

“I”-Frame and the “Mystery” of Being: the “solution” of it by returning to experience.

Takashi OKINAGA

Introduction

Becoming aware of “my being” is an intuitional wonder, and we think it is impossible to answer the question what is the reason of my being. This impossibility is caused by our thought that this being is not in the least conditioned and has no further reason. But is it really conditioned in nothing? For example, if this “I” which we think is premised on nothing in fact turns out to be emerging from a certain logical condition, the mystery of “my being” will disappear, if this is at all possible.

In this paper, we consider that “I” needs a certain logical condition to emerge, and furthermore, this condition is indispensable to our rational thinking in general. By referring to the texts of William James; “*A Pluralistic Universe*” and “*Essays in Radical Empiricism*”, we will establish why this condition is the premise of our thinking, as we define it: “I”-Frame. Next we will also confirm that metaphysical paradox arises from “I”-Frame, and that it also brings about the mystery of being.

We will then consider what will happen when this “I”-Frame disappears. This disappearance will also mean the elimination of the metaphysical paradox, that is, the solution of the problem of “my” being. But this solution will not be given as a recognizable answer to our question, and such character of solution has something to do with our departing from rational thought, in a sense. Further this notion of departing does not mean breaking with reality, but merely means our “becoming” the true state of reality.

Section 1: The structure of emerging “I”-Frame and the quality of wholes about consciousness.

The reason the mystery concerning “me” arises is that the reality “I” includes an originality which can never be eliminated. We find this originality in the fact that this reality seems necessarily to be accompanied by all of our consciousnesses and thoughts. But, there are some cases in which this reality does not emerge until a certain logical structure is founded. Here, we see this case in the subject “compounding of consciousness”¹. James deals with this subject mainly in the chapter which has the same name and is contained in his *A Pluralistic Universe*. Whenever we think about

anything, this thought already follows the form of “I”, and this form is also essential for our consciousness. Conversely, where the form of “I” is not given, we inevitably lead away from our essential form of intelligence to “thinking about something”.

Now, we observe the quality of this form concretely which is peculiar to our consciousness. We find this form in the following case in our everyday life. We can be conscious of each letter of the alphabet. And we can also be conscious of the sum total of these 26 letters in the case of the English alphabet. In this case, the total amount of information for each of the 26 letters does not surpass that of the whole of 26 letters. However we do not consider that the complexity of 26 consciousnesses, each of which corresponds to each letter, is equal to a single consciousness which is aware of the whole of 26 letters at once.

“We can’t say that awareness of the alphabet as such is nothing more than twenty-six awarenesses, each of a separate letter; for those are twenty-six distinct awarenesses, of single letters *without* others, while their so-called sum is one awareness, of every letter *with* its comrades. There is thus something new in the collective consciousness. It knows the same letters, indeed, but it knows them in this novel way.”(PU p.86.).

That two consciousnesses are different does not mean that they know different objects: meaning that even if they know just the same object, they are different in case their “ways of knowing” are different. Therefore, what makes this difference comes under the “something new” in this case.

“talk rather of their *knowing the same things*. They are different mental facts, but they apprehend, each in its own peculiar way, the same objective A, B, C, and D.”(PU p.86.)

This fact is characteristic of consciousness and we can find the essence of this character in the “something new” or the “way” above cited. From the standard of quantity, the total of A, B, C does not exceed $A+B+C^2$. But, as for our viewpoints themselves which look at objects, we cannot use this standard of quantity. However, it

¹ It is generally known that James had already argued in full detail about the problem of self, especially about the problem “I” which cannot be objectified in his *The Principles of Psychology* and so forth. The argument there was about the subject who knows. And this argument was founded on the viewpoint of epistemology. But in this paper, we argue about “I” from the viewpoint of the wholeness of spirit, that is, the viewpoint of the character that “I” cannot become any others, and of the contradiction against monism. We inevitably find all of these characters as far as we use the concept “I”, and they are the problems which arise from the gap between logic and reality.

² We can single out the “relation” between alphabets as what is not included in each alphabet but comes out from them on the whole. It is expressed in the phrase “the whole is more than the sum of the parts”, and the difference between the accumulation of parts and the whole itself is the same kind. And this “relation” is

is difficult to indicate concretely what is different between two viewpoints regardless of the fact that their object is the same. In short, the characteristic of consciousness is kept in what makes them "different", and the problematic of it is also included in the same place.

The same kind of "difference" is found in our judgment that "I" am not "you" and "you" are not "me". This difference is certainly found in our natural condition. It is our intuitional division prior to logical reasoning. However, on the other hand, it is not contradictory that "I and you can share our thinking and contents of our consciousnesses to some extent." Thus we prove from these contrary facts that "there exists something between 'I' and 'you' that prevents us from fusing into one regardless of the fact that we can share our thinkings". And this is a quality original for consciousness which cannot be found in "material". When material A and material B are put together, there is no problem in the fact that they turn out to be $A+B$ ³. Despite this, we cannot imagine that spirit A and spirit B are put together. Each of A and B is one whole entity for itself and we cannot imagine a spirit $A+B$. On the contrary, we cannot imagine each of A and B as an independent spirit by itself, if we can imagine the spirit $A+B$. This shows the very quality of our spirit that it is one whole in itself and it realizes itself on its own.

When we inquire into this quality of the wholeness of spirit, we find that "my" representation of the world turns out to be one whole in itself and then justifies the solipsistic insistence at last that this world is the world for me. This fact rests on the uniqueness of "my" representation which is drawn from the exclusive quality of spirit. This wholeness and exclusivity of spirit maintains an undeniable insistence that there is nobody in this world other than "me", in spite of the fact that "I" seem objectively to be not more than an ordinary person amongst countless many persons.

Nonetheless, is the idea that there is nobody in this world other than "me" correct, without reservation, in the first place? If it is not without reservation, it might

nothing other than the "relation" between matters which can be objectively observed, therefore it emerges as something observable as we add each alphabet. On the contrary, our consciousnesses about each alphabet cannot themselves be objectified in the first place, so we cannot even imagine what is to add them each other. As far as we consider about consciousness in this character, it is not possible to find such an objectified "relation" among our consciousnesses.

³ James says that "in the *physical* world there is no real compounding"; moreover, that "'Wholes' are not realities there, parts only are realities"(PU p.89.). In this situation, "the whole is the sum of reality". In the situation where the whole is regarded as more than the sum of the parts, the "relations" between parts are added to the sum of the parts, but even in this case, the whole itself is not always a sole reality.

be possible that the problem caused by the uniqueness of “me” does not arise from the beginning, but rather, the wholeness of spirit and the complete character of “me” are essentially identical, and the very self-evidence of this character makes that uniqueness seem without reservation. As soon as we say “I”, there arises a frame which divides my self and others, and the interior of the frame becomes an independent region isolated from the outside. And this frame is also justified by its functional availability. However, if this frame has a genetic background in spite of its apparent apriority, this frame’s feature of “without reservation” would be called into question. In fact, within the immanent immediateness of our experience, this frame has not still been discovered only because, in this experience, “I” have not yet existed. In such a returning to our immediate experience, the solution of the problem caused by “I”-frame is not executed as a logical solution of a problem which is conceptually proposed. Such a solution should be executed as our awareness that such a problem did not exist in the first place. And our acknowledgement of this awareness will correspond to our acknowledgement of the reality which cannot be conceptualized.

Section 2: The fate of “intellectualism”- the paradox led by our rational thinking

In this section, we will present the certain ground of the reality which cannot be conceptualized through examining the paradox into which our rational thinking concerning “I” inevitably falls. Further, we will connect this paradox with the mystery of “being” given by this conceptualization. After that, we will grope for the solution of it.

James indicates this paradox by its two aspects; first is the mystery of “act”, and second is the mystery of the absolute who is needed to solve that mystery. Now, when we propose to think rationally about something, we should in advance objectify it and conceptualize it and name it as a necessary condition, for, in so far as our thinking deals with something as a defined matter, we need a clear distinction between this thing and other matters⁴. Then a problem arises how can it be possible that an object “a” acts on another object “b”. According to James, this problem follows from the fact that when we strictly maintain the rational condition that each conception is independent, a paradox emerges from this condition itself, although we usually simply consider that acts naturally arise from relations between objects. James mentions this paradox as that

⁴ Setting up something as an object means setting it up as something that is not all the things other than it. This setting up is executed by discrimination, and simultaneously, being of each object is found to be accompanying with it. Hence, thinking that something exists is conditioned in that this thing is conceived independently and regarded as something that is not other things than itself.

of "intellectualism" in his "A Pluralistic Universe".

"What is it to act? Is it not to exert an influence? Does the influence detach itself from a and find b? If so, it is a third fact, and the problem is not how a acts, but how its 'influence' acts on b. By another influence, perhaps? ..." (PU p.31).

This is one of the consequences produced by our act of objectifying reality or making it independent. Therefore, when we regard each a and b as strict independent conceptions, then it turns out to be that we find the "effect" neither in a nor in b. This situation arises from our idea that as far as a conception is independent, it must be independent from other conceptions in all respects. Thus, when we choose an ontology which insists that in the first place each a and b existed in themselves, then another secondary "effect" should arise between a and b, next in turn the relation between the "effect" and a or between the "effect" and b should become a new problem. For James, an infinite regress follows after that⁵. To solve this regress, we should no longer consider the relation between the "effect" and a or b; instead, we should find out from where in our thinking that each a and b is an independent being has arisen in the first place. It means that we should not regard the original form of reality as independent objects such as a, b or "effect". Therefore if we attempt to find out the origin of the being such as a, b or "effect", it also turns out to be a useless attempt.

Now, we can apply this character of independent objects to the problem of "I". We have found the problem involved in independent objects in that objects a, b, ... in general were distinguished from the "effects" between them. Added to this independence, "I" and "others" have a remarkable peculiarity in that each of them has a completed wholeness and uniqueness for itself. If the "effects" hardly take place

⁵ This apparent strange logic follows from the thought that "For admit in fact the slightest modicum of independence, and you find (if you will only think accurately) that you have to admit more and more of it, until at last nothing but an absolute chaos, ... remains upon your hands." (PU p.30). This view was adopted by an intellectualistic demonstration to derive a contradiction included in pluralism, in order to prove the rightness of monism by *reductio ad absurdum*. And this demonstration was carried out by Lotze. This demonstration was, after all, derived from the attitude that "*The treating of a name as excluding from the fact named what the name's definition fails positively to include*" This treatment is similar to the fact that our setting up a conception is nothing other than the negation of all conceptions other than the former. The world seen from this attitude is a segregated world which is presented in return for inquiring into the ideal of such rationalism as conceptualization, and this world is a result from what James calls "*vicious intellectualism*" (PU p.32.). This attitude establishes rationality with conceptualization and independence, but when this attitude is performed radically, this independence becomes "the absolute independence" in which even the mutual influences between conceptions are impossible. The standpoint contrasted to this is "the relative independence" which insists that "The same things disjoined in one respect *appear* as conjoined in another" (PU p.35.). This standpoint indicates the world in which the elements of it are partly discriminated and partly related. But, from the viewpoint of radical conceptualization, this world is filled with contradictions because reality and non-reality are thought to be discriminated and not discriminated at once in this world.

between them, it will be still more difficult that the combinations between them are established. Thus, James points out, “intellectualists” adopt the concept “the absolute”⁶. As a result, the concept “the absolute” makes our thinking possible to combine us in a way that is beyond our intellect because it is beyond the ability of our personal wisdom. And furthermore, “the absolute” must complete the universe as one unity because of its absoluteness, but in this place, a paradox arises. It is that the concept of absoluteness, that the universe is one unity, should also contain “me”, but the concept of “me” can never be united with others because of its peculiarity of independence. In other words, “I” know the universe only through my finite wisdom, and “I” execute it with my uniqueness, but on the contrary, the absolute should contain in itself such incomplete finite wisdoms, each as finite reality. This contradicts with the fact that one knows the universe through his/her absolute wisdom.

Thereupon, James suggests a way to solve this paradox through “pantheistic philosophy” in order to overcome this chasm between God and me. Also in this solution, God’s objects of thinking exist for God only in the way God thinks of them, and on the contrary, each of our separate lives thinks about themselves in other myriad ways from God who is the original thinker. Here, a barrier which separates God and me through “I”-Frame exists. Consequently, this separation gives rise to a contradiction against the idea of the monistic universe by God.

“The particular intellectualistic difficulty that had held my own thought so long in a vice was, ... the impossibility of understanding how ‘your’ experience and ‘mine,’ which ‘as such’ are defined as not conscious of each other, can nevertheless at the same time be members of a world-experience defined expressly as having all its parts co-conscious, or known together. The definitions are contradictory, so the things defined can in no way be united.”(PU p.100)

For us to cope with this situation there are two possible ways; one is to consider that only the absolute has the ability to transcend even logical contradictions, and second is that we approach the truth of reality by, in a sense, giving up logic. James struggled to reconcile this contradiction and our rational attitude in his earlier thought. But in his later thought, he developed the opinion that this rational attitude does not necessarily coincide with the truth of reality. Such an opinion does not promote an attitude that easily abandons rationality. Rather, it is an attitude trying to give a novel quality to our wisdom in a realistic standpoint by distinguishing ordinary wisdom from

⁶ Also when we realize the association of ideas, this method is adopted. When we mix white paint and black paint, we have the middle color in fact. But we think we can never combine the idea of white and the idea of black by all means. However, in fact we find they are combined in our mind by something incomprehensible, so sometimes it is called “transcendental subject” and so on. Moreover, “the absolute” that combines our spirits plays the same role as this “subject”.

reality. The attitude does not aim at solving the problem of combining independent concepts by setting up a still more transcendent reality which combines them. On the contrary, it aims at solving the problem by not executing our initial conceptualization which causes the notion of independence. By not allowing the notion of independence to arise the mystery is also prevented from the outset.

The method above is not a peculiar agnosticism or irrationalism of James. Far from it, this method is an experiment to prevent the outbreak of metaphysical mystery and even erase it by executing the method of empiricism thoroughly and by returning to the dimension where even our acts of objectifying matters are still not settled. We can reevaluate his "radical empiricism" and the world of "pure experience" or the "*durée*" of Bergson etc. from the viewpoint which regards them as the dimension where such metaphysical mystery has not been formulated. Reevaluating the concepts above also insists that "the flux of sensible experience itself contain a rationality that has been overlooked", and "harking back to it more intelligently"(PU p.38). It means breaking through empiricism as positivism from inside of it, and finding an original reality in experience as the region which is the ground of logic or verification. The metaphysical mystery does not arise until we acquire an attitude syllogistic logic or verification⁷.

Thus, our thorough execution of empiricism has come to the reality where even our prescription "what" or "species" which is the fundamental condition of our naming or conceptualization is yet to be formulated⁸. When we return to the problem of "I", we are obliged to ask whether the distinction that "I" am not "you" is a consequence from the conceptualization of "I" and not a consequence from the things themselves. In other words, we are to ask which is more original between our intellectual distinction supporting all our recognitions and the independent character of "I" itself. If our intellectual distinction is more original, the problem above is eliminated by itself when we remove our tacit logical operation which produces this distinction. In this case, however, to remove this logic, we are obliged to depart from our scheme of recognizing

⁷ It is true that James seems to have intended a kind of abandonment of or a farewell to empiricism as a rational decision when he says that "For my own part, I have finally found myself compelled to *give up the logic*, fairly, squarely, and irrevocably."(PU p.96.) or that "I prefer bluntly to call reality if not irrational then at least non-rational in its constitution"(PU p.97.). But instead statements can be regarded as an attempt to extend the region of rationality and adds to it a novel meaning concerning the relations between rationality and reality. This meaning is, in a sense, our unifying with reality, and further, this meaning is a natural consequence of our thorough-going empiricism, far from our farewell to empiricism.

⁸ We cannot tell about anything until we classify it and name it. Conversely, we can tell nothing before this operation because even "what" cannot be settled before it. "When we name and class it (the immediate experience; by whom this sentence cited), we say for the first time what it is, and all these whats are abstract names or concepts."(PU p.98).

objects. Moreover, this departing does not necessarily mean to separate us from the truth of reality.

Further, our operation of recognizing objects as independent matters also calls the “being” of objects into question. When something emerges as an object, the object has already been founded by the being of it, and we always regard this being as a base which has been present before our finding the object. Nevertheless, we must examine whether “being”, which seems to sustain the object, really arises apart from the intellectualistic distinction. It is true that that being has an aspect which we may regard as a universality transcending the individuality of objects. In spite of this universality, we must reconsider about treating being of an individual object in that transcendental quality, in case we assume the non-existence of such an object. Nevertheless, we suspect the mystery of the being of individual objects arises only after our logical discrimination of this individuality. Subsequently in the next section, we will examine the character of being which arises as a consequence of the “I”-Frame.

Section 3: The character of being called in question under the fixing of objects

We have confirmed that the being of objects is already settled as a substratum whenever we fix any objects, and it has become a question whether such being emerges from our distinguishing it from not-being or such being is transcendent of the dimension of our discriminations in which the foundation of the meanings of our language functions. Now, we substitute the object which presents the problem of being for “I”.

- A In the case of the object’s being which emerges from our distinguishing it from not-being, “I” emerges from our distinguishing it from “the other”, and the problem of being of this “I” arises from the same background. When we do not regard this distinguishing as the origin of truth reality, the problem of being in this sense of A eliminates itself in the dimension of this truth reality.
- B “Being” as something without premises and most original entity which is founded before our logical discrimination between being and not-being. We have decided not to regard “being” as a problem which arises from the question why it is not a not-being, for, in this dimension of “being”, we cannot set up the not-being by means of objective distinction.

As we refer to these A and B, let us consider the question “why have I happened to exist?” From the viewpoint of A, this question arises as a proposition distinguished from the thought “It could be possible that I have not existed at all.” It follows that the

not-being of "I" is necessarily conditioned by the existence of "the outside of the being" and if this does not exist, "the being of me" cannot be called into question. From the viewpoint of B, on the other hand, "being" works out even if "the outside of the being" does not exist. Thus, this "being" cannot be logically identified, with the exception that "being" in this sense seems a logical contradiction and even mysterious. A similar argument for case B could be found in James's essay.

In the first place, we see this case in "being" of "the idealistic absolute", that is, in "being" whose participator "my" being can be explained. Here the absolute is pure "being", and we cannot say "what" kind of being it is. In concrete things, being is necessarily "being of something", but only "being" of the absolute is without this "something" and only "being" is solely purified. This quality of the absolute has a kind of necessity at which we inevitably attain after inquiring into the idea of absoluteness, but on the contrary, this quality rejects meaningful expression or objectification. Thus this quality should be inevitable in spite of its unknowable nature.

Moreover, when being of "I" is explained from the participation in being of the absolute, we need no longer to ask the question why "I" was born from nothing and did not continue to be not-being. This needlessness is deduced from the dissolution of the mystery of our being into the unknown quality of the absolute; however, from the perspective of our actual state, "I" am not "you" and also "I" am not the absolute. And we cannot get over this abyss and avoid the question above as far as we consider being by logic. In other words, to overcome this paradox, the absolute must be unknowable and have the transcendent quality which abolishes even logical contradictions.

"The absolute is true because it and it only has no external environment, and has attained to being its own other."(PU p.53)

This statement "has no external environment" means that there is no other object than itself; that is to say, the universe is on the whole the absolute and is also unhistorical. Moreover, this negation of "external environment" leads us even to the place where not-being of the absolute is not called into question, that is, being in the sense of A doesn't matter at all. In the sense of A, not-being is nothing other than the "external environment" against being. And the fact that "I" who cannot understand the "absolute"-ness exists within the absolute as the whole universe contradicts this absoluteness. But in this case, such an external environment cannot exist. As a result, the absolute must possess in itself a capacity to erase the contradiction that it is different from "I" who is the other of it and far from the absolute, while at the same time, it constitutes the one whole with such "I". This capacity is the mode of being "its own other", and when we see this mode from our perspective, it contains a contradiction and we should regard this mode as having a double structure of being, but from the perspective of the absolute, this mode has no longer any contradiction. In this

way, "being" in the sense of B looms up in the first place, after the disappearance of not-being in the absolute which can erase even the logical contradiction by the method transcending our rational wisdom. And this quality of the absolute is deduced from a high degree of abstraction.

As for James, this quality of the absolute does nothing more than put off the solution of the problem, and he insists that the other method in which the "external environment" disappears is the viewpoint of "doing". It is also the "'immediate' viewpoint", "the viewpoint following the sensory continuity of life". While the viewpoints which execute rational thinking and observation must be settled outside of the observed object, those viewpoints are not confronted with their objects, and in this situation, the objects and the viewpoints are not separated.

Thereupon, we should regard those viewpoints as solving the double structure of being, and not producing such a paradox that arises from our form of "understandings" in the first place. The reason why those viewpoints do not produce such a paradox is that when an object does not find itself, the formal distinction between the object and what is not the object is absurd in the first place. In the same way, if we amplify this situation by invalidating the formal distinction, we find the problem of being in the sense of A does not exist from the beginning. The symbolization of this situation is expressed as "foolish little children" (PU p.121.). This is not simply a lack of consideration but is an indiscretion in the specifically refined meaning which transcends any of our ordinary discretions. Then, what does it mean that transcendence of these ordinary discretions also overcomes our discretion between being and not-being in the sense of A ?

Whenever we talk about "my" being, it is limited to the meaning of A. Such situation is based on the fact that, so long as this being is subject to the form "the being of something", this being emerges from the distinction of "the not-being of this thing" and we cannot find being before this structure of distinction is organized. Consequently, when we attempt to consider "being itself", we cannot succeed due to the form by which we discover this being always with "something". The structure of this form is coincidental with the structure of the fact that we cannot speak about "me" at all if all "my" concrete relations with others are removed. Therefore, if "my being" does not create problems in this removal, also "being" does not emerge as a problem in "being itself" in the former structure.

What is "being" in which we do not realize any problem with its meaning? We have confirmed that, in James's empiricism, our comprehension of things by objectifying them as a character of our "rational" thinking reflects only one aspect of

reality; being in the sense of A has to be conditioned in this objectifying. On the other hand, "being" in "real experience" is obliged to disclose itself only in the sense of B. As for this disclosure, we will make it clear by our examination of the "understanding" through "experience" which transcends what is called rationality.

Being in the sense of A is found in the objects of our "logical wisdom", therefore this being cannot be free from the form "something which exists for our thinking". This thinking finds the objects within our law which is available and is a "convenient order" for our lives. Moreover, this law is regarded as "coexistences and successions", i.e. causality which fundamentally controls every object, and we think there is nothing which can evade it. However according to James, our "logical wisdom" which is subject to such causality is nothing other than a function executing "a retrospective patchwork, a postmortem dissection", or "that we illusorily ascribe to such activities, strung along the surfaces of space and time..."(PU p.112.).

According to this insistence, the viewpoint which coincides with true reality should not hold such notions of causality. This unintelligible quality is also one aspect of "true experience". Our wisdom for such "intellect" was the fundamental cause to "make matters seem self-contradictory" concerning metaphysical problems. Contrasted with this wisdom, James insists "the solid dimension" "inner dimension of reality" "occupied by the *activities* that keep it going"(PU p,112.); he further noted that "pure intellectualism" "finds itself obliged to deny, and persists denying, that activities have any intelligible existence"(PU p,112.).

As we have already suggested, this view is also our own view which regards true experience as unintelligible, but we should pay attention to the fact that this "intelligibility" applies only to our understandings in the dimension of A. "But place yourself at the point of view of the thing's interior *doing*, and all these back-looking and conflicting conceptions lie harmoniously in your hand."(PU p.117.). Thus, while our rational understandings do not obtain in this dimension, also the metaphysical paradox does not emerge from it. This dimension is the viewpoint of "interior *doing*", and is an intrinsic glance which cannot be grasped from the outside, and in this viewpoint the "comprehension" in dimension of B is put forth. As soon as our wisdom tries to understand this viewpoint, this trial fails to comprehend the dimension. It is not to say that this "failure" means the failure to comprehend reality.

We will proceed from this "comprehension" to "being" in dimension B. James indicates this "being" in the sentence "What really *exists* is not things made but things in the making"(PU p.117). Being understood in the A meaning is objective and static, but "being" in the dimension of B is opposite to the former and cannot be settled in the

region in which our language acts functionally. Naturally, the meaning of “being” in the B dimension is “mysterious”, is qualitatively different from the meaning of the mystery which we call in question in the A dimension.

In A, the mysterious character of being obtains in the form that we call it in question but cannot solve it; therefore, the character is negative. But in B, this negativity itself is eliminated. Accordingly, the negative character of being turns out to be positive and the disappearance of mystery should become an affirmation of “being”. The frame of an object enables us to glimpse the being of each object along with it, so the mystery of being is also caused by this frame. Therefore, that mystery should disappear precisely when this frame is erased, and further, after this disappearance we cannot even remember where the mystery has existed⁹. In this situation, being is no more incomprehensible but, on the contrary, the positive “being” overwhelmed with the basis of incomprehensibility is eliminated.

⁹ We can find out this “being” in dimension B in Wittgenstein’s *Tractatus Logico-philosophicus* which regards ontology as something unspeakable on the one hand, and regards it as something “mysterious” on the other hand. This “mystery” is an example of the modality of “being” which is not conditioned in logic, and we can find this example in one of two kinds of assertions in *Tractatus* both of which are related to “being” and are apparently contradict each other. The one assertion regards “the denial situation”, that is, the situation “something does not exist” as inconsiderable. But this situation is indispensable for us to call being into question as a negative matter. Thus, this assertion conceives that all situations are affirmative in their original form and that our denial against the space including affirmative situations cannot be possible until we add to this space mere formal and logical “operation”. “Wir koennen also in der Logik nicht sagen: Das und das gibt es in der Welt, jenes nicht.”(5.61). This is the same assertion that we cannot find any denial against a picture in itself which describes the world. According to this assertion, denials or affirmations in the sense “against” denials do not exist in the objects themselves which are described, but in the “ways” of their descriptions or in mere “logics”. Therefore, being which is called in question through this denial should be being in dimension A.

While refusing “the denial situation” on the one hand, *Tractatus* insists that it is “mysterious” that the world is. “Nicht wie die Welt ist, ist das Mystische, sondern dass sie ist”(6.44). As for these assertions, even if we refuse “the denial situation” thoroughly, being may still emerge as “mystery” without “logic” which discriminates being and not-being. In short, here we should make clear what is “being” before “logic” at all. Concerning this problem, *Tractatus* also says that „Die Logik ist vor jeder Erfahrung—dass etwas so ist. Sie ist vor dem Wie, nicht vor dem Was.“(5.552). We should pay attention to the fact that “Was” in this stage is not defined as “something” through our discriminations. Contrasted from this “Was”, “logic” is the form for “how” or “so”, by which “something” is discriminated from other things and denial is settled outside of the “something”. Therefore, in our experience before “how”, we cannot argue about “what” which is conditioned in discriminations and relations with things other than it. So, the mystery of being in the sense of A does not emerge before “how”. Consequently, the “mystery” before “how”, as far as it is before logic, cannot help being “mystery” which is already not mysterious, and that, this “mystery” can exist only within the “experience” in which experience with discriminations has not yet been set up.

It is true that this “mystery” may still sound like the negative mystery does. But we can understand that “being” as “mystery” in this dimension in which our discriminations or denial logics are eliminated is already not even a being contrasted against nothing. Therefore, being as “mystery” in *Tractatus* must be opened to the positive “being” in dimension B in which even negativity has already been uprooted.

Section 4: "Being" which unconditionally discloses itself.

In spite of the fact that the condition of the incomprehensibility of being vanishes in B, we cannot explain what this vanishing is at all, and for this reason, we might not agree with it. We have certified that eliminating the frame, experience, "the solid dimension" and our return to "*doing*" makes our discrimination of "I" invalid. Although, we still suspect that if the frame of "I" is eliminated, only "being" of "I" will still remain irrelevant to the logical frame. Which leads us to inquiring further into the structure of the disappearance of this frame concerning being of "I", and we will assert at the end of this paper that the mystery of "my" being will turn out to be an affirmation through the conversion of our viewpoint, and that this "being" after our conversion is equivalent to "reality" according to James's view, for both are nothing but pure "becoming".

Firstly, the problem concerning being of "I" which is caused by the logical frame supposes the premise that the situation "I" do not exist now would be possible. This situation is opposed to "my" being and this opposing structure has the same condition with that of the emerging of "I"-Frame. The next quotation suggests this condition in our perceptions.

"The pen-experience in its original immediacy is not aware of itself, it simply *is*, and the second experience is required for what we call awareness of it to occur."(ERE p.65.)

In this "original immediacy", there is no logical distinction between being and not-being. And "not aware of itself" means the absence of the frame; therefore, the problem of being logically has not come into existence. In this sense, even the question where a reality has come from cannot arise if the reality has not been defined by our logical discrimination. In the dimension where that frame is still absent, even the basis of such an insistence that "my" being is baseless cannot be settled, and instead, our thought of being "baseless" arises on the condition that we set up that frame without noticing it. And we cannot inquire into even the "basis" of "my" being until we are based on the frame. The mystery concerning that basis arises from our discrimination about being. But whenever we think something, we cannot do it without using this discrimination, and even when I think about "me", this unavoidable character also applies.

But still we suspect intuitively that even if we eliminate this structure of discrimination and come to the dimension where the frame has not yet been formulated, the wonder why "I" have come to exist and have not continued not-being from the beginning to the end of the universe will not to be solved. Nevertheless, this intuitive wonder "I have come to exist in spite of the possibility that I have not existed" might

lead us to “being” which is not founded by logic. As for James, this intuitive wonder occurs in the moment when our experience shifts from the state “simply being” to the state “becoming aware of itself”:

“The difficulty of understanding what happens here is, therefore, not a logical difficulty; there is no contradiction involved. It is an ontological difficulty rather.” (ERE p.65.)

“I” emerges along with this shifting. This emergence is said to be no problem from the logical point of view. But it is said to have a difficulty ontologically. If it is not a logical problem, this difficulty does not arise along with our discrimination between me and the others or my previous consciousness. In other words, this unintelligibility concerning the cause of this difficulty may mean that where this “ontological” problem arises is out of our speaking. On the contrary, discrimination is the condition of meaning or a function of our language. Therefore, this “ontological” difficulty is situated in our tendency to cope with a problem in our region of discriminations which in fact does not exist in the region. And what we should examine here is whether this “being” itself which is beyond our discrimination should ever be clothed in shabby attire.

“But how the experiences ever *get themselves made*, or *why* their characters and relations are just such as appear, we can not begin to understand.” (ERE p.66.)

This statement still suggests being as a negative and mysterious matter, and it arises from where experience becomes “my” experience, that is, from where the individual being has come. As far as the mystery is caused by the frame of “me”, it must be negative. On the contrary, “being” of “experience” cannot be spoken and that cannot be negative. This situation is similar with the case that not-being or nothing cannot be negative here. In fact, while the idea “I was born from nothing” is still meaningful, the idea “pure experience was born from nothing” is meaningless. Hence if pure experience is an original reality, it should be a contradiction to set up being of “nothing” “before” this reality. We cannot contrast nothing and experience nor objectify it through discrimination, but rather nothing should be regarded as one reality with experience and as something never to be objectified. In this situation, there is not any viewpoint in which we can distinguish experience from another matter. This fact suggests that the idea of “the outside of experience” is meaningless and that experience and our viewpoints are originally one undividable reality.

We saw that pure experience still has not yet recognized its own self; therefore, it “only was”. “Not recognizing itself” means “being united with it”, and also being which is contrasted against nothing is not settled here. However, the experience in this situation is regarded as “being” in a peculiar sense and even if we still call it “being”, the incomprehensibility of it cannot emerge here. In short, “being” here is nothing other

than affirmation which has completely erased its contrast against negation. So long as "anything other than me" does not exist, the solipsistic "I" also does not exist.

This vanishing mystery is caused by the disappearance of the distinction between being and the other than being. Since in this disappearance, our inquiring into the basis of being turns out to be invalid of its own accord, because we cannot objectify being from the beginning. So, if we apply "me" to being, the question about the basis of "me" turns out to be invalid and then the mystery in a negative sense is eradicated. The reason why the mystery eradicates itself is that the "I" which is the cause of the mystery is eliminated of his own accord in this situation. On the contrary, if we let the frame of being remain and attempt to deprive being of its basis, we shall make being fall into nothing which is a contradiction of being itself¹⁰. This is caused by the arising of nothing as negation, due to the persistence of our views which objectify beings. To prevent this arising, it is also required to make our objectifying views invalid. This means our "becoming" reality itself, instead of seeing reality as something objectified. We understand that this "becoming" is the very character of reality in James and that it corresponds to "being" as an affirmation of what we have argued above. Thus at last, we solve the problem of being in the way that "the problem disappears of itself without our noticing of the disappearance", instead of the way that "an answer is given to the question which has been objectively analyzed". In the former case, the problem disappears with its source simultaneously, and with this disappearance the affirmation of the whole reality comes to be realized.

The more this disappearance is perfect, the less our conscious about the solved matter remains. In our ordinary attempts to solve paradoxes, we are conscious that "the problem has been solved" and, therefore, we can reconsider the solved matter clearly. This can take place on the condition that what was solved and the subject who solved it are distinguished and therefore the difference between the "before" of this solving and the "after" of it are made certain by the subject. On the contrary, in the vanishing of the problem of being through our "becoming", even our consciousness that the problem

¹⁰ For example, if we accept the idea that "consciousness" is nothing other than the product of brain as "material" as contrasted with "consciousness", the basis of what is called "consciousness" is deprived and it comes to be regarded as a kind of illusional idea, no matter how we attempt to maintain the reality of consciousness by our conceptualization of it. Such is the opinion of eliminativism which erases consciousness. On the contrary, if we do not remain the reality of "consciousness" and also do not define the reality of "material" as the opposing concept against the former, then "material" also turns out to be a mere sign which cannot be defined until it is contrasted against the concept of "consciousness" and, at once, "consciousness" does not remain reality in itself. Thus reality must be set before them. The double aspect theory of body and soul which was taken by Spinoza or Russell adopts this scheme, and the empiricism of James takes a similar view as far as "experience" in his standpoint cannot be defined.

“has been solved” no longer exists. Here, we can not see “what” has been solved and even where the problem existed, because what was solved and the solving subject are inseparable, and thus the subject cannot see the before and the after of the solving at the same time.

This method erases the distinction “the being and the other than the being”. But we should be suspicious here whether this method actually erases the distinction between “being and not-being”. It is true that some special method which is other than the method for erasing the distinction in the former case is not prepared for erasing the distinction in the latter case. That is, also in the case of “being and not being”, the structure in which the whole being is affirmed through our making the frame of being invalid is adopted. This structure is available in so far as the frame made invalid has also been intimate with being which is different from the being and our erasing the frame even deprives the position that “being has no basis” of its basis. The reason of it is that even such a negative insistence as “being has no basis” presupposes not-being and therefore the affirmation of being is not carried out until our view which produces this not-being is made invalid. This invalidity is under the condition that there is no logical outside of “the basis of being”, that is, there is no negation against being and no not-being. As far as we ask about being of a certain being, this inquiring into “the basis of being” presupposes the outside of the being, namely not-being of the being. But, if this outside as the region of the basis is not distinguished from being, even an idea of “baselessness of being” is already meaningless, except for the case that this undistinguished reality is again newly regarded as the being.

In this depriving meaning from “baselessness of being”, negativity turns out to be the positivity of its own accord because the basis of negativity already does not exist. If we apply this situation to “my being”, this positivity corresponds to that of experience without me. On the contrary, what can be spoken about “my” being generates mystery because it inevitably produces not-being. Therefore we can never speak about this positivity of “being” by language which is founded on discrimination.

For example, we can find this ineffability in the situation in which the “thisness” of “me” does not stir up anxiety but rather changes into positive activity of its own accord. The “thisness” of “me” is barely expressed as the very quality of “me” who does not exist anywhere else and exists here only once during the whole history of universe. But the essence of this quality cannot be expressed and continues to slip away from even the word “I”. And when “thisness” is contrasted from others or from nothing, the baselessness produced here stirs up mystery and anxiety. This is the negativity of “thisness”. In another case to the contrary, “thisness” can emerge without supposing discrimination, and it is in this case where even the character “baselessness” cannot be stirred up because there is no discrimination in the first place. And through

this situation, the view attaching to "thisness" overcomes its negativity from inside because it erases the distinction between itself and outside of itself; moreover, it eliminates even the characteristic of only once in the whole history of universe. In this situation, it is determined that there is no region outside of self; accordingly (or therefore) even a solipsistic self cannot be brought into existence. And this situation is conditioned by a kind of conversion from our ordinary self which is defined through our discrimination, and that, this situation cannot be "understood" from a view which has not experienced this conversion.

Conclusion

So far, while we have confirmed the character of "I" which accompanies all our rational thinking as fundamental being, we have on the other hand seen the structure of paradox which arises from the very existence of "I". This paradox is, after all, found in the contradiction between the frame for our rational thinking which sustains the fact "I" am not you, and our equally rational thinking which regards the universe as monistic. To solve this dilemma, we have suggested a choice: (1) to set up "the idealistic absolute" as the transcendent that solves even this contradiction or (2) to make a rational form which causes this contradiction to be invalid in the first place. Though both methods aimed at contrary directions, they were the same in that both attempt to solve the problem in the region which is beyond our wisdom.

Through the form of rationality, being of considered objects has turned out to be a problem, which being is thought to be a basis which sustains any matters on the one hand, but on the other hand, being can never emerge unless we glimpse it through the objectified being. And for the reason that this way of glimpsing is rational, this way also causes the mystery of being in contrast to not-being. And with regard to the being of "I", this mystery of being arises as the question why I have happened to exist regardless of the possibility that I have not existed at all. And such mystery discloses itself as the negative aspect of being. But when the being has come to no longer be objectified, "being" overwhelmed by that mystery becomes invalid. And this "being" is already not being in a negative sense which has been glanced through the being, but being with positive activity. Moreover, when we make "me" act for the being which is no longer objectified, then "I" for whom the frame is indispensable and the viewpoint which objectifies matters are eliminated, and that "being" turns out to be affirmation of the whole without "me" as the focus of the viewpoint. This "being" as affirmation corresponds to "reality" in the Jamesian way, and in this situation, reality is no longer seen as something and the view which saw reality should "becomes" reality.

We should inquire further into this turning process and should see how the

change from the negative appearance of being to the positive nature of it is performed. In fact, an "answer" is not given to the question about the mystery of being proposed in the former appearance, but rather, the basis of our attitude which seeks the "answer" is made invalid, and in the dimension in which we no longer know where the problem existed, "being" is again affirmed fundamentally. This is also common with the mysterious character of religious experience which occurs in the "union" of "me" and the "more". Surely, this experience should never be applied to the frame of psychological experience and process which are objectively observed, and therefore, this experience should be considered based on the process concerning the ontological question about "me" and the solution of it. And so far as this question is "answered" through our "becoming" reality, the incomprehensibility of this experience should not be solved in our form of wisdom which aims at a certain matter "knowable" for us some day. Therefore, it should be considered to be essentially incomprehensible as far as we seek the answer to this question as such wisdom.