the perceptual-mind’s ability to interpret sensations of sight, scent, auditory, taste, and feeling, into conscious ideas within the mind for human thoughts that Hume based his entire philosophy on.

With the perceptual-mind as the conduit for receiving and interpreting sensations from the five physical sense organs, this research has made it clear that the recognition of the perceptual-mind as the only faculty of mind attached to the five physical sense organs as being a specific, independent, faculty of mind that provides human beings information about objects of the external world (unlike the faculty of reason) that has no attachment to objects of the external world. This fact was also what Hume was trying to point out to the world in his rejection of the reason’s apprehension of information about objects of the external world that Plato claimed to be the source of eternal truths about the world.

Nonetheless, the newly revealed “perceptual-mind” is comparable to any of the accepted faculties of mind such as Plato’s faculties of reason and imagination, or Freud’s faculties of id, ego/reason, and superego/conscience, on any level of validity and reliability (that Hume fought so hard for). This research has proven that when Hume stated that “when I enter most intimately into what I call myself, I always stumble on some particular perception or other, of heat or cold, light or shade, love or hatred, pain or pleasure, I never catch myself”...what Hume meant by the phrase “I never catch myself”..., This statement meant that he Hume, never caught his thoughts that derived mostly out of his five physical sense organs (as people’s thoughts are clearly derived from the five physical sense organs most of the time) before reflection by their faculties of reason. In these words, Hume was speaking about ideas of heat or cold, love or hatred, pain or pleasure. from his perceptual-mind (in his thoughts). (Lavine, 1984; p.172. pp 1)

**Class:** It is important to remember that the human mind is filled with four faculties of mind situated within the mind inside the head. The five physical sense organs are found outside the mind and around the head as windows to the mind. That is why the four faculties of mind within the human thinking processes cannot be in contact with objects of the external world except the single faculty of mind that is specifically attached to the five physical sense organs. Therefore, it is only one specific faculty of mind within the human mind (called the faculty of perceptual-mind) that serves as the conduit for the reception of all sensations that sent by the five physical sense organs and transmitted through the brain (as perceptions) to the other faculties of mind (within the mind) of the human thinking system (Lavine, 1984; p 172-173).

The verifiable fact is that only the single faculty of “the perceptual-mind” represents human perception as the one faculty of mind within the human mind that is connected to the five physical sense organs. The second fact is that the brain acts as the conduit for the five physical sense organs to the perceptual-mind alone. The third fact is that it is the perceptual-mind alone that interprets (sensations from the five physical sense organs) as perceptions within the mind. These three facts about the perceptual-mind are of the utmost importance in understanding the prominent role

the perceptual-mind plays (among the four faculties of mind within a person's head,) to produce ideas within the human mind. So, it is the job of one specific faculty of mind alone, called, the perceptual-mind which as the faculty of perception, is directly connected to the brain that receives sensations from the five physical sense organs.

It is difficult for people to understand and even for the scientific community to figure out that each of the four faculties of mind has a different function. The best analogy is the different functions of each of the five physical sense organs of seeing, hearing, smelling, tasting, and feeling. The eyes only see objects. The eyes do not smell odors or hear noises. The ears only hear noises. The ears do not taste food nor smell odors etc. In the same way, the functions of each of the four faculties of mind is different. This is why the functions of the human reason is different from the functions of the perceptual-mind. The functions of superego/conscience, differs from the functions of the ego/reason.

Therefore, it is critical to emphasize that only one faculty of mind namely, the perceptual-mind performs the task of perception or only the perceptual-mind interprets sensations from the five physical sense organs as ideas within the mind. And it is this faculty of perceptual-mind alone that has the ability to perceive sensations provided by the five physical sense organs as perceptions of sweet scent that is pleasant, sour taste that is unpleasant, or a beautiful sight that is good to stare at. No other faculty of mind has this ability of perception. Certainly not the human reason as Plato supposed. This is why in contrast to perception Plato used the word apprehension for the human reason as Plato spoke about the reason's apprehension of thoughts. In this case an unwary person would say this is semantics. But it is not semantics just as hearing is different from smelling, so perception is different from apprehension. These are natural facts of life. Nobody can say that their ears smelled a scent. Can they?

**Class:** The crux of Hume's argument against Plato was that since perception occurs only through the five physical sense organs, and since there was no evidence of any of the five physical sense organs' perception of Plato's theory of forms, Plato's theory

of forms had no basis in reality. Hume's contention was that any information about objects of the external world or any knowledge about abstract forms of objects could only be received by the human mind through perception. Furthermore, the human mind's perception of objects of the external world could only occur through the five physical sense organs of seeing, hearing, tasting, smelling and feeling as sensations nothing more. And Hume was right. And Hume's point ought to be clear.

In contrast to Hume, Plato had claimed that the human reason was not only able to apprehend objects of the external world (in spite of Plato mentioning "belief/perception" as one of the modes of thought), the human reason could construct deeper meaning or construct abstract forms of objects as eternal truths. That the human reason's apprehension of the forms of objects superseded the perception of the same objects by the five physical sense organs as more real than human perception of the same objects (according to Plato's theory of forms).

That was where Hume counted that sensations of objects of the external world can only be perceived into the mind through the five physical sense organs (but not through the human reason's abilities of apprehension (of objects of the external world). So, Hume contended that the abstract forms of objects that Plato claimed as permanent ideas than perceptions by the perceptual-mind, did not reveal any deeper forms of objects or any eternal truths as Plato claimed. Therefore, there was no factual basis for the "ultimate truths" Plato attributed to the human reason, because the human reason had no ability of direct apprehension of objects of the external world that would yield ultimate truths Plato claimed. This is why Hume denied Plato's claim of the permanence of the forms of objects as fantasies and thus utterly useless as ultimate truths.

Hume stated that the human mind's perception (represented by the perceptual-mind's) of objects of the external world through the five physical sense organs was the only dependable basis for human knowledge. However, Hume did not state this point so cogently as Hume did not assign a name to the specific faculty of mind namely, (the perceptual-mind) that has the ability of perception. In hindsight, it is this research Paper



that has assigned a name to the faculty of mind that has the ability of perception (that Hume spoke about) as the perceptual-mind. Nonetheless, it is this specific ability of the perceptual-mind to interpret sensations from the five physical sense organs as connoting fear, pleasure, good news, bad news, or good feelings, or bad feelings within the mind of a person, that can be reliably demonstrated as knowledge about objects of the external world.

That was how Hume could say; “when I enter most intimately into what I call myself”, (that is his mind consisting of the four faculties of mind including his reason), “I always stumble on some particular perception or other, of heat, or cold, light or shade, love or hatred, pain or pleasure, I never catch myself...”. Any or all of these sensations derive from the five physical sense organs that were interpreted in Hume’s mind as love or hatred, pain or pleasure by Hume’s perceptual-mind in his thoughts inside his head. Without a specific faculty of mind inside Hume’s thoughts that interpreted the sensations flowing from his five physical sense organs that are situated around the exterior of his head), Hume could not know the meaning of the sensations coming to his mind through his brain (Lavine, 1984; p 172-173).

**Class:** A good analogy between the four faculties of mind (within the head of each person) and the five physical sense organs (outside the head) is this: The four faculties of mind are in a closed-circuit pond that waits for information about the external world via the five physical sense organs to come into the pond. Information about the external world from the five physical sense organs flow into the pond simultaneously through the pipeline of the brain that acts as a conduit. It is only one of the faculties of mind namely, “the perceptual-mind” attached to the brain act as the gateway to the brain while the brain acts as a conduit to the five physical sense organs. Hence, it is the “perceptual-mind” that interprets sensations from objects of the external world for the remaining faculties of mind to reason, imagine, and form opinions of love, hatred, pain, or pleasure, as good news to welcome or bad news to flee from.

In other words, when sensations from the five physical sense organs reach the brain, an interpretation of

the sensations have to be made within the mind (by the perceptual-mind) as to what the sensation means for the personality to make up their mind. Whether a sensation is good news to accept or bad news to flee from for preservation of dear life, it is the perceptual-mind that makes such interpretations for human beings as well as animals. People forget that animals too (that do not have the faculty of reason) have similar five physical sense organs that send sensation of heats and cold, pain, and pleasure, or even fear through their brain to their perceptual-mind to interpret as good news to accept or bad news to flee from.

When the existence of animal consciousness and awareness of objects of their environment is brought into the picture by contrasting the abilities of the faculty of reason (which animals do not have), to the abilities of the faculty of perceptual-mind (which animals definitely have), and which connects animals to perception of objects of their environment, the picture becomes quite clear. The argument as to which faculty of mind is in contact with objects of the external world, through the five physical sense organs, or which faculty of mind has no connection to the five physical sense organs, (which is the faculty of reason), also becomes very clear. People forget that Freud who pondered about the fact that animals also have the faculty of perceptual-mind to perceive objects of their environment, insisted on animals having a faculty of mind (not the human reason but the faculty called id) similar to the human perceptual-mind.

**Class:** Is the difference between the faculty of reason (for reasoning and analysis) versus the faculty of perceptual-mind (for perception by both humans and animals) clear now? That the faculty of perceptual-mind only gives basic interpretation of sensations of objects of the external world that arrive in the mind. Then, the faculty of reason applies its ability of logical analysis to apprehend additional meaning from the perceived sensation about objects of the external world as deep love, or the sensation of hate as wickedness. This is how the human reason can attribute deeper meaning of love or hatred to the same sensations of love or hatred perceived by the perceptual-mind of a person or animal. Animals, especially pets feel love from their owners but pets do not apprehend any deeper meaning of hatred from those who maltreat them.

Folks, if you do not know the big difference between the limits of reasoning by the faculty of reason (on which Plato based) his theory of mind, and the limits of perception by the faculty of perceptual-mind (on which Hume built) his entire philosophy of mind? You know nothing about consciousness and the human mind. It is all about the difference as well as the limits of these two major faculties of mind. This is because what we perceive (through the five physical sense organs), we do not conceive or apprehend (with the faculty of reason). And what we conceive or apprehend with the faculty of reason, we cannot perceive (with the perceptual-mind) through the five physical sense organs. If we can perceive an object by looking at it, or by actually touching an object, we do not have to conceive it. Nothing can be clearer than this.

So, when Plato spoke about the self or of having a self and soul that was continuous from childhood to old age, to death, and beyond, Hume asked; how do you know that? When Plato spoke about objects having higher forms of reality and numbers having abstract meaning (Plato's theory of forms), Hume asked; did you acquire knowledge of the higher forms of objects through any of your five physical sense organs? Did you acquire the metaphysical meaning of numbers from any of your five physical sense organs? If not, then those deeper or metaphysical meaning you attached to the forms of objects and numbers have no basis in reality. They cannot be objectively tested as eternal truths.

Hence, Hume pointed out that all of human thoughts about the forms of objects are the same sensual sensations that conceal no special forms of objects, e.g. "the rest of mankind... are nothing but a bundle or a collection of different perceptions which succeed each other with inconceivable rapidity and are in a perpetual flux and movement". (Lavine, 1984. p 172. Pp2).

In other words, Hume reminded the philosophers that perception of objects of the external world by the faculty of perceptual-mind did not convey any higher forms of objects that can be verifiably traced to any of the five physical sense organs or to any scientific instruments.

Hume's point of contention was not whether objects have higher forms or not, or that numbers could have deeper meaning or not. Hume's argument was against Plato, Descartes and other philosophers' insistence that the higher forms and deeper metaphysical meanings their faculties of reason conceived are not objectively present in reality. Therefore, the forms of objects and the deeper meanings of numbers could not be ultimate truths. And since the so-called ultimate truths were not verifiable (by the perceptual-mind) through the five physical sense organs, how can those truths be accepted as ultimate truths? Therefore, from Hume's point of view), Plato's higher forms of objects were mere opinions that have no basis in fact.

So, Hume declared that such opinions from Plato, Descartes, or earlier philosophers were fantasies or baseless assumptions that should be regarded as thrash instead of being regarded as ultimate truths. Incidentally, Hume's statement that 'human thoughts were a bundle of perceptions that pass and repass in rapid successions' came to be referred to as "Hume's bundle of perceptions theory of mind". Here again, it is clear that Hume was speaking about the perception of ideas in his thoughts and within his mind through his five physical sense organs. It is also obvious that the five physical sense organs are different from the four faculties of mind within the human thinking system in that the faculties of mind are enclosed in the head within the mind, while the five physical sense organs are situated around the head outside the mind.

This means consciousness of the faculties of mind are enclosed inside the head of a person. And human awareness by the five physical sense organs is located outside the heads of human beings. Otherwise, it would be four faculties of mind plus five sense organs to make nine faculties of thought which is not the case. The difference between the five sense organs and the four faculties of mind is the reason why the word "physical" is always attached to the sense organs of seeing, hearing, smelling, tasting, and feeling. The five sense organs serve as windows to the world for the four faculties of human mind enclosed within the head of the human body. The five physical sense organs send sensations from objects of the external world to the brain of each person as a conduit that are interpreted (by the perceptual-mind) as specific ideas by the four faculties of the human mind to form

ideas and opinions as knowledge about the world.

The four faculties of mind are stationed within the head. And the five physical sense organs are located outside the head of each person to connect each person to objects of the external world. This makes the four faculties of mind clearly different from the five physical sense organs. This is why in speaking about his own perceptions, Hume referred to his mind and not to his five physical sense organs when he clearly stated; “the mind is a kind of theater where perceptions successively make their appearance, pass and repass, glide away and mingle in an infinite variety of postures and situations...”. (Lavine, 1984. P172. pp2).

What Hume argued for, was simply that the human reason’s apprehensions were not connected to any of the five physical sense organs. However, the mind (represented by a faculty of perceptual-mind) perceives objects of the external world through the five physical sense organs which the human reason has no contact with. In other words, the human reason has no contact with objects of the external world. This was the main point Hume tried to point out. Hume’s argument was about the central role the five physical sense organs play as the mind’s point of contact to objects of the external world as the basis of human knowledge

This is why it was imperative for Hume to point out that the human reason has no connection to the five physical sense organs, and therefore the faculty of reason has no contact with objects of the external world. And since, the human reason has no contact with objects of the external world, the reason’s apprehension and opinions of the theory of forms of objects have no basis in reality. In this argument, Hume pitched one faculty of mind known for perception, (as the perceptual mind, that is in contact with objects of the external world), against another faculty of mind namely, the human reason (that is not in contact with objects of the external world).

This means that human beings have two major faculties of mind as

1. Perception (represented by the faculty of perceptual-mind in this research) that perceives sensations from objects of the external world through

the five physical sense organs, against.

2. The faculty of reason that cannot perceive objects of the external world. That is, one faculty of mind can perceive objects of the external world, and the second faculty of mind cannot perceive objects of the external world. These are two critical facts of human ideas about the world. For example, Plato’s theory of forms (out of the faculty of reason) which “proposed that abstract ideas were real and that the objects we experience through the physical sense organs (as perceptions by the perceptual-mind), were mere shadows”. In this case, Plato pitched apprehensions of the human reason against perceptions by the perceptual-mind (Lavine, 1984 p 172-173).

Even apart from Hume, Plato’s critics questioned how the forms of objects interact in reality and how we can truly know them [2]. It must be pointed out that Aristotle did not make the same metaphysical assumptions about abstract forms of objects by the human reason as Plato did. Aristotle’s ontology was quite opposed to Plato’s, in that Aristotle believed the particular things to be more real, whereas Plato believed the universal ideas to be more real [3].

In the final analysis, Hume helped to establish perception (represented by the perceptual-mind) as a major faculty of mind that is in contrast to and comparable to the human reason as the other major faculty of mind.

### **Breakdown of Consciousness: Two Faculties of Mind: The Perceptual-Mind Versus Reason**

**Class:** We have dwelled on Hume’s arguments about the importance of perceptions as the main method of thinking for a great length of time, for a very important reason. The reason is that while Plato fought for the recognition of the faculty of reason as the preeminent faculty of mind of human thoughts, Hume fought for recognition of the perception of objects of the external world (by the perceptual-mind) as the main faculty of human thinking. So, each of these two philosophers – Plato and Hume stood for the two major faculties of the human mind in the human thinking processes namely, the faculty of reason, versus the faculty of perceptual-mind.

These two major faculties of mind namely, (the fac



ulty of reason and the faculty of perceptual-mind) backed by two major philosophers Plato and Hume, amounts to the first true breakdown of consciousness. This is an important fact about the human consciousness and the human thinking system. This crucial fact about the two major faculties of mind in the human thinking system have eluded the preceding philosophers and scientists about what types of faculties of mind or what elements of consciousness the human thinking system consists of. But this crucial fact about the place of the two major faculties of mind of in the human thought processes is critical to understanding how people think about each other in their daily affairs,

This revelation about the two major faculties of mind namely, the perceptual-mind and the human reason clarifies the first breakdown of consciousness as well as the faculties of the human mind.

This is why the historical confrontation between Hume the empiricist and Plato the rationalists, was no accident. Each philosopher stood for one of the two major faculties of mind, as well as one of the two main constituent parts of consciousness. Plato batted for the faculty of reason, while Hume batted for the faculty of perceptual-mind. Thus, to Hume (and now the rest of the world), perception (via the perceptual-mind) represented one of the two main ways of thinking. while to Plato, the human reason (via the faculty of reasoning) represented the other main avenue of thinking.

In hindsight, and because of this research, it can now be clearly seen that the human thinking system consists of at least, two major faculties of mind namely, perception versus reason or the perceptual-mind versus the faculty of reason. This two-part consciousness, or two- part elements of consciousness, form the combined dual way of the human thinking system that amounts to the first and greatest breakdown of consciousness of the human thinking processes. Breaking down consciousness (a.k.a. the human mind) this way, makes it crystal clear just like the (left-brain right-brain divide) that consciousness is not monist but in a sense dual. This is a phenomenon of consciousness that that people are not ordinarily aware of.

Breaking down the human thinking system into two main parts of perception and reasoning between the perceptual-mind and the faculty of reason makes a huge difference in the attempts to understand how the human mind works or how consciousness works to provide human beings with knowledge about objects of the external world. This is because perception of objects of the external world by the perceptual-mind, (which animals also have as animals are able to perceive objects of their environment and react to them), is the clearest indication of the difference between perception of the perceptual mind, and reasoning and analysis by the faculty of reason which often thinks in abstract terms that Plato spoke about in human thinking.

Now, the huge difference between the perceptual-mind that perceives objects of the external world versus the faculty of reason that forms opinions about objects of the external world is unmistakably clear. However, and stranger than fiction, perceptions of the perceptual-mind has become the more dominant faculty of mind than the logical analysis of the faculty of reason in the human thinking than what Plato, Descartes, and Kant made the faculty of reason to be, as this research has revealed.

It is clear by now that the five physical sense organs needed to have their own specific faculty of mind, and that is what Hume fought for without identifying a specific faculty of mind for perception. But for clarity, this research has identified the faculty of perception as a specific faculty of mind called the perceptual-mind within the human thinking system. If Hume had assigned a specific faculty of mind to perception (as the perceptual-mind), all arguments about human perception and reasoning would have been clear. Nonetheless, as Hume pointed out, the reason's method of apprehension or cogitation and analysis is different from the perceptual-mind's interpretation of sensations from the five physical sense organs as ideas within the mind.

Hume's demand for proof of evidence of any observation by the perceptual-mind (with the help of scientific instrumentation), versus mere logical analysis by pure reason won the argument against the Rationalists' claim that the reason's analysis (that may or may not include fantasies and conjectures) constituted the



certainty of truth. Thus, Hume's demand that any declaration of truth by the human reason must be based on verification by the perceptual-mind, divided the human thinking system into two main opposing faculties of mind between perception and reasoning, or between the perceptual-mind and the faculty of reason. That was another way of breaking down consciousness into two mental processes of reason versus perception.

Unfortunately, Hume's failure to identify the perceptual-mind as a specific faculty of mind, (for perception) left the question of the perceptual-mind being a specific faculty of mind for the five physical sense organs hanging in the air. The proper mental template by Hume should have been the faculty of reason versus the faculty of the perceptual-mind. This is because Hume had raised perceptions (arising out of the five physical sense organs within the mind) into such higher prominence for the thoughts and behaviors of each person that was even higher than the human reason, without advocating for any specific faculty of mind namely, (the perceptual-mind) for the five physical sense organs.

Failure to categorize the perceptual-mind as a specific faculty of mind was Hume's great omission in his theory of philosophy. Hume succeeded in establishing a theory of 'a bundle of perceptions' within the mind and thoughts of persons but failed to establish "the perceptual-mind" as a specific faculty of mind for perception to show the perceptual-mind versus reason as two faculties of mind whose functions and operations within the mind divide the human mind into two opposing camps. Hume's failure to establish the faculty of perceptual-mind as the conduit for the five physical sense organs within the human thinking system, is what diminished Hume's theory of mind compared to Plato's philosophy of mind in the historical records.

This is why Hume was not regarded as a great mental theorist comparable to Plato, Descartes or Kant. Instead, Hume has been regarded merely as a brilliant thought disruptor, a mental provocateur, and a footnote in the history of the philosophy of mind. No more, this research has resurrected the reputation of Hume as a great philosopher and a great mental theorist in the philosophy of mind, comparable to and

second only to Plato and second only to Plato. In the history of the greatest minds in philosophy.

As for Kant who supposedly came in to repair the damage done by Hume's extreme skepticism and relentless questioning of the nonempirical basis of the grand theories of Plato, Descartes, and others as fantasies and conjectures designated as truths, Kant offered no empirical basis for his 12 points of a-priori pure concepts of the mind either. What Kant essentially did was slap back theories of opinions and conjecture (based on the power of reason without any empirical basis that Hume had rejected and criticized earlier. Kant yarned his own ideas of what he called "pure concepts of the human reason" as necessary concepts that arose out of the nature of the human mind which in hindsight cannot stand any verifiable scientific test.

Kant's argument that a) his 12-point a-priori concepts of the understanding that "organize sense impressions to make experience possible", and b) that also made cause and effect possible, by showing that effects necessarily follow causes, which gave the human reason the assurance that the Sun would most likely rise again tomorrow (also without any empirical basis demanded by Hume), was accepted with glee as collaborating Plato and Descartes' claims of ultimate truths. Kant's unverifiable a-priori concepts were accepted without question just so philosophy could move on and forget Hume's extreme skepticism.

Acceptance of Kant's arguments for a-prior concepts completely disregarded Hume's demand for empirical proof of evidence for the 'a-priori concepts' that Kant regarded as truth. Yet the assertion of Kant's 12-point a-priori concepts that had no empirical basis in perception was what was hailed as Kant's great restoration of the power of reason to propound profound truths, in contrast to Hume's destructive theory of that was based on empirical evidence. On the other hand, Kant's theory of 'a-priori' concepts of the mind have remained redundant in philosophy that nobody ever used, while Hume's demand for empirical proof of evidence (by the perceptual-mind) for any ideas or any research findings holds true. It is Hume's demand for empirical proof of evidence that has become the basic measure of validity and reliability for acceptance of

any theories and findings not only in philosophy but in the social sciences as well. Thus, Hume's revenge (for proof of empirical evidence) in philosophy and the social sciences lives on for all future researchers, students, and professors.

### **Freud Versus Plato: Freud's Contribution to the Break-Down of Consciousness**

**Class:** First of all, people forget that Sigmund Freud was and still is the only psychologist, scientist, and mind theorist, who presented a theory of animal consciousness. Freud wrote his theory of mind in a physician's gab to present a scientific front as a scientist who was determined not only to repair Plato's philosophy of mind, but to find out what caused mental sickness and lunacy. It seems that Freud joined the mental debate to be seen as a mental healer or healer of mental diseases. What Freud did in his attempt to repair Plato's philosophy of mind was to heal or cure mental diseases instead of fighting over which of the two faculties of reason or perception, delivered ultimate truth to mankind that Plato and Hume had engaged in.

Thus, Freud took a different approach of investigating the mind by interviewing people or rather interviewing real mental patients in real time to find out what went on in people's minds. So, Freud sat his patients on his famous couch and questioned them to find out what was going on in their minds and thoughts in real time, as a more realistic way of finding out how real people think about the world and their frustrations in life that may have overwhelmed them to the point of making them neurotic or schizophrenic. In other words, Dr. Freud did not merely argue about which faculty of mind was the source of ultimate truth. Dr. Freud tried to treat the mental diseases of neuroses and schizophrenia through a new method of psych-analyzing people's minds. So, Freud was the first person to introduce psychoanalysis and psychotherapy as a scientific method of treating mental disease.

In trying to introduce a scientific method to cure what ails the mind, Freud investigated mental diseases he categorized as neuroses and schizophrenia which was quite refreshing and different from the old religious abjuration of evil spirits out of mental patients. To do that Freud needed to understand the

minds and thoughts of lunatics and schizophrenic patients' experiences, expectations, wishes, fantasies, projections, pretenses and fear of disappointment that turned into anxieties, through psychoanalysis. Freud thought that the force of suppressed anxieties in the unconscious mind of the id, kept bubbling up that constantly sought to pop up and pop out into the conscious mind or the ego.

The ego on the other hand kept suppressing the anxieties and demand for satisfaction by the faculty of id into what became known as repressed wishes or unfulfilled wishes. The battle between the ego that repressed anxieties and the faculty of id whose demands for satisfaction kept trying to pop up and out into the ego turned the mind and thoughts of those who felt overwhelmed into neurotics and schizophrenics. This portrayal of the human mind as a battleground of opposing forces between the demand for satisfaction by the id, and suppressed anxieties by the ego was radically different from arguments by Plato and Hume about which of the two faculties of reason or perception was the preeminent faculty of mind that Plato, and Hume spent their entire lives arguing about.

As a physician with the new technic of psychoanalysis, Freud opened "the hood of the human mind", looked inside, and found a whole lot of suppressed anxieties, disappointed wish-fulfillment and dirty thoughts envy, and unfulfilled desires that led to depression inside people's minds. Freud revealed the thoughts of neurotics, lunatics, and schizophrenics as deriving from the contentious relationships among the id, ego, and superego faculties of mind; for example, instincts in the id bubbled up for satisfaction, the ego/reason suppresses the bodily needs of pleasure, and the superego/conscience controls the ego's dirty thoughts. Therefore, Freud set out to put together a new theory of mind (based on Plato's mental template of the Tripartite Soul of Man) that consisted of the id, ego, and superego, that later became known as the three faculties of the human mind.

Freud was quite a character. He discovered many things about the human mind than any philosopher or scientist before him and after him. For example, Freud discovered conscience (superego) as one of the faculties of mind that no philosopher before him had mentioned. When Freud took on the problem of restoring

Plato's philosophy of mind, the human mind stood as consisting of Plato's faculty of reason, imagination/conjecture, and perception/opinion versus Hume's perceptual-mind ("perceptions") that derived from the five physical sense organs.

### It was Freud who added

1. Conscience as a faculty of mind which he named the superego. Freud also discovered.
2. The id that consisted of instincts as the first faculty of mind for both humans and animals.
3. Freud discovered the unconscious mind filled with anxieties.
4. Defense mechanism.
5. Instincts.
6. Oedipus complex.
7. The superego's control of the ego.
8. Anxiety that produced mental disorder known as neuroses and schizophrenia that can be cured by psychoanalysis.
9. Psychotherapy as a scientific method of curing neuroses and schizophrenia that now adopted for curing drug addictions and all other mental disorders by psychiatrists today.

### Freud and Animal Consciousness: The Instincts Filled-Id for Animal Consciousness

Being able to surface many hidden processes of consciousness as well as the unconscious mind within the human mind was no small feat for one person to discover for the world. After discovering all the numerous mental processes that go on in the human mind and consciousness, Freud set his mind on formulating a theory of mind fashioned after Plato's triune faculties of mind. But Freud immediately faced a dilemma.

**Class:** What dilemma did Freud face after prying into the deepest thoughts of the human mind? Freud faced the dilemma of evidence of the existence of animal consciousness. What?

**Professor:** Yes, Freud thought about animal consciousness as a valid subject for philosophic and scientific inquiry. Plato who started the philosophic inquiry into consciousness focused only on categorizing the faculties of the human mind and consciousness as the basis of all human actions and interactions. In other words, Plato focused on

understanding human behavior by trying to understand the specific modes of thought or, which faculty of the human mind does what. What Plato did was to show how the human mind works, and how consciousness produces the compendium of human thoughts and actions by pointing to the influence of each faculty of mind on human thoughts and behavior, (just as neuroscientists have identified specific parts of the brain associated with specific thoughts and feelings that can be analyzed individually).

Thus, properly categorizing the specific faculties of mind for behavior analysis became the most important basis for Plato's philosophy of mind.

On the other hand, Freud whose aim was to improve or restate Plato's faculties of mind as a scientist rather than a philosopher, thought of expanding human knowledge about consciousness to include the existence of animal consciousness as well. This was because Freud saw animal consciousness and animals' activities of survival as being quite similar to human consciousness and human activities of survival. So, Freud thought animal consciousness also deserved scientific and philosophic inquiry. This was because Freud realized that animals such as dogs, cats, pets as well as animals in the wild such as lions, monkeys, birds, all engage in similar activities of survival such as feeding, avoiding becoming prey to bigger animals, taking care of and protecting their babies for the perpetuation of their species just as human beings do.

Therefore, Freud felt that any philosophic analysis or scientific inquiry into human behavior and the human mind should include mentioning the faculty of mind for animal consciousness. Hence Freud invented a faculty of mind he called the id, that is filled with both instincts of pleasure (eros), as well as instinct of death (Thanatos) for the pursuit of pleasure for both human beings and animals. Freud then claimed that the underlying motivation for the actions of both animals and human behavior, are the pursuit of pleasure for the perpetuation of their species in similar ways for both animals and human beings.

However, to Freud's contemporary philosophers, theologians, religionists and psychologists, Freud's, the idea that animals have mind and not only that, animal consciousness could consist of one of the faculties of mind of human beings, was unacceptable and a bridge



too far to cross.

To Freud's contemporary psychologists, philosophers, theologians and religionists, Freud had crossed the line.

**Class:** What line?

**Professor:** Freud had crossed the line between the natural demarcation between what makes humans human beings human that separates us humans from the animal kingdom. At that time, it was and still is assumed that animals were not supposed to have mind and soul in any form at all. This is the underlying assumption why human beings kill and eat animals for food. If animals have mind, that would imply that animals can have souls too, which would make it impossible to kill animals for food. And if according to Freud, animals have one of the faculties of the human mind and probably a soul, how can we kill animals for food?

But Freud insisted that not only do animals have mind, animals have one of our human faculties of mind that he, Freud had just discovered or rather invented which he called the id. To Freud's contemporary psychologists, the invention of a new faculty of mind called id for both humans and animals cannot be allowed to stand. Freud must explain this properly. If Freud had stated that the id was a faculty of mind for animals only, that could be tolerated. However, Freud insisted that the faculty of mind called id was for both humans and animals. Then Freud claimed that the id was filled with instincts-for-pleasure, as a motivating force behind animal behavior.

Furthermore, Freud claimed that the aim of instincts within the id was to seek pleasure and satisfaction for animal animals' activities of survival. However, and belatedly, Freud tried to imply that the instincts-filled id could be regarded as a special faculty of mind for animals' instinctual behavior that was the opposite of thinking and controlling abilities of the human ego.

Thus, according to Freud, the motivating force behind animals' instinctive behavior was to seek satisfaction for the fulfillment of animals' basic needs for food and survival only, but not for thinking which

is the cause of human behavior. But Freud's explanation of the instincts-filled id being mostly for seeking satisfaction for the fulfillment of pleasure, for animals' survival needs was not enough. The harm had been done. And Freud's crazy idea of animals having a faculty of mind like humans or animals having consciousness must be opposed at all cost.

To oppose Freud's theory of id for animal consciousness, psychologists asked Freud about the difference between animal instinctive behavior and human infants' instinctive behavior. For example, are infants' instinctive behavior motivated by their ego or their instincts-filled id? The question about infant's behavior is where Freud tripped himself up inescapably. Freud could not resist the fact that infants' behaviors are wholly instinctive, therefore infants' instinctive behavior were little different from animal instinctive behaviors. At the same time, Freud realized that animal consciousness could not include the ego that made decisions for human behavior. Nonetheless, according to Freud, animals deserve a faculty of mind for feeding and protecting their babies just as humans do.

Freud implied that since animals did not have the faculties of ego and superego, the instincts-filled id was the right faculty of mind for animal behavior even though the behavior of newborn babies and infants are as wholly instinctive as animal behaviors. Freud insisted.

The confusion about Freud's three faculties of mind that included the controversial id for both animals and human beings doomed Freud's theory of mind. Part of Freud's problem was that he developed two new concepts about consciousness which he called instincts and an instincts-filled faculty of mind he called id. Freud's definitions of both the faculty of id and instincts that Freud claimed had aims were controversial. Freud reserved the ego and superego exclusively to human beings which nobody had any problem with. It was Freud's insistence that instincts and the instincts-filled id was a faculty of mind for both humans and animals that were deemed as unacceptable to be included as part of the human mind and consciousness.

### Comparison of Freud's Three Faculties of Mind with Plato's Three Modes of Thinking

**Class:** This is what the breakdown of both Plato and



Freud's faculties of mind of human Consciousness looks like. Freud assembled his three faculties of mind as id ego, superego in comparison to Plato's three modes of thinking that consisted of dual mental modes of reason/dialectic, belief/perception, and conjecture/imagining, thus; Plato's three modes of thinking were: Reason, Perception, and Imagination. There was no mention of Conscience. Plato did not include the faculty of conscience in his three modes of thinking. Freud's three faculties of mind: Were listed as Id, Ego/reason, Superego/Conscience, but there was no mention of the faculty of Perception. Freud did not include the faculty of perception in his theory of mind.

In hindsight, it can be seen that if a modern mental theorist added the faculty of conscience (which Plato omitted) to Plato's theory of mind, that would make a more complete four faculties of mind of Plato's philosophy of mind as; reason, perception, imagination and conscience. In the same way, if the faculty of perception (which Freud also omitted) in his three faculties of mind is added to Freud's three faculties of mind, that would make Freud's theory of mind as four faculties namely, id, ego/reason, superego/conscience and perception (as the perceptual-mind). Either way, it is clearly obvious that the breakdown of the complete faculties of mind for human consciousness would be four faculties of mind by both Plato and Freud, instead of the three faculties of mind that both Plato and Freud had established for mankind.

Hence, the breakdown of the correct number of faculties of the human mind and consciousness can be clearly seen as consisting of four faculties of mind. This is because counting the number of faculties of the human mind as three faculties would mean, omitting the faculty of perception (by the five physical sense organs) as nonexistent, as well as omitting conscience as nonexistent against the fact that both of these two faculties of mind cannot be excluded from a valid theory of mind. On the other hand, both faculties of perception and conscience, are natural faculties of mind that cannot be omitted or dismissed from any logical composition of the faculties of the human mind and consciousness.

### Analysis of Plato's Reason: Vis a vis Freud's Ego

Plato's triune faculties of mind centered on the supremacy of the human reason as the preeminent faculty of mind. This is because Plato constructed the human reason as an amalgam of two faculties of mind conjoined as one mighty faculty of mind that joined reason and perception together. In other words, Plato assigned the analytical abilities of the faculty of reason as well as perception of objects of the external world (through the five physical sense organs) to the same faculty of reason. So, Plato's Reason had two directly opposite and actually impossible abilities of perception and rational analysis at the same time (as this research has clearly shown).

It must be remembered that Plato whose triune faculties of mind clearly identified perception as a separate mode of thinking (in the form of belief/perception) discounted the importance of perception of objects of the external world (through the five physical sense organs) as mere awareness of sensations of reality. Hume on the other hand, took perception of objects of the external world as the sole factual interpretation and verification of human awareness of reality

To Plato, human awareness of objects of the external world could be assigned to perception alright, but interpreting and understanding objects of the external world was all done by the human reason. Hence Plato emphasized the highest mode of thinking as coming from the human reason's dual abilities to apprehend and interpret objects of the external world at the same time. In other words, people's opinions, coming out of their belief/perceptions, did not matter to Plato. What was important to Plato was peoples' ability to apprehend and understand political events through their ability to reason. That was why Plato exaggerated the abilities of human reason above the other modes of thinking of 'belief/perception' and 'conjecture/imagination' which he regarded as lesser modes of thinking of the masses.

By emphasizing the apprehensive abilities of reason, and downgrading the other two modes of thinking, (belief/perception and conjecture/imagination), Plato's main goal seemed to differentiate the superiority of the cogitations of philosophers from the perceptions of the masses or serious thinkers from the common

people. However, Plato's error was downgrading perception of objects of the external world through the five physical sense organs (which Plato called 'spirited elements of the body'), and raising the supremacy of the apprehensions of the human reason. To Plato, nothing compared to human reason's apprehension of deeper meaning of understanding (of his theory of the forms) that underlies objective reality in order to achieve ultimate truth.

Thus, the reason's ability to apprehend, understand, and attain ultimate truth through the power of rational analysis formed the basis of the conflict between Hume and Plato. Hume's challenge to Plato's claim of the attainment of ultimate truth by the power of reason was that such claims of ultimate truth could not be verified by any of the five physical sense organs neither could the claim of ultimate truth be verified by any scientific instruments. Therefore, to Hume, there was no ultimate truth. And worse, Plato's insistence that the human reason could achieve ultimate truth had no basis in fact.

Hume argued that it was the faculty of perception of objects of the external world directly through the five physical sense organs, or indirectly through scientific instruments that could reveal any ultimate truth to Mankind, not the reason's unproven conclusions that have no empirical basis in fact.

**Class:** Do you see the great bone of contention between Plato and Hume about ultimate truth, by these two mental giants of the philosophy of mind? Do you see the revolution that arose in philosophy by which Hume almost destroyed the birth of philosophy as a major discipline of study? It was about the important difference between the mental ability of reasoning versus perception by the faculty of perceptual-mind's ability to interpret sensations from the five physical sense organs (as the factual way of knowing reality) that Plato called ultimate truth. This was a case of Hume's position that ultimate truth could only be achieved by the faculty of perception through the five physical sense organs, versus Plato's position that ultimate truth could be directly apprehended by the human reason. In hindsight, the two opposite arguments of Plato and Hume raise the question

as to who was right and who was wrong? The right answer is that Hume was technically right, Plato was technically incorrect. Furthermore, both Hume and Plato's claims were half-truths that were technically incorrect as this research has ably laid out.

### Analysis of Freud's Ego: Vis a vis Plato's Reason

According to Freud, the ego (or the I of the self) is 'that part of the id which has been modified by the direct influence of the external world' (Freud 1923). For Freud, the ego is "the representative of the outer world to the id" ('Ego and the Id'). In other words, the ego represents as well as enforces the reality-principle, whereas the id is concerned only with the pleasure-principle. While the ego is oriented towards perceptions in the real world, the id is oriented towards internal instincts; whereas the ego is associated with reason and sanity, the id belongs to the passions'. Freud's ego is the rational part of the psyche that mediates between the instinctual desires of the id and the moral constraints of the superego, operating primarily at the conscious level [4].

**Class:** Please take note that Freud stated that

1. The ego is oriented towards perception (of the real world). This is where Freud attributed perception to the ego as a combined faculty of mind just like Plato's reason.
2. Note also that Freud stated herein that the ego is associated with reason and sanity.
3. The ego is "that part of the id which has been modified by the direct influence of the external world". Hence, Freud ego resembled how Plato conceived the human reason to represent both perception and reasoning. National Institutes of Health (NIH.gov).

Then, according to Wikipedia, Originally, Freud used the word ego to mean the sense of self, but later expanded it to include psychic functions such as judgment, tolerance, reality testing, control, planning, defense, synthesis of information, intellectual functioning, and memory [5]. And ego, in psychoanalytic theory, is that portion of the human personality which is experienced as the self or the "I", and is in contact with the external world through perception. (Britannica <https://www.britannica.com>).

Furthermore, Freud suggested that when the Ego is

overwhelmed, the result is the formation of anxiety. Three types of anxiety were proposed: objective anxiety (fear of real danger from the world), neurotic anxiety (fear of being punished for the Id's urges), and moral anxiety (fear of compromising one's morals, a.k.a. superego/conscience) [6].

What is the cause of neurotic anxiety according to Freud's theory? According to Freud's psychoanalytic theory, a person experiences neurotic anxiety because of feeling like they are losing control over themselves, losing control over their lives, or when their ego is threatened [7]. For Freud, anxiety was the product of tensions between the demands for bodily satisfaction of the id and moral demands of the superego against the ego. The ego copes by using unconscious defense mechanisms, such as repressions, (Therefore, Freud assigned perception of objects of the external world and reacting to them to the ego just as Plato that Hume argued against [8].

On the other hand, it must be noted and emphasized that Freud never mentioned any perception of objects of the external world by the ego. But his explanation of the activities of the ego sandwiched between the demands for satisfaction (from objects of objects of the external) world by the id versus the moral demands of the superego on the ego, clearly indicates that it is the ego that is cognizant of perceptions of objects of the external world and reacts to them.

### Analysis of Freud's Superego/Conscience

With regards to the superego/conscience, one can appreciate Freud's genius in correctly identifying superego/conscience as the master faculty of mind that exercises control over the ego. However, Freud's conception and definition of the superego/conscience as a residue of parental control was totally incorrect to say the least. Freud claimed that 'The superego/conscience incorporates the values and morals of society which are learned from one's parents. However, in truth, 'The superego/conscience is not the carry over image of fear of the father figure and parental control as Freud proclaimed. Rather, the effect of the father image and fear of parental control in children are attributable more to children's perception of fear, and not the nature of the superego/conscience as this research explains [9].

### Wundtian Psychology beyond Freud: Transition from Faculties of Mind to Consciousness

The new or current structural psychology also known as Wundt's experimental psychology (after Freud), that is taught in universities as a valid pedagogy of social science discipline was started by Wilhelm Maximilian Wundt in 1879. Wundt is now referred to as the father of experimental psychology. When Wundt is described as the father of psychology, this indicates that Freudian psychology has been sidelined and a new type of psychology that does not recognize Freud's faculties of id, ego, and superego theory of mind has superseded the type of psychology that Freud painstakingly constructed based on the theory of three faculties of mind of the human thinking system. What happened to Freud's id, ego, superego theory of mind?

**Class:** So, what is Wundt's theory of mind?

**Professor:** "Wundt originally developed the theory of voluntarism which involves the organization of the mind and presupposes freewill by a person" [10]. Wundt called his method of analytical process "The Introspection Method" which he described as "an objective analytical process that involves training people to self-reflect so that when presented with external stimuli, they can explain their thoughts, feelings, experiences, and sensations". Wundt defined psychology "as a scientific study of conscious experience", and he believed that the goal of psychology was to identify components of consciousness and how those components combined to result in our conscious experience" according to BC campus Pressbooks. (<https://pressbooks.bccampus.ca>)

Furthermore, Wundt's aim was to study the structure of the human mind, and he believed that the best way to do that was to break down behaviors such as sensation and perception into their basic elements. Because of this, Wundt's approach was referred to as structuralism and the technic Wundt used was introspection. And this is what is recognized as the origins of modern psychology according to (<https://alleynesa-cademy.co.uk>). Wundt believed in reductionism. He believed that consciousness could be broken down (or reduced) to its basic elements without sacrificing any of the properties of the whole. Wundt argued that conscious mental states could be scientifically studied using introspection according to [7].



So, how did Wundt study the basic elements of consciousness? “Wundt proposed three elements of consciousness as;

1. **Sensations:** Occur when sense organs are stimulated.
2. **Feelings:** Result from sensations (Wundt developed the Tridimensional Theory of Feelings, which includes pleasure-displeasure, tension-relief, and excitement-depression).
3. **Emotions:** As more complex feelings”. Wundt explained; Sensations, an element of consciousness, occur... (Wundt) when sense organs are stimulated. Feelings, an element of consciousness (Wundt), result from...sensations. Wundt developed the theory by introspecting to the Tridimensional Theory of Feelings: pleasure-displeasure, tension-relief, excitement-depression. Emotions, as element of consciousness are... more complex feelings [8].

Wundt’s theories of Voluntarism, or Structuralism, and method of Introspection came from Wundt’s first textbook of; Principles of Physiological Psychology, 1873-4, Wundt is credited as setting up the first laboratory of experimental psychology in 1879, where Wundt used the scientific method to study the structure of sensation and perception (<https://Tutor2u.net>).

**Class:** This research has carefully traced Wundt’s theory of structuralism and experimental approach of introspection as a scientific method “to reduce consciousness to its basic elements”. Wundt is said to believe in reductionism and that consciousness could be broken down (or reduced) to its basic elements”. Wundt also proposed the structural theory of three elements of consciousness as sensations, feelings, and emotions that can be identified through introspection above, that look nothing like Freud’s three faculties of mind nor Plato’s Tripartite Souls of Man.

Wundt’s structural psychology gained traction as the widely accepted new psychology by the scientific community in spite of the criticism of introspection as a method of self-reporting process that Wundt adopted. For example, “one of the main criticisms of Wundt’s structuralism was its reliance on Introspection as a method. Introspection involves self-reporting

on one’s own thoughts and experiences, which can be highly subjective and prone to individual biases according to Medium, (<https://medium.com>). And, “In Wundt’s structural approach, the methods were unreliable, due to the reliance on non-observable responses, such as memory and perception. Therefore, the lack of reliability lead to the inability to replicate the introspective results” [8]. Even Watson who started his own scientific psychology of behaviorism “Watson rejected introspectionism as both unreliable and effete”, as Watson redefined psychology as the science of behavior. (<https://www.sciencedirect.com>).

This new structural psychology invented by Wundt circumvented the problems associated with Freud’s three faculties of mind. In contrast to Freud’s three faculties of id, ego, superego, Wundt adopted three elements of consciousness namely sensations, feelings and emotion through the method of introspection. This is the type of Wundt’s structural psychology that has been embraced by psychologists, neuroscientists, and physicists when scientists chose to adopt the word consciousness in lieu of the word mind in order for scientists to feel comfortable in proclaiming consciousness as a valid subject for scientific inquiry.

Therefore, this research did not find any significant contribution to the breakdown of consciousness by Wundt’s structural psychology. Wundt adopted a theory of mind based on three elements of consciousness over Freud’s theory of three faculties of mind in order for psychology to move on and away from Freud. The acceptance of Wundt’s three elements of consciousness over Freud’s three faculties of mind is parallel to what occurred in philosophy with regards to Kant’s a-priory concepts (that had no merit whatsoever), being accepted as the theory that restored Plato’s philosophy of mind in order for philosophy to move on and away from Hume’s destructive skepticism that had undermined philosophy.

It is Wundt’s “elements of consciousness” over Freud’s faculties of mind that has been accepted as a subject fit for scientific inquiry by physicists and the scientific community. And all the social sciences fell in line and fell in love with consciousness.

Thus, the popularity of consciousness as an important field for scientific inquiry began to soar in the



1980s, and 1990s spearheaded by physicists, catapulted consciousness into the limelight as representing the best construct for the human thinking system. This was supposedly because it was felt that scientific analysis of consciousness did not require a breakdown of consciousness into any constituent parts as (Plato and Freud did). And the scientific community assumed that inquiring about consciousness freed them from the confines of defining the mind in terms of faculties of mind that they did not want anything to do with anymore. So, scientists began to consciousness to represent the brain and human thoughts.

This is how the word consciousness came to supersede mind, and the word mind or faculties of mind were put in a coffin, sealed and buried in the vault of dead old ideas.

Everyone in every academic discipline heaved a sigh of relief and hailed the word consciousness as “the new kid on the block” for the scientific inquiry into the human brain and human thoughts about the world.

However, what the physicists (whose *modus operandi* is reductionism) have forgotten or conveniently ignored to do to make consciousness a real scientific object of inquiry, is to breakdown consciousness into its constituent parts or reduce consciousness its basic elements similar to what physicists do with any object or any construct of scientific inquiry that physicists analyze such as atoms, molecules and elements of the periodic table, similar to electrons, protons, quarks, muons and photons of light.

The inability of physicists to reduce consciousness to any elemental parts which would amount to breaking down consciousness into its constituent parts, debunks physicists claim of having any definitive scientific knowledge about consciousness. For example, physicists are unable to answer a simple question such as; what are the elements of consciousness? In the interests of reductionism, light is reduceable to photons, so what is the basic element of consciousness by which to measure the consciousness of human beings? Or do physicists not have the obligation to reduce consciousness into its elemental parts? Do scientists know that the consciousness of a newborn

baby is different from the consciousness of a teenager, or the consciousness of an adult? Why has no neuroscientists and physicists who are in the frontline of inquiring about consciousness unwilling to breakdown consciousness into its constituent parts?

### **First real Breakdown of Consciousness: Brain Consciousness Versus Cosmic Consciousness**

The fact that neuroscientists, physicists, and the scientific community have been unable to breakdown consciousness into any constituent parts does not mean that consciousness cannot be broken down into its constituent parts. As this research has explained the difficulty of breaking down consciousness by Plato, Descartes, Hume, Kant, and Freud, this research has laid out the correct breakdown of consciousness into its constituent parts from scratch. The best way of breaking down consciousness into its basic constituent parts is to break down consciousness among the three main kingdoms of living things namely, plants, animals, and human beings (including the five taxa of all living organisms).

In my previous writings about plants consciousness, we introduced the first major breakdown of consciousness into two main parts between plants having Cosmic Consciousness on one hand, and animals including us humans as having brain consciousness on the other. This constituted the first major breakdown of consciousness which showed that both animals and human beings use brain consciousness for their activities of survival, while plants (that do not have brains) use Cosmic Consciousness for their and activities of survival. Thus, there has always been two major types of consciousness in the natural world namely 1a), human brain consciousness that drives human behavior and activities of survival and 1b), animal brain consciousness that drives animals’ activities of survival, as well as 2) Cosmic Consciousness that drives the activities of survival of plants because plants and other organisms do not have brains.

With regards to plants use of Cosmic Consciousness comes the question of proof of the existence of Cosmic Consciousness. There are three proofs for the existence of Cosmic Consciousness as a result of plants use of their Cosmic Consciousness. The argument is that the best way to show any valid proof of the existence

of Cosmic Consciousness is the use of Cosmic Consciousness by any living organism. And the living organism that demonstrates the use of Cosmic Consciousness for their activities of survival are the species of plants.

Thus, the first proof of the existence of Cosmic Consciousness based on plants use of their Cosmic Consciousness that are scientifically indisputable are

1. Plants control of crosspollination and seed dispersal.
2. Plants production of weapons (of lectins) to fight their animal and human predators.
3. Plant's ability to inflict diseases on human beings through the weapon of lectins that have been found to be the cause of many autoimmune diseases, digestive diseases, drug addictions, and other dietary diseases.

The second major proof of the existence of Cosmic Consciousness is that not only plants, but animals and human beings also have Cosmic Consciousness (in charge of their autonomic processes in addition to their brain consciousness. We have proved the existence of human Cosmic Consciousness as the underlying consciousness that controls the autonomic physical and nervous processes in both animals and human intentional bodily movement activities.

Apart from Cosmic Consciousness, the third major breakdown of consciousness in general focuses on breaking down human brain consciousness into its constituent parts that was started by the philosopher Plato (which is a problem that neuroscientists and physicists have failed to do to and conveniently ignore). So, the breakdown of human brain consciousness into its constituent parts is what Plato started at the beginning of the philosophic quest for knowledge about the human mind. Thus, long before this research, Plato and Freud had started to breakdown the human brain consciousness into its constituent parts. Plato reduced consciousness into three parts which he called the Tripartite Soul of Man that Freud changed to three faculties of mind.

Thus, the scientific breakdown of consciousness can only reference Plato's categorization of the human thinking process in the form of what is now known

as faculties of mind as the first attempt to breakdown consciousness. There is no way of breaking down consciousness into atoms, molecules, photons, or quantizing consciousness into particles, waves, or wavelengths of energy. Therefore, physicists who are trying to define consciousness in terms of quantum mechanics, micro-tubules or 'collapse of the wave function' are merely beating about the bush. Consciousness cannot be reduced to atomic particles that can pass through the classical 'double-slit experiment' as depicted in science class experiments.

Therefore, the breakdown of consciousness can only be scientifically analyzed or defined in terms of faculties of mind or rather as faculties or elements of consciousness that got nothing to do with quantum mechanics. It is quantum mechanics that may have to adapt to consciousness and not the other way around, where consciousness is made to adapt to quantum mechanics.

**Class:** If the breakdown of human consciousness can only occur in terms of the faculties of consciousness, then it would seem that Plato and Freud already broke down consciousness into its constituent parts, isn't it? The answer is yes.

**Professor:** However, Plato and Freud's breakdown of consciousness were not exactly correct. The breakdown of consciousness by both Plato and Freud were inconsistent in many ways as this research has explained above. Hence, this research needed to break down consciousness into its constituent parts properly again. So, what is the breakdown of consciousness into its proper constituent parts?

**Professor:** To breakdown human consciousness into its proper constituent parts this research had to start with the consciousness of a newborn baby. And the question becomes, what type of consciousness or what level of consciousness does a newborn baby come to the world equipped with? The answer is that every live newborn baby arrives (out of the mother's womb) into the world equipped with two faculties of mind or two types of consciousnesses namely, the fetus' Cosmic Consciousness, as well as its brain consciousness. In other words, a fetus comes to the world as a newborn bouncing baby with two faculties of mind – classified as

- a) Its Cosmic Consciousness.
- b) Its brain consciousness to perceive objects of its immediate environment.

It is the baby's perceptual brain consciousness for perception of objects of its immediate environment that is connected to the baby's five physical sense organs of eyes, nose, ears, mouth, and bodily touch. Again, it is the faculty of perceptual mind or perceptual consciousness that connects the newborn baby's five physical sense organs to its immediate environment as well as to the rest of the world for the newborn baby to begin to perceive the world around it. We have stated that a newborn baby's perceptual consciousness is connected to its five physical sense organs that in turn connects to objects of the rest of the world. But what about the consciousness of a newborn baby animal such as a dog, cow, or even a hatched bird or chicken?

Well, most newborn baby animals have brains, they have five physical sense organs that allows most newborn baby animals to immediately engage in activities of feeding for survival faster than human babies who merely cries for help from its mother. And it is agreed that most baby animals have brains and brain consciousness regardless of how dissimilar or unequal to human consciousness – but consciousness nonetheless.

**Class:** So, what type of brain consciousness does animals have?

**Professor:** The breakdown of consciousness detailed in this academic research has definitively surfaced the type of consciousness animals have or do not have. The finding of this research is that all baby animals are born into the world with two types of consciousness namely, Cosmic Consciousness and their brain consciousness. similar to human babies. So, in a sense, Freud was right to a certain degree in writing a theory of mind for animal consciousness which he called the instinct-filled id that was rejected as too controversial in his prior theory of mind.

### Second Break-down: Freud's Animal Consciousness Versus Human Consciousness

**Class:** It must be remembered that up to now, at this moment of this academic research to breakdown

consciousness into its constituent parts, the scientific community does not recognize animals as having consciousness or animals. The scientific community does not have any definitive faculties of mind for animals. Some scientists even deny that animals have consciousness. Some scientists still claim that animals are not conscious. This is where the uniqueness of Freud's genius in his theory of mind comes into play. Freud was the first psychologist (who presented himself as a scientist) to think about including animal consciousness in his concept of his theory of the three faculties of mind.

However, Freud did not consider the idea of animal consciousness from the viewpoint of animal perception through their five physical sense organs. Instead, Freud claimed that animal consciousness consisted of something different from brain consciousness which he called instincts.

This is where Freud's theory of mind got twisted and weird. This is despite the fact that Freud gave animal consciousness one of the faculties of the human mind namely the id, in his id, ego, superego faculties of mind. Freud claimed that the id was filled with instincts that motivated all animals' seeking nothing but pleasure. According to Freud, the faculty of id was instinctual and the id represented animal consciousness instead of brains representing animal consciousness.

But what happened to animal brains? According to Freud, animal brains consisted of nothing else but instincts and the pleasure principle. The question then becomes what about animals five physical sense organs and animals' perception of objects of their environment? Freud's answer was that animals' perception of objects of their environment was all instinctual, that animals perceive by instinct or rather, animals perceived objects of their environment by the instinct-filled id and not necessarily by their perceptual-mind. But why did Freud substitute instincts for animals' brains and perception by their five physical sense organs that are scientifically indisputable for animals' perception of objects of their environment?

Perhaps it was because of religious reasons of the early 1900 that could not accept that animals could have any type of consciousness that resembled human



consciousness. Maybe, Freud tried to appease the religionists that by suggesting that animal consciousness was all instinctual would indicate that he did not mean that animals have mind and soul like human beings. So, by representing animal consciousness as deriving from instincts, Freud tried to differentiate animal consciousness from human consciousness to make it clear that although animals have consciousness, animals could not have mind and Soul.

But Freud's appeal to instincts did not stop Freud's detractors from rejecting his theory of instincts and his whole damn theory of animal consciousness. On the other hand, apart from the misguided theory of instincts, Freud was scientifically right about animals having mind and consciousness that drives their activities of survival. All Freud had to do was point to animals' perception of objects of their environment as a result of animals having brains and five physical sense organs that validates animal consciousness similar to but in many respects different and unequal to human consciousness. In conclusion, Freud was the first philosopher or psychologist to rightly claim that animals have brain consciousness – a fact that to this day and this moment of this research into consciousness, has never been embraced by the scientific community.

Regardless of the reluctance of the scientific community to accept the fact of animal consciousness, it is now indisputably clear that based on the fact that animals have brains, the five physical sense organs and the ability to perceive objects of their environment is proof that animals have brain consciousness similar although unequal to, and different from human brain consciousness. So, with regards to the problem of breaking down consciousness into its constituent parts, the analysis of consciousness clearly shows that brain consciousness can be divided into two parts namely, human brain consciousness and animal brain consciousness.

But human beings and animals are not the only living organisms on the earth. Human beings and animals constitute only one large kingdom of living things, while plants constitute the other half of living things known as the plants' kingdom. While it is obvious that both human beings and animals that have brains rely on the use of their brain consciousness for their

activities of survival, what about plants and other living organism that do not have brains? The fact that plants do not have brain consciousness which is obvious does not mean that plants cannot have consciousness.

The intriguing question is; can any organisms be alive and engage in activities of survival to propagate the continuation of their species without having consciousness because they do not have brains? In other words, is consciousness restricted to only living things that have brains? The fact of plants having their own consciousness in the form of Cosmic Consciousness surfaces the lie by neuroscientists and physicists that consciousness cannot extend beyond the human brain. Clearly, for any organisms to be alive, survive for any length of time, and engage in activities of survival for the extension of its life, it has to have consciousness. Of course, consciousness in an organism such as an animal or a human being enjoys brainpower similar to how engines are the powerhouse of cars.

Thus, both human beings and animals use their brain consciousness to direct their activities of survival and behavior. On the other hand, since it is obvious that plants have the abilities to feed, grow, reproduce and even take care of their offspring, plants compel us human beings and our scientific community to accept the fact that plants have some type of consciousness that is not brain based. Therefore, plants consciousness can only be a type of consciousness that is outside or beyond brain consciousness namely, Cosmic Consciousness that represents plants' consciousness, since plants do not have brains.

### **Third Breakdown of Consciousness: Cosmic Consciousness as the Consciousness in Plants**

The third breakdown of consciousness specifically deals with plants use of Cosmic Consciousness whose proof of existence has been explained in the pages of this research. With regards to plants use of Cosmic Consciousness, this research has already given three proofs of plants use of Cosmic Consciousness by the fact that plants have sensitivity, sentience, and intelligence that are the intrinsic characteristics of Cosmic Consciousness is an indication of plants use of Cosmic Consciousness to pursue their activities of survival of their species. Here are examples of plants use of their Cosmic Consciousness that are scientifically



demonstrable such as;

1. Plants control of crosspollination and seed dispersal.
2. Plants production of weapons (of lectins) to fight their animal and human predators.
3. Plant's ability to inflict diseases on human beings and animals through their weapon of lectins that are meant to deter human beings and animals from eating their seeds to protect their seeds for the continuation of their species.

Cosmic consciousness serves as the non-brain consciousness for plants since plants have sensitivity, sentience and intelligence in spite of not having brains. So, how does Cosmic Consciousness work in plants to allow plants to feed, grow, produce offspring and take care of their offspring just as human beings and animals do? Once more, it must be reiterated that Cosmic Consciousness is an emergent property of the earth that inhered and infused all living organisms with sensitivity, sentience, self-awareness and intelligence which includes plants.

However, unlike human brains that drive human activities of survival through thinking, Cosmic Consciousness directs plants activities of survival through intuition which is a process of knowing without thinking, or a process of acquiring knowledge without the use of brain analysis. This is because intuition is the method by which Cosmic Consciousness triggered the gradual evolution of life from the simplest organisms to the most complex organisms that characterized the gradual growth of all organisms. The development of organisms by Cosmic Consciousness necessarily involved the evolution of life of (tinny organisms that could not have brains) to drive their activities of survival including plants, to the largest organisms that developed brains.

The assumption is that Cosmic Consciousness evolved alongside the evolution of all organisms of the tree of life. Thus, the evolution of consciousness, specifically Cosmic Consciousness matches the evolution of life in tandem. This is how Cosmic Consciousness served as the common denominator of consciousness for all living organisms of plants, animals and human beings. You cannot have one without the other. Life as well as consciousness of all living organisms evolved out of Cosmic

Consciousness found within the three main kingdoms of plants, animals and human beings. This is how plants acquired the use of the non-brain Cosmic Consciousness for their activities of survival of their species.

Hence, the evolution of consciousness that began with Cosmic Consciousness triggered the evolution of plants consciousness, animals brain consciousness, and human brain consciousness in that order. Thus, the gradual evolution of consciousness in all living organisms was a sort of fine tuning of consciousness from the simplest organisms to complex organisms. The breakdown of consciousness as explained in this research clearly shows the gradual evolution of consciousness as well as the fine tuning of consciousness from plants consciousness, to animal brain consciousness, to human brain consciousness.

However, the next breakdown of consciousness deals exclusively with human consciousness that consists four faculties of mind known or four elements of consciousness as perceptual-mind, imagination, reason and conscience, or Freud's instincts, id, ego/reason, and superego/conscience.

### **The Eventual Four (4) Faculties of Mind in the Breakdown of Human Consciousness**

**Class:** The fourth and last breakdown of consciousness explain the human brain consciousness only. First and foremost, human brain consciousness consists of four faculties of mind that pertain to the four aspects of human consciousness that Plato, Hume, and Freud dealt with as explained above in this research Paper. This means human beings are the only living organisms that developed (four faculties of mind), after consciousness emerged out of the earth to give organisms, sensitivity, sentience, self-awareness and intelligence.

Thus, For the record and for the summary of the development of consciousness, plants developed and used only one faculty of mind namely, Cosmic Consciousness which is also the first faculty of mind that emerged to give all organisms sensitivity, sentience, self-awareness, intelligence. In other words, plants (without the benefit of brains) failed to develop perception of objects of their environment, but plants relied on their Cosmic Consciousness to develop

intuition and intuitive abilities to know objects of their environment (as published in my Research Paper titled: "Evidence of Plants Consciousness").

Furthermore, animals that have brains and the five physical sense organs developed perception of objects of their environment by their perceptual-mind in addition to having Cosmic Consciousness.

This is how animals have two faculties of mind, namely, animals Cosmic Consciousness (that controls their autonomic and sympathetic nervous systems, plus animals' perceptual-mind for animal perception. However, unlike human beings and for whatever reason, animals failed to develop the faculties of imagination, reason and conscience which is quite obviously clear from animal behavior that shows no sign of animals having imagination, reason or conscience in contrast to human consciousness.

On the other hand, only human beings gradually developed four faculties of mind one after the other as; the perceptual mind, imagination, reason, conscience in that specific order one by one explained above in this research.

Thus, each kingdom of organism namely, plants, animals, and human beings, developed certain number of faculties of mind as well as appropriate levels of consciousness consummate to each of the three kingdoms of living things. This fact and knowledge about appropriate number of faculties of mind and levels of consciousness for each kingdom of organism, is critical to the correct breakdown of consciousness among all living organisms as explained in this research. Thus, correctly establishing the specific number of faculties of mind for each kingdom of organisms namely, plants, animals and human beings shows how this research has diligently solved the old philosophic problem of different faculties of mind that Plato tried to establish.

The history of the squabbles about the definition of Plato's faculties of mind by each of the four subsequent philosophers Descartes, Hume, Kant, and Freud, each of who wrote their own philosophies of mind has been made very all clear in this research.

**Class:** In spite of, or because of the history of the difficulty of correctly categorizing and defining the four faculties of the human mind, scientists chose to avoid the word mind and replaced the word mind with the word consciousness. In substituting the word mind with the word consciousness in their inquiry of human consciousness, behavior, and human activities of survival, scientists hoped to avoid the problem of the breakdown of consciousness that bedeviled the philosophers. Needless, to say, the wretched definition of consciousness by scientists, without breaking consciousness down into its elemental parts will continue to haunt scientists for their inability to breakdown consciousness into its natural constituent parts. The end.

### Conclusion

The need for the breakdown of consciousness into its constituent parts can be seen from the importance Plato placed in categorizing the four different faculties of the human mind as the starting point of understanding people's thoughts and behavior. This research has shown that Plato laid out four modes of thinking as the underlying premise of his philosophy of knowledge for students of his Academy. According to Plato, the human mind consists of

1. The ability to reason in the form of reason/dialectic as the highest form of thinking.
2. Understanding/Science as the next higher form of thinking.
3. Belief/Perception as the third higher form of thinking.
4. Conjecture/Imagination as the lowest form of thinking (that the Sophists in ancient Greece) used to downplay serious discussion of the affairs of State. So, Plato set the apprehensions of the human reason as the preeminent faculty of mind for human knowledge about the world.

Hume on the other hand, disregarded Plato's division of the human mind into four modes of thinking as the underlying motivation for people's thoughts and behavior. Instead, Hume focused on the human mind's perception of objects of the external world as the underlying premise for judging any theories of knowledge about the world propounded by the early philosophers. Thus, Hume set up human perception by the perceptual-mind (instead of human reason) as the preeminent faculty of mind for human knowledge.

In hindsight, this research has flushed out the big clash between Plato's apprehensions of reason as the preeminent faculty of mind, against Hume's perceptions by the perceptual-mind as being the best judge of human knowledge about the world as detailed above.

Thus, this research has broken down human consciousness, first into two major opposing faculties of mind namely, the reason versus the perceptual-mind as the two giant pillars of the human thinking system that generate opposite thoughts and behaviors for human beings. What this research is claiming is that the two faculties of reason and perceptual-mind form two natural opposing faculties of mind in the human thinking system within the human consciousness that is unavoidably clear. This is why it is necessary to breakdown consciousness into the four specific faculties of mind that forms people's mental models. So, there is a need for the breakdown of consciousness into its constituent parts or into the correct number of four faculties of mind that physicists have failed to do in their definition of consciousness, (and conveniently ignore).

In other words, Plato was saying that (any thinker and philosopher) needed to understand how the human mind works to produce people's opinions and positions. A philosopher has to know which faculty of mind influenced people's mind and behavior with regards to the affairs of State. For example, a philosopher can analytically find out whether what people say comes from their fantasies, or from false opinions, or from serious reasoning. Furthermore, each faculty of mind often leads a person to think and act in certain specific ways that can explain any bizarre behavior, stupid behavior, bad behavior, or good behavior which is always traceable to one or a pair of the four faculties of the human mind.

We have consistently pointed out in this research that when properly analyzed, the faculties of mind (whether Plato's modes of thinking or Freud's faculties of mind) amount to four faculties of mind namely, reason, perceptual-mind, imagination and conscience or Freud's id, ego, superego, and perceptual-mind. And this research has positioned the reason versus the perceptual-mind as the two preeminent opposing faculties of mind that always divide

the human thinking system into two opposing camps of thoughts as evidenced by the clash between Plato's choice of the human reason against Hume's choice of perception by the perceptual-mind.

But what about the two lesser faculties of imagination and conscience? The claim of this research is that the two lesser faculties of imagination and conscience usually fall in line behind the two major faculties of reason and the perceptual-mind. Therefore, the human mind and consciousness operates as a divided camp of self-belief against self-doubt which Shakespeare famously articulated as 'to be or not to be, that is the question'. This is how the four faculties of mind work in the two divided camps of the human thinking system; the lesser faculty of conscience always aligns itself with the faculty of reason but never with the perceptual-mind. On the opposite side, the lesser faculty of imagination often aligns itself with the perceptual-mind which makes the human mind and consciousness, a perfectly divided thinking system of two opposing camps within a unified but polarized human consciousness.

Nonetheless, the four faculties of mind often bond in pairs in working against each other in what essentially constitutes a divided thinking system of two pairs of opposing faculties of mind within the human consciousness in the human thinking system. In other words, the human mind and consciousness operates as a dual platform of a game of good versus evil, good-cop versus bad-cop, reasonableness versus unreasonableness, common sense versus stupidity, knowledge versus ignorance, all within the mind and consciousness of each person that creates self-doubt as expressed by Shakespeare's Hamlet's famous saying; 'to be or not to be, that is the question'. This is the underlying quandary and enigma of human consciousness. This self-question of 'to be or not to be', is also the quintessential expression of self-doubt uttered by Shakespeare to underline the essence of the divided mind.

Interestingly, the opposing divide between the four faculties of mind within the human thinking system was led by the two major faculties of Plato's reason versus Hume's perceptual—mind which forms the most interesting part about human behavior for further research. However, after scientists replaced the



word mind with the word consciousness, (in connection with how people think), Scientists thought they could define human consciousness better than philosophers defined the human mind (without facing the problem of breaking down consciousness) similar to the problem philosophers faced in their attempts to breakdown the human mind.

Thus, scientists, spearheaded by physicists have been trying to define consciousness not in terms of breaking down elements of consciousness, instead, scientists have been trying to define consciousness in term of quantum mechanics. Physicists have been trying to quantize bits of consciousness (as a way of breaking down consciousness into its elemental parts), by describing consciousness as a wave-function, or describing consciousness in terms of the collapse of the wave-function. The idea of describing consciousness as a wave-function was sponsored by British Mathematician Roger Penrose and anesthesiologist Stuart Hamer off have described consciousness (in terms of quantum mechanics) as analogous to bits of microtubules.

As for neuroscientists, by limiting their definition of consciousness to the brain alone and nothing else, thus, equating the brain to consciousness, and excluding (Cosmic Consciousness which caters to trees and small plants as one half of natural organisms versus animal and human brain consciousness, neuroscientists have taken themselves out of any serious discussion about consciousness. It is not only physicists and neuroscientists who err about Cosmic Consciousness, the entire scientific community has refused to recognize the existence of Cosmic Consciousness. On the other hand, this academic research has proved beyond any scientific doubt that Cosmic Consciousness is the source of intelligence for plants activities of survival and perpetuation of their species whose existence cannot be denied or ignored.

By refusing to reconsider the erroneous belief that consciousness is limited to the brain and nothing else, physicists and neuroscientists can never achieve any meaningful understanding of the scope and expansive nature of consciousness that encompasses all of the natural world of plants, animals and human beings, regardless of how long they bury their heads

in the sand. Interestingly, scientists especially, physicists, neuroscientists, and social scientists have done no better in defining consciousness than the philosophers did with defining the human mind. Where do we go from here, now that it is clear that physicists have no better understanding of consciousness than philosophers?

In the meantime, with the proper categorization of consciousness that includes Cosmic Consciousness, this research can explain the individual characteristics of each of the four faculties of the human mind (that together form consciousness), in a way that elucidates how the struggle for control between the perceptual-mind versus the reason or between the id and the ego that leads to anxiety, neurosis, and depression highlighted by Freud. Hence, a new line of research is needed for inquiry into the origins and cause of anxiety, neurosis, and depression (as a matter of the divided mind). The aim of such a line of research by future student, mind theorists and professors of consciousness would be to improve the treatment of mental illness of schizophrenia, lunacy, and madness with appropriate therapeutic formula that Freud had in mind.

**Class:** Finally, the important points to take home is that this research has illustrated beyond any scientific doubt the breakdown of consciousness as consisting of;

1. Four faculties of mind namely, the perceptual-mind, imagination, ego/reason and superego/ conscience in that order of emergence that is slightly different from Plato, Hume, and Freud's theories of mind.
2. The four faculties of mind work with the five physical sense organs to give human beings complete knowledge about objects of the external world.

Another important area for further research about consciousness for students, mental theorists, professors, and other researchers, is to find out how the four faculties of mind combine to form a chasm of the divided mind within one unified consciousness for each person. In other words, any further research about consciousness should be able to confirm or reject whether consciousness is monist or not, or whether consciousness breaks down into four elements or not.



**References**

1. Northwestern Medicine (<https://www.nm.org>).
2. Fiveable (<https://library.fiveable.me>)
3. Aporia (<https://aporia.byu.edu>).
4. Psychology Today (<https://www.simplypsychology.org>).
5. Wikipedia (<https://en.wikipedia.org>)
6. (<https://gohighbrow.com>)
7. Choosing Therapy (<https://www.choosingtherapy.com>).
8. Quizlet (<https://quizlet.com>)
9. Socratic (<https://socratic.org>).
10. Study.com (<https://study.com>).
11. Brainly (<https://brainly.com>).
12. Collins Dictionary (<https://www.collinsdictionary.com>).
13. Edinburg University Press (<https://www.euppublishing.com>).
14. National Institute of Health (NIH), (<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov>).
15. Neurotherapy Neupsy Key (<https://neupsykey.com>).
16. Springer, (<https://link.springer.com/satisfaction>).