

Bruce Charlton's Notions


About Me

Bruce Charlton

Bruce G Charlton. Anonymous comments are deleted without being read. Comments are moderated (pretty severely). Established commenters are privileged, but in general I only publish comments that I judge to contribute to the intended effect of the blog post.

[View my complete profile](#)

My Blog List

 **From the Narrow Desert**
[Lucid walking, and Carrotman](#)
[Mushman](#)

 **Francis Berger**
[The Inversion of Democracy is](#)
[Itself an Inversion](#)

 **Meeting The Masters**
[Ethnocentrism and Globalism](#)

 **New World Island**
[Jan 22nd - Feb 4th 2024](#)
 (Audio)

 **SYNOLOGOS - Christian**
[Blog Aggregator](#)

Blog Archive

- ▶ [2024](#) (58)
- ▶ [2023](#) (432)
- ▶ [2022](#) (482)
- ▶ [2021](#) (543)
- ▶ [2020](#) (579)
- ▶ [2019](#) (688)
- ▼ [2018](#) (654)
 - ▶ [December](#) (56)
 - ▶ [November](#) (62)
 - ▶ [October](#) (64)
 - ▶ [September](#) (44)

Tuesday 2 January 2018

Not Process but Provenance - (and Polarity is an abstraction of creative-being)

I have belatedly realised (such things always take me a *t-horribly* long time) that the modern world is being duped - wholesale - by the fake assertion that process is the ultimate source of validity; whereas in fact provenance is the basis of truth...

Allow me to explain... The (modern, fake...) idea is that 'understanding' of something is a matter of being able to describe it in terms of process; and that correct understanding has happened when process leads to predictable outcomes.

So - the modern activity of professional bureaucratic research that calls-itself 'science' claims that **valid results are what come-out-of this process of research**, and what comes out of this process is intrinsically valid. Science is regarded as The Process.

But, it would be truer to say (although still an abstraction) that science is what comes-out-of *scien-tists*; that is, out-of individual human creative-beings whose *motivation* is scientific. *Science is what-(real) scientists-do.*

Other examples would be my current obsessions of **Primary Thinking** and **Polarity**. I have been having difficulties explaining these, including to myself (especially polarity...). And these difficulties are related to my trying to do this explaining in terms of process - which is an abstraction. I should instead have been trying to understand them in terms of their provenance.

Yet my explicit metaphysical foundation is that ultimate reality is personal, not abstract - my bottom line is that reality is made up of *beings* (variously alive and conscious beings). Abstractions are therefore merely models - therefore (being models) always simplified and always incomplete and *always not-true...* no matter how expedient or useful in limited circumstances.

So, trying to explain Primary Thinking in terms of process is always and necessarily *wrong* - in reality primary thinking is *the*

- ▶ August (52)
- ▶ July (58)
- ▶ June (56)
- ▶ May (61)
- ▶ April (49)
- ▶ March (51)
- ▶ February (45)
- ▼ January (56)

Who will win demographically
- Sterile Leftists or...

Tolkien nods - a rare, but
significant, lapse in L...

Appearances may Not be
deceptive - a new mini-
book...

Why does a theology of
reincarnation so often go-a...

Faith, Hope and Charity - the
antidote to fear (an...

Meditations on Steve Cutts
short animation about t...

Christianity Or Western
Civilisation? Things comin...

The reality of demons - is it
crazy to believe, or...

The deep meaning of
evolution: 'unfoldment of
huma...

Magical Thinking - The future
of Magic

Living forever versus eternal
life

Divide and rule?

Obedient clueless
incompetence - mainstream
modern...

The next step: When you don't
believe Them - Say so!

Discard your fear of being-
wrong. Embrace your inn...

What would stop Europe's
demographic decline?

Love and consciousness from
the assumption of Bein...

thinking of that-which-is-primary: i.e. the thinking of our real self, which is a divine self (a son or daughter of God): a self that is in part existent from eternity.

The thinking of this real self is primary thinking - and the validity of the 'products' of divine thinking comes from *that provenance*: that is from thinking's origin in the real self. Thought that originates-from the real self is valid, and *that* provenance is what makes thought valid...

And polarity... I have (following Coleridge and Barfield) tried to explain it abstractly, that is as a model... but polarity so-considered is a process; a process consisting of opposed by inextricable centrifugal (feminine) and centripetal (masculine) elements... and so on. And all processes are abstractions, hence wrong.

So, in the end, polarity has *not* really been understood. And nobody can make a machine or any other model that 'does polarity'... Only beings do it.

Polarity is an abstract model of creativity, and creativity is done by beings.

The ultimate creativity is to create *creators* - that is, to pro-create, to have offspring. Thus the ultimate reality, of which polarity is merely an abstraction, is the fertile dyad of man and woman; of two complementary beings.

Other types of creativity (literary, scientific artistic etc) are inextricable from the inclusion of beings - a poem without a person to read/ a symphony without someone to hear it... is not a creative product but merely ink marks on paper.

All creativity entails *beings*. (And beings entail life and consciousness - of some type and degree.)

That is, creativity is also (like polarity, like primary thinking) a matter of provenance, of source and origin...

So, to return to Primary Thinking - we cannot explain it as a process, indeed that is its nature to be inexplicable as a process - else it would not be *primary* (and instead 'the process' would be primary).

We know primary thinking by knowing that we *do* it - more exactly, that we have been-doing it: that our real self has-been-thinking. We *cannot* look-*within* the process of primary thinking -

The Harry Potter Litmus Test to discriminate betwe...

For those who like the metaphysics on this blog...

Resist implemented evil - solo dissidence

Direct Christianity made possible by Christ's pres...

Is it possible to write a great song with only ONE...

What is the Big Issue, the Litmus Test? Mass Immig...

The English radical tradition - Christian versus a...

Freud, not Marx, destroyed the USA (then The West)

What is the biological cause of modern Western ins...

The bureaucratic solution to Life

What should we do first? (Given that Western popul...

Evil during sleep

Evil is an attribute, a positive thing: it is the ...

Direct knowing compared with perception, feelings ...

The meaning of death, and life - conscious knowing...

'Restorer of the Eternal Light' - by John Fitzgerald

Don't try to 'strengthen' your thinking...

Monkey Magic!

The archetypal library

'Loadsamoney' in the Lab

We need a post-mortal utopia to guide us

Is it possible to write a great song with only TWO...

The five rhythmic-phases of my typical Daily Life ...

Could Rudolf Steiner have become a Professor (inst...

The uses and abuses of meta-

because primary thinking is *what eventuates-from our real self*. We know primary thinking by recognising that it *has-eventuated* - we recognise primary thinking as *a product-of our real self, thinking...*

Therefore, the deepest *understanding* is not of (inevitably incomplete and biased) abstract models of processes; but knowledge of *the nature of the beings that constitute reality*.

Aside: All this is why and how Christians can correctly regard *love* as primary in God's creation - which would not make sense if ultimate understanding of creation was of the nature of physics or mathematics. Love is primary because beings are primary - thus ultimate reality is alive, conscious, purposive.

Posted by Bruce Charlton at [Tuesday, January 02, 2018](#)



2 comments:

Chiu ChunLing said...

I think that, by "polarity" you mean orientation with respect to desires for a particular situation. A sense of what is "better" and what is "worse". This situation is properly one in which there are two *complementary* persons, with complementary desires, the desire of each for the other in a resolution in which *both* are satisfied. So it is in a sense very apt to the analogy to magnets, except that magnets are simply reacting to physical forces, it is not a matter of desire or satisfaction.

It may also be apt in that magnets, when drawn together, tend to form a larger magnet. Parents truly unified are to their children more than just two people, happy couples and their families bond together into an extended family or larger community. Ultimately, our desires for God and His for us bind together all persons who embrace this complementary relationship rather than insisting always on being the sole beneficiary of any relationship. A desire that soon morphs only into demanding that others bear only pain and regret from any interaction even if that is accomplished at the price of there being no benefits for *anyone*.

3 January 2018 at 15:55

Bruce Charlton said...

@CCL - No that isn't what is meant by polarity here - it is meant as the absolutely fundamental way of structuring discourse. Ive tried, without much success, to explain this several times before - but my main source is Owen Barfield's What Coleridge Thought.

3 January 2018 at 17:37

analysis

The historical Merlin

Honesty is why Christians
have become unemployable

Lies upon lies about sex and
the media - another c...

Direct Christianity

The collapse of Western
Christian Churches (for
We...

Rudolf Steiner's (1918)
accurate predictions of th...

How might foresight/
prevision work?

Good ideas on the best places
to visit in England

Some jazzy flute

Q: Are psychological-
biological group differences
...

The opposite of Abstract is...
Personal (*not* 'co...

My ultimate reason for
blogging...

Not Process but Provenance -
(and Polarity is an a...

The disaster of increased
funding (New Left strategy)

► [2017](#) (544)

► [2016](#) (644)

► [2015](#) (615)

► [2014](#) (682)

► [2013](#) (611)

► [2012](#) (556)

► [2011](#) (450)

► [2010](#) (303)

► [2009](#) (6)

► [2008](#) (6)

Some of my other blogs:

 [Tolkien's The Notion Club Papers](#)

 [William Arkle](#)

[Post a Comment](#)

[Newer Post](#)

[Home](#)

[Older Post](#)

Subscribe to: [Post Comments \(Atom\)](#)

Simple theme. Powered by [Blogger](#).