

[page 335]

CHAPTER 16
A Cosmos of Consciousness

This of all subjects has interested me most. In this inner laboratory of my own mind I have done my most difficult experimenting, my most extensive and elaborate lines of research; and it is in this domain of my own consciousness that I have discovered a new continent and brought the first scientific report.

—ELMER GATES

The feeling and intuition that a great new mental domain awaits discovery often appears in the writings of Elmer Gates: “A whole new and unexpected world,” he wrote in 1899; “pupils should make a prospection of it, try for it. Surely the greatest hope and expectancy for the future lies in the mind’s domain. Someone will find a leading and discover something that will amaze and transform the world; it will not be spiritism or telepathy or such for that leaves the mind’s mystery mainly unexplored. It will relate to the mind’s introspective processes in some way and their relation to ontology and epistemology.”

“The one dominant impulse and intuition and overmastering desire of my life,” he wrote a year later, “is to discover some great law relating to the mind’s action. I feel that, like the man who could not see the forest for the trees, I cannot see this

[page 336]

discovery because it is so near to me or my consciousness—so self-evident, so immediately practicable.”

Early in his studies he decided that the one great subject was mind. Though the whole of modern science since Thales has studied environment, including bodily organs and minds as objective parts, Gates made clear that the best way to prepare for the study of environment was to study the mind, which was a domain of its own. By 1900 he saw clearly that in the study of environment and mind the central problem was Consciousness. How to handle Consciousness was the question.

“First and foremost is health, sanity, superabundant energy, oxygen, unaltered circulation, recuperation, rest, sleep, normal activity—else Consciousness cannot be vigorous and clear. What else? Imagine me saying O I wish I had some consciousness upon which to experiment. Naught else is so surely and completely mine as my own Consciousness, it is I. I can observe the effects of conscious states in other things, but only in my own Consciousness can I directly and immediately know what Consciousness is and

experiment on it and with it. This is experimental introspection which reveals a hitherto unknown continent in the world of mind. The first thing I knew was a conscious state, and I have since known naught else. But though it is my consciousness, it is nevertheless a cosmic process. I do not make the nature of my consciousness any more than gravity or truth. Consciousness has discovered truth about itself and the not-self. What is the law of that discovery? It is experience, but what is that? Surely it is a consciousness of Consciousness because only Consciousness can have experience, only it can get knowledge.

“There are phenomena in the objective world that Consciousness cannot predict or know except by experience; therefore Consciousness must learn about the objective world inductively,” he concluded. He acquired a new point of view, as yet indefinable. He practiced the consciousing of consciousness and the awaring of introspection hoping to discriminate some new domain in his consciousness, which must be influenced by the

[page 337]

Consciousness of the Cosmic whole. Could he discriminate the subjective connection?

“The nature of the world is fixed and includes Consciousness.” But by voluntary effort Gates found that he could increase the power of consciousness and extend his knowledge of self and not-self. This was the great marvel of Consciousness—“its power to be self-active; its power to will!” He achieved a new view of the relation of Consciousness to itself: it can exercise control over its own states. It is self-active and can call into action or accept such states as it chooses and can inhibit others. Inhibiting the bad and re-functioning the good states in each domain of intellection, emotion, and conation, he believed, would soon re-create his consciousness.

“It is not only mind that makes every discovery, but it is Consciousness—the power of becoming conscious, of detecting new discriminations in states of consciousness. Undoubtedly the most important thing to be done by Consciousness for itself is the elimination of undesirable emotional states and false intellectual data. In studying Consciousness it is always necessary to remember that every act whereby Consciousness becomes conscious of itself is a voluntary act. We cannot separate intellection, emotion, and conation; and one of the most fundamental factors of conation is *directing the attention*. It follows that an introspective study of Consciousness involves the volitional factor to such an extent that the result of the introspection will be modified by the nature of the effort. It is impossible to separate a single introspection of a conscious state

from the voluntary effort made in directing the awareness to that state. Perhaps I was on the right track to discover some great things about Consciousness when experimenting with the psychal factor of volition.

“As far as my reading goes, I find that no one has ever tried to introspect the nature of Consciousness itself. They have introspected certain differentiated conscious states, such as sensations and pains, fatigue, images and certain mental processes. Now if I could divert this introspective domain from a study of some

[page 338]

special state and direct it to a study of Consciousness itself as modified by physical and environmental conditions, and by psychal conditions, it may be that I can learn something new about Consciousness itself. If from the content of Consciousness I cancel its specific qualitative states, does there remain a plenum or sub-stratum of Consciousness out of which the different states have arisen? Will the introspection of Consciousness itself augment its activity? . . . It is very difficult to introspect Consciousness; the results are misty and indistinct. Only by frequent practice can I become aware of the introspective Consciousness. . . .

“The fundamental interaction of self and not-self is the sole condition of Consciousness. Mind is fundamentally social (as representing communion between self and not-self): even the first sensation is a product of this fundamental interaction between Cosmos as a whole and myself as a finite part. Mind in its very nature is an adjustment between a finite organism and its environment.”

Such were some of his points of view expressed in diary entries of 1900. In 1903 his five attempts at business mentation brought results relating to Consciousness and pointed to a great discovery. He had frequent practice: in 1904 he wrote that every day during the past ten years two or more morning hours were devoted to a systematic study of the science of Consciousness (cognostology), “looking” for more facts, classifying and generalizing. He also carried on systematic practice of the corresponding art of consciousing (cognosing), by which Consciousness studies and inventories its own states and processes, its normal nature and activities, and attains skill, thereby increasing its vividness and power, augmenting directly or indirectly the basic energies of life and mind.

“Next to discovering a truth is to point out its need and the way to find it. Not on inspiration or genius need we depend for these discoveries, but on an *art* of conceptuating, ideating, and

thinking.” So Gates wrote, and so he did. The heurotechnic method was further applied to an experimental study of the

[page 339]

nature of knowledge. Out of the foregoing steps and a number of others, and much further experience with the arts of inventing and discovery, and especially out of the Four Branches of Introspection and the art of validation, came a *notable subjective effect* upon his whole being, an exalted rapture of expectation and an intense desire and leading to become acquainted with a more sure and certain kind of knowledge.

“My attention was completely and dominantly centered on this subject,” he wrote later about it in 1911, “and I felt a new step coming. But I was not walking around in a dreaming ecstasy; I was busy fourteen hours a day, five of them (my best early morning) being spent in my subjective laboratory and the others in my objective laboratory. This laboratory in my inner world was irresistibly attractive. To the world studied by this inner laboratory there are Three Gates: the New, Newer, and Newest Introspection. The First Gates admit into The Realm, the Second to its Capital City, the Third to the Court. In each there are Towers of Observation (the memorial, the dreamlike, the phasmic degrees of vividness), and from each one of these nine Towers four kinds of phenomena may be studied—the ceptive, spective, entic, and ectic. From the highest Tower of the Court I studied *entic cepts* and in the entic factor of cepts I beheld the Dawn of The New Cycle. And in that supreme moment I was a thousand times repaid for every sacrifice and effort during the twenty well-filled years since my twelfth. I knew from that moment on all the rest of my life would be devoted to the study of mind and environment from the cognostic standpoint and by cognostically rectified methods. Does this sound mystical? It is not. Though the names sound allegorical, they are simply convenient terms for actual mental faculties and processes and methods. There is not anything whatever that is as directly and immediately known as cognosis. The first great result from this line of research was the discovery of cognosis; the second was the discovery of a criterion of truth; the third was the discovery of the cognostic rectification of cognostic validation called *alethification*.”

[page 340]

As Gates became sufficiently skilled in ceptive introspection he *knew* that something of a non-mental character was going on in a cept besides volitional activities—different from his instinctive and phylogenetic subconsciousness—and that such a self activity was

not a mental activity. After canceling meanings and educating it to become dominant, he knew it to be something more than a cept. As a cept it was a unit factor in his mental life; as a non-mental self-activity by which it maintained itself as a cept it was a cognocept. By watching that self-activity, by “initiating” that “spontaneity,” he became aware of an ability to exert a directive action on it—not by volition, but by educating it to follow certain lines of activity.

“This non-mental factor or cept is always the same for a given interaction with, or stimulus from, the environment, subjective or objective; and is thus a criterion of truth. The cept is always what it seems to be and represents that specific interaction or relation or stimulus (sensation) between the given objective or subjective thing, and nothing else whatever,” he was certain; and he continued, “There is immanent in the mind a Consciousness per se that is not individualistic but an *active process* of consciousing, alike in all minds, self-active, the ceptive base of every mental state.”

It takes a long time to get acquainted with a new capacity or mental power and utilize it knowingly. Cognosis was gradually disclosed to him from 1891 to 1899 and subsequently to 1911. It was fifteen years after he actually began to experience it before he was able to distinguish it from his new methods of introspection, and still another dozen years before he could use it as a whole. By long practice and growth and favorable periods and insights the Awareness entered more and more into his introspection and became a part long before he could identify or use it separately. More and more it became a witness, and one day while “awaring” a cept (divested of its meanings) he knew “indubitably that the ens of the cept was a bit of the cosmically-immanent Consciousness per se and its urgings was its self-activity.” Thus Consciousness reveals to itself its own nature and

[page 341]

moods, the data of which axe absolutely known criteria of truth, constituting the basis of a new and more fundamental epistemology.

“A cept is a window opening into the new Cosmos of Consciousness!”

From the new standpoint the law of cognition is that a cept is a bit of Consciousness per se, while a spect is an interpretation of that cept by having been associatively enregistered with some characteristic feature or act of experience. That is, meanings are due to spect, while cepts have no cognitive meanings. The act or process of apperceptive interpretation enregisters a qualitative cept (feeling, sensation) with some other qualitative cept (musclation,

feeling, motor act), thereby creating a more complex unit called a spect, which is a cognitive state. A state, whether about an outer or inner thing, has cepts in it, few or many, but the spect is due quantitatively to a combination of ceptive units.

By causing Consciousness to become conscious of itself and with its own states (not one of which is any of the usual and hitherto known mental states), a new group of facts are identified, constituting a new science. All these facts are known absolutely and indubitably, and not relatively, giving a series of standard data that actually are just what they seem to be. These facts constitute a *criterion of truth*; and the mode of knowing by which they were discovered, cognosis, is more fundamental than the logical modes and psycho-logic processes of perceptual observation, induction, or deduction, and is corrective of the errors in them. Not one of these facts of cognostic data is derived from sensory perception or induction or deduction or from any traces of reasoning whatever but are true even if the whole other content of the mind be untrue. This is a new basis for science and a new foundation for philosophy, and gives to science verified by the only criterion known to man a deeply religious significance. By aid of this criterion and the mode of knowing upon which it is based, we get in under perception and all modes of cognition and cognitive inference, rectifying them to give rise to cognostically rectified methods of cognitive validation. It gets in

[page 342]

behind and antecedent to esthesias and thus evaluates them. It gets in behind all cognitive self-activity and thus enables the selection and test of urgations (Gates' collective term for different kinds of volitional effort, of which conation is the simplest) All this intellective and introspective validation, esthetic evaluation, and urgative testing is called alethification—the art of determining the true, good, and useful in mental states and processes.

All this domain of cognosis has been wrongly identified with the instinctive and subconscious processes; it has been so close to the mind that it has been used unawares. Indeed, Consciousness is frequently defined as being merely the general name for all conscious states, as if each did not contain the particular factor of Consciousness. Consciousness has an inherent nature of its own; it is a property over whose nature the individual has no control; it is cosmic in origin. It arises in an organism when the conditions are right, and the whole nature of Consciousness is then and there manifested; it is at the same time the power that introspects and is introspected. Consciousness is the most significant and important factor in life and mind, and to know its nature and laws is the fundamentally useful knowledge.

To use this power of cognosis intentionally we must know where it ends and intellection begins, how cognostic activity furnishes data for voluntary attention and volition and how self-initiated bodily movement brings the establishment of adaptive relations between inward processes and states and outward conditions, resulting in interpretations of an experiential character and thus carrying the natural validity of cognosis into intellection and rectifying it. Cognosis does not relate itself directly to the adaptive experience of the individual, but it is the process that furnishes the first premises for them; it begets our knowledge of sensations and is the basis of reasoning.

The reasoning process commences at the very beginning of cognition in the formation of the simplest and lowest intellection. When the self first relates muscular motion to sensation, it *infers* that its self is making the bodily motions, and this inference is an

[page 343]

inductive step by virtue of that same kind of process as all reasoning processes—by remembering the results of discriminated conscious experience. Thus when a conscious volition of a certain subjective character produces a certain movement of bodily parts, the self remembers that such conscious states produce such motions, and then repeats them with that end in view. The fundamental nature of inductive reasoning is discriminating a conscious experience by detecting a difference in Consciousness, and that of deductive reasoning is remembering an induction and detecting its likeness as compared with some other experience. Induction consists in detecting a difference, deduction in detecting a likeness; this is the solution of the hitherto inexplicable mystery of reason.

“One of the supremest moments of my life,” Gates recollected, “was when this insight first came. I was seeking, O so eagerly, an understanding of the nature of reason and its taxonomic place in the scheme of intellective integrants. I had been reading logic from Aristotle to Mill and Spencer to the last magazine article. I had many times introspected every step of my intellective process. When I saw the nature of the ratiocinative process in all its profound and fundamental simplicity, and at the same time saw a still more fundamental basis for my analysis, I felt that my life had not been in vain; my joy in the realization of the truth of my work was my deepest satisfaction.

“What is this insight? If the self at any given step of its development, in which it has a certain number of conscious states, could never discover in the totality of its subjective states any new conscious state, any differences or differentiations in the stream of Consciousness, then further mental development would be

impossible. A new conscious state must arise by the mind's discovering or detecting a difference between its present states and a new state just experienced. I do not think a multiplication of remarks will make the point any plainer. If the self could not distinguish differences there would be but one conscious state which would be psychally impossible; a conscious state can exist only as a relation or relatedness to other states.

[page 344]

“The next process is remembering that experience. The creation of an enregistration in the bodily structure and the re-functioning of it constitutes the memory of that experience. The self finds it can repeat that previously discovered state by subjectively repeating that process by which it was first produced, and that is deduction. Similar self-active conscious states produce similar results in Consciousness. In making this discovery the mind detects likenesses between one group of conscious states and another group. To detect a likeness is to classify. At the very beginning of intellection the mind, by its nature, commences to make a taxonomy of its subjective states and tries to make it conform to perceivable objective conditions.

“The cosmic Consciousness immanent in a creature responds to its interactions with its environment in such a way that when a certain kind occurs a consciousness-state of a certain quality arises in the creature. As this state invariably occurs *with* that interaction it becomes the sign of that objective thing to that creature, and the two are associatively integrated in memory constituting a cognitive state. But the same quality of Consciousness-state to another creature or on another world might be associated with a totally different kind of objective thing. For example, to a creature in a pond a given object may cause the sensation of red, and if that object is used as a food, that sensation will mean something good to eat; to another however, of a different degree of evolution or on another planet, that same sensation may mean something noxious. Now divested of its cognistic meaning this state will be the same in *kind* to each one of a dozen creatures however widely its meaning may differ. The meanings are cognistic, but the consciousness element which constitutes the sensation of red apart from its meaning, is Consciousness *per se*. If a moment of Consciousness *per se* did not arise in response to the stimulus from the object, the creature could not be aware of the object. According to the special experience of each creature, that Consciousness state comes to have a quite special meaning: it is individualistic, local, temporal, relative while the Consciousness state *per se* is non-individualistic (the same in different

[page 345]

creatures), universal, absolute. All the experiences of a given creature in a given environment are primarily pure Consciousness states but when interpreted they are cognitive states and their enregistration as memory-structures and mental content builds the cognitive mind, which is local and temporal (necessarily so for adaptive value in an evolving creature).

“Grasp this interpretative, local, and temporal nature of cognition and you will not wonder that the eternal verities cannot reveal themselves through cognition; you will not wonder that ten thousand theories have clouded the sky of human intellect, filled it with storms and wrecked it with cyclones. You will cease to look for finalities in cognition; you will know that its very nature lies in its complete localness and temporalness and individual adaptiveness (specificity).”

So Gates vehemently wrote.

This discovery of the true nature of cognition, the demonstration of the genesis and nature of meaning and volition, he considered among the “greatest glories of the heurotechnic method; all made possible by the discovery of cognosis.” Heurotechny discovered the New Introspection and created the new science of introspectology, and with them discovered the fourfold validation as a new domain in scientific method that led to the discovery of cognosis and prelogic. This phase of Gates' work was not made public and was seldom talked about, except to a few of his closest associates. “Had I done as most discoverers,” he answered a friend's complaint about not writing out this discovery, “I would have stopped with the first step and spent the rest of my life writing about it. I saw so many further wonders opening before my enraptured vision that I had not the time to develop and publish that one step.”

There were hours and days in his early life when he yearned inexpressibly for just that kind of knowledge, never actually daring to believe he could get it. “Nevertheless I never stopped the yearning, never ceased seeking,” he wrote. “When I found it, it was so big I could see only a small part of its vast scope, like a man trying to see the earth from where he stands. Gradually

[page 346]

I became aware of the magnitude of what I cognosed and now it fills my horizon. O how my heart goes back to those dear old days when I made my transition from the pre-psychurgic cycle of human development into the New Cycle—when Consciousness cognosed itself and cognition was seen from a higher Level! It was a great day for me when I definitely *knew* and *knew indubitably* that Consciousness is the fundamental certainty—and

the very greatest reality of Existence. I thought it over and over and realized that without organic feelings and sensations I could not possibly have known of the existence of anything, but the fundamental factor is the Consciousness that constitutes them. It is the most fundamental fact that it may ever know, prior to all doubt. I had at last *escaped from doubt* by discovering the indubitable and fundamental and uninterpreted nature of Consciousness....

“That concealed within the known Cosmos there should be another hitherto totally unknown cosmos was a surprise. Psychurgy was the Columbus of a new cosmos. It identified within the known physico-chemical cosmos another and vastly more complex cosmos, their synthesis constituting *one* psycho-physical complexus of inconceivable complexity. In every cognitive mental state was found, like a jewel in its matrix, a Consciousness-state (cept) through which my Consciousness could peep into the Cosmos of Consciousness,” he marveled.

“This Cognocosmos is the immanently directive organizer of the picture and the screen and the beholder. A new human faculty had to be born. It cannot be detected by the senses, nor intellectually perceived nor discovered by exploration with a telescope or microscope, nor by induction or deduction, nor by physical laboratory experiments, nor even by introspection. But ceptive introspection is the perilously dizzy path that leads to the Heights from which the new faculty may look through a rift in the cognitive clouds and discover a new and far more sublime cosmos than has ever exalted the mind of man. If the human race had always been without eyes, imagine the extent to which its cognitive world would expand with sight! They have been

[page 347]

cognostically blind, but with the advent of cognosis the thick veil of opaque cognition has become transparent and sometimes it is wholly lifted for a few brief seconds, disclosing a new and almighty and impersonal Cosmos of ineffable beauty, majesty, and of infinite power, a whole new cosmos revealed! The wonder of this startling assertion is this—each successful cognostic pupil finds it to be true!”

The advent of cognosis is the *rise of a new power* in the human mind, and it marks the beginning of the psychurgic era by disclosing the disparate difference between cognition and cognosis and disclosing the local, temporal, and purely interpretative nature of cognition. Cognosis is ultracognitive. In cognosis we attain a new relationship to the Cosmos and a new and higher mode of religious insight and experience. There are certain things that we can indubitably know, namely cognocepts, and in them we have a criterion of truth and absolute proof of the mind's sanity and a

contact with the infinitely immanent and transcendent in the Cosmos; and then through cognition, with its sensations and organized feelings and introspection and its intellectual integration, we arrive at a knowledge of the Outer World—merging from the absolute certainty of cognosis into the relative inductive certainty of cognition.

Out of this knowledge comes also identification of the cognistic self and discovery of a Cognostic Self. By cognosis (cognition), Consciousness evolves for each species in interaction with its mechanical and social environment a mind adapted to those creatures for that environment, and at the same time in interaction with the Cognocosmos there is ripening in each individual a Cognostic Self that is an adaptation to the universal and eternal conditions of the Cognocosmos; and in some individuals a cognistic apprehension of that Real Self may occur and voluntary use be made of that knowledge.

“To see and know the ‘content’ of a cept as a self-activity independent of one’s volition (wonderful!),” exclaimed Gates, “is to meet your own Real or Cognostic Self—the impersonal, universal, and perhaps eternal Self. As an activity it is able to

[page 348]

direct the motions of the atoms constituting its brain substance and reorganize it structurally and make enregistrations as mental memories. Consciousness is the brain builder. Being self-active, it is a *self*, for a mere mechanical motion is not self action. It is the real self, all else in man is an automaton. It is the Higher Self. As cognosis is the basis of cepts, the mind is of the nature of cognosis. The individual self acquires additional and a higher kind of self-expression. In cognosis is a true self-activity, the basic *self-reliance*.”

It has been noted that in his steps in introspection what Gates called the Awareness played an increasing part and finally became a witness. He recorded early that consciousness is not a single phenomenon but a dual performance. Consciousness consciousing itself implies two consciousnesses—a dual perception of the same mental state in the same organ, in his brain and in a cosmic Consciousness. “O give me to sing this solid, simple, plainly understood truth; it is more wonderful than all mysticism,” he wrote with youthful ardor.

He learned to discriminate introspection—which varied, from Awareness—which did not vary. Awareness is that which pays attention to and witnesses the whole conscious content of the mind. He warned “the truth-loving reader against any attempt at an occult or mystical interpretation of this most interesting and wonderful

phenomenon. It is a natural and not supernatural condition, as all my experiments prove; it is cosmic and not supracosmic.”

The following entries in his diaries of 1899-1904 show progress in his study of cognosis and Awareness, and the beginning of his knowledge of how to utilize Awareness. (Adapted.)

I am a differentiated part of the Cosmic Mind. If I am not, then my mind came without adequate cause. I watch the Cosmic Mind process every day in my own Consciousness. I am amazed to find it has a nature of its own, and I understand how that nature could not have been different without impossible things being possible. Thus my mind *knows* (introspects) that there is

[page 349]

no limit to Space; that a body cannot travel from one place to another in a straight line and skip half the distance—that is, my mind is aware that it could not do so. Consciousness is aware of itself, that half is less than the whole. It not only knows these statements to be true but is fully and authoritatively aware that they could have been true in no other way, with an absolute knowing with which the ordinary certainties of inductive science are not comparable. Scientific data are matters of experience, and we do not know but what the facts might just as well have been different. The Awareness of Consciousness knows not only that a fact is true as a matter of experience but also that it could not possibly have been different. This Awareness that knows essential truth is not introspection, and when I cognitively understand why, then I realize that Awareness is the expression of the ontological nature of the universe.

In trying to become aware of our conscious introspects we must not try to image that which is by its very nature not imageable—for example, Space. When we try to get the mind's affirmations about space, we are apt to project imaginary lines in various directions and to picture it as a sphere. And such images are not attributes of space but steps in the method by which we arrive at a true awareness of it.

How the mind has this strange capacity to be cognizant of this dual Consciousness—to be a witness to its own states and acts, and to its introspection of them, and to the critical approvals and disapprovals, and at the same time to be cognizant of truth—is one of the amazing mysteries. . . . To my Awareness I am as objective as a tree, to my mind Consciousness is as cosmic as chemistry or gravity; between Awareness and Consciousness is the mind, built by Consciousness and viewed by Awareness.

In cognostics I have enregistered as mind-units data relating to the experience of Consciousness with itself that are new to the human race. Awareness is clearly a synthetic consciousness combining mental states and introspects of them into one whole that includes in one externalized way self and not-self; it is a composite

[page 350]

state that integrates perception and introspective experience. But all these states are produced by a property of existence more fundamental—Consciousness. By means of volitionally paying attention to the factors of a mental state I notice that there is a more fundamental conscious state that Awareness has hitherto included, and then I observe that Consciousness notes its experiences with itself. Awareness touches the synthetic oneness of all cosmic units; Consciousness touches the immanent life of them all. By making Consciousness get a new conscious state about itself so that I remember it, I will enregister a series of memories new to the human race, and out of that new mental content may arise the power I seek—the power to read more of the book of Consciousness.

This power to look down upon and into yourself by the Awareness is the most impressive, immense, and awful event in the world. The Awareness simply witnesses—it does not even judge, it neither approves nor disapproves. It simply knows; it is aware of all that takes place in your mind, of the false and the true. Cognosis knows the cognitive content by being aware of it through cepts; the bridge to cognition is the Awareness. Cognition through entic introspection of the cepts becomes aware of the Cognosis of the individual; its bridge to cognosis is Awareness. The Awareness is witness to both these interacting worlds, between the subjective and innermost somewhat as sensation is the bridge between the subjective and objective. Now the immanent is in both. It has self-active and effective causal relations with both. The subconscious is phylogenetic, ancestral, suggestible—can be set to a good as well as to a bad task. It is to the superconscious, or Awareness, that high guidance comes when guided by knowledge, justice, love.

How marvelous that we carry with us every moment a witness that remembers every motive and secret wish and thought and act and yet does not in any way prohibit these unless trained and asked to do so! This training, and even the idea of it, is my discovery and contribution to morals and ethics. It requires an associative enregistration of the Awareness memory with the

[page 351]

memory of each motive and desire until the related memory content of the mind has a greater number of awareness associations with it than without.

When once the psychurgist discovers that mental processes are cosmic, that the mind is cosmic, that he asks of it and it performs, that it contains that which is immanent and universal, he will realize in his own Awareness his connection with The All, and in his introspective Consciousness will realize his identity with the Cosmic Psychal Process. I know this, and I know others can be led to know it. Surely there can be no more positive religious force than the direct knowledge of the immanent presence in your own consciousness of that-which-is-at-the-head-of-Cosmos. To realize that every conscious state is at once known by the Awareness—surely this is an ever-present power over morals.

The nature of Consciousness is such that you cannot deceive it, bribe it, lie to it. Consciousness is cosmic, is immanent in all minds everywhere, is a universal process. The nature of Consciousness is a better guide to all creatures in all worlds than would be a multiplicity of externally enforced plans, and better than any preconceived design, because Consciousness is immanent in the mind of every creature and continuously readapts itself to ever-changing conditions of environment; and to Consciousness, mind is an environment.

It is especially significant that the study of this subject of Consciousness by the new methods requires a highly developed moral and religious life. It is not only upon a complete and accurate scientific knowledge about life and its environment that we should depend for conduct-guidance but also upon the feelings and impulsions and other goings-on of life itself. Life is larger and more complex than our knowledge of it; we need not only the guidance of our scientific knowledge about the esthesias but also the guidance of the esthesias themselves, for there is much more to them than we know. We should be led not only by science and philosophy but also by the scientific and philosophic processes and abilities and impulsions going on in us, and also by the self-directive and cumulative process of the world's progress

[page 352]

in science and philosophy. Not only a knowledge of things but also the natures and happenings of the things themselves, not only our knowledge of Mind (Life) and Consciousness but the felt influences of the continuous goings-on of Mind and Consciousness, should lead us; for it is by this felt influence that their (to us largely unknown) natures and activities become more

fully operative in our lives. Not only what we know and feel but also that much larger part that we do not know and feel should be allowed freedom to affect us. The alogical and subconscious and superconscious do actually lead and drive us according to their own cosmic natures, but it is our *scientific knowledge* of them that enables us to utilize them more directly, efficiently, and completely, and to avoid useless effort and mistakes. Therefore, to study Mind and Consciousness successfully we must live the natural and sincere daily life of Consciousness and Mind and thereby put ourselves not merely under the guidance of our scientific knowledge of these things but also under the leadership of the things themselves. Students may enter further and deeper into the cognostic domain. A new psychology arises: a cognostology. Through cognosis we are able to study the eternal and universal; if there is a Life Beyond and if ever we reach direct knowledge of it, it will be through cognosis. (Up to the advent of psychurgy nothing had been found in the mind that was adapted to an eternal or universal life—only a cognostic hope for a life beyond the grave and love's promise.)

Cognosis is in touch with that which the religiously inclined, without being able to define it, have been seeking in all ages; namely, conscious contact with this immanent and transcendent regnancy of the Cosmic Process. It is by cognosis that we actually come into the presence of the unmediated flat, and in a far more fundamental way than has ever been conceived possible. Cognostic experiences are not mystical experiences. It is hard to drive from the human mind this obsessing phantom of mysticism, so long has the mind been schooled in it. Eastern pantheism with its "All-pervading Presence" and its "divine Unity manifesting

[page 353]

as multiplicity" gave us philosophic mysticism. As Monism it quickened the intellect of Plato; as Neo-Platonism it entered Christianity. The sparks that kindled the Reformation came from the brains of two German mystics—Eckhart and Tauler. Luther drank deep at the same mystic spring. Philosophical mysticism seeks *intellectually* to know about God; religious mysticism seeks *esthetically* to know and feel God. The one contemplates, the other worships; the one thinks, the other loves; the one wonders, the other adores. Professor James says that 'personal religious experience has its root and center in mystical states of consciousness.' How could it be otherwise when cognostic realities cannot be cognitively apprehended, or at least cannot be cognitively described? How could it be otherwise when the mind has tried to cognize things not cognizable, but only cognosable? How futile to attempt to image that which is non-cognitive! Of

course the result will be nothing other than mystical states of consciousness as long as cognition tries to grasp cognosis, as long as the fish tries to walk. The psychurgic religion has its root and center in cognostic states of Consciousness cognostically known, and thereby mysticism vanishes; and while these experiences are cognitively uncommunicable, they are not cognostically so from a teacher *who has had the experiences* to a pupil who has the ability to receive them. Moreover, never before in long history has there been any experience so indubitably known. Truly it is a religious basis built on a rock.

Copernicus changed man's conception of the universe by making the sun and not the earth the center (or one of the centers) of the mechanical system; so cognistics and cognostics have changed man's conception of religion by making the nature of (mind and) Consciousness, and not anything else whatever, the center of the moral, ethical, and religious system. It is its own mind and environment and the nature of Consciousness that determines for any creature in any world what is good or bad, right or wrong. Ultimately the conception of right and wrong is either the nature of Consciousness or the nature of

[page 354]

matter and motion. We do not bow to some external authority: our authority is our own immanent nature—not the Light Within (that is merely a cognistic tool).

The conclusion from the cognitive, local, and temporal nature of reason that what is true to one creature may be false to another, that what is beautiful to one may be ugly to another, that what is good for one may be bad for another, and so on, is of profound philosophical and religious significance, especially when it is remembered that this is not true of cognosis.

That the Light Within (the moral conscience, or Kant's categorical imperative) is purely cognistic is a discovery of far-reaching practical consequence to morals, ethics, and religion. To see this great truth and to see that the standard for conscience is in the nature of the mind itself, and that to accumulate validated data in science, philosophy, and art, and in the objective imperative, is to normalize and rectify the conscience. By rectification is meant the adaptation of conscience to what is normal in a given species.

[From diaries of 1903-4, one phase of Gates' study of Consciousness, felt as a "self" or presence, is described.]

October 24, 1903. I awoke this morning with my mind filled with utter wonder about Consciousness—that life's maximum joy consists in re-functioning and intensifying our awareness of the world, or our knowledge of it. Hence Awareness sums up the joys of intellection, esthesis, and conation, sums up our experience with

the Outside World and the Inside World. I had *arrived at new content and meaning*—in sight of unexplored domains. The new meaning was that the joy of one's awareness of that knowledge of an esthesia once experienced is like a snapshot of that pleasure to be carried afterward. Not merely as a memory will that experience be retained, but as an introspective formula for repeating and re-experiencing all the best of it without the bad—and that best a thousand times magnified, not merely the pleasure but the bliss of awareness of that pleasure. It was my first insight into the esthetic pyramid, or psychotaxis of esthesias. I can now state that the greatest discovery will relate not merely to Consciousness but to the art of increasing,

[page 355]

augmenting, and prolonging its happy states, which are the sole objects of all efforts.

February 13, 1904. This morning just after awakening and while my body was as yet motionless with a feeling that I did not want to move and my senses were quiescent, but fully awake, I again had the recently oft-repeated experience of being in close communion with my own Consciousness and Awareness, but in addition I strongly felt that larger Self of the Cosmic Mental life in which I am a unit. These experiences have taught me that my usual daily attempts at quiescence are comparatively ineffective, as I do not really get quiet. When all mental and bodily disturbances are completely at rest, then those unusual and but little-used mental powers are free to act; and in one of these moods I ought to discover something about the mind and its relation to Cosmos.

Sunday, March 13, 1904. More and more frequently I have these morning inner experiences, but I can never quite describe them because their emotive content is so much larger than the intellective. This morning, however, I had just a little intellective content—but I must nevertheless try to describe it by something else as a dim suggestion. On awakening it has become my habit to contemplate or try to realize my mental relations to The All, or to my Consciousness or Awareness. So accustomed have I become to this daily "communion" that if it does not take place I miss it like a loved one. It does not take place every morning. It used to be only once or twice a year, then every month or so, but recently about once or twice a week, and I am greatly interested. I very much desire to attain some new insight into my relation to the immanent Consciousness that underlies and builds my mind, or the Awareness that witnesses my mind and is regnant over it, or to that Cosmic Life and Mind with which my Consciousness or Awareness is in touch; or if possible to get some kind of touch, intellection, emotion, conation, with either the immanent or

superregnant mind of Cosmos or some individualized or organized intelligence therein. I hold myself free of prejudice.

[page 356]

There is an outer series of cosmic events, such as movement of the stars and the evolution of life on earth, and my own subconscious life processes, over which I do not have direct volitional control; and there is an inner series of cosmic conditions called Consciousness and Awareness over which I have no direct volitional control; and between them exists my own inner mind-series, which according to its knowledge of all three series enables me to adapt my acts to purposive conduct. If that knowledge is correct and extensive and if feelings are normal, I will drift or conform to the trend, or tendency, of the cosmic series. Now, my knowledge is limited and largely incorrect, and to that extent I am apt to run constantly counter to the cosmic purpose, or telos. But if I am in close touch with my Consciousness or Awareness, it may influence my mind (intellectually, emotionally, or subconsciously), being part of the cosmic series that tend to normalize me. Now, I have felt during this morning experience that I am getting nearer to something. This morning I felt strongly that I was face to-face with the Cosmic Presence as a Self. . . . It was like a characteristic feeling, advice to a friend, or new insight into work. Add to this feeling that characterizes a coming insight, the further feeling that I had of a Cosmic Presence combined with the feeling that precedes the advent of a new idea—of an idea scared away. . . . Henceforth we will be companions, aware of each other. Then the feeling of the presence and of the dawning insight withdrew behind the thick veil, and I felt so *lonely*.

Do you understand, O my reader, that if it ever does speak to me in unmistakable terms, I will carry out its behests despite deaths, devils, and hells—will do it if it takes me millions of lives and work in millions of worlds. Or I will do it even if with the insight comes the knowledge that in a few short years death will be the end of me forever and forever. I am arriving at a point of view about my relations to the outer and inner series of activities and conditions.

March 30, 1904. My tendency to contemplate The All and my relation to it is growing so strong that it is the almost invariable

[page 357]

content of my consciousness when I awake. A sweet, beautiful elevating rapture, full of trust and hope and a growing consciousness of a Presence, so strong it begins to pervade my dream-states and makes my nights peaceful and free from worry. This sweet Consciousness of Awareness coming in contact with

the Cosmic Life begins to be felt in my subconscious instead of my worries; this Awareness comes of its own accord. I wonder if my long worry has been one of the means of training by which I can accomplish this. I never succeed in writing what I intend. It is largely a feeling-content and wholly indescribable.

August 8, 1904. This morning I felt again close to the Great Presence—that Consciousness as I experienced it is conscious of something larger than itself—of something that affects me as a presence that is aware of me, and of which I am dimly conscious. The problem is becoming amazingly clearer, this morning more than ever: how I should study Cosmic Consciousness; that esthesias are constants and intellections are variables in motives; that introspection is Consciousness noticing one's mental states, that consciousing is Consciousness noticing itself; and whether Cosmic Consciousness is a Personality or a Force, I can hope to learn how to utilize it directly. Consciousness is the route to a knowledge of one's own mind and through that a knowledge of the subjective Self of Cosmos, which is one's completed self. Awareness is a route to a knowledge of the objective self of Cosmos. Every morning I awake with the consciousing process going on, and I feel very near to a Presence and to a great discovery—a great Power.

Such were some of his insights through 1904, and by 1905 he wrote: "I became aware that the Cosmic Consciousness recognized me and saw that I knew it. But O so subtle-*evanescent*, different from what would be supposed—*simpler*—*grander*."

But it was his *sophic* dominancy of 1910 that allowed him to write his treatise on Selves, Persons, and Cosms, summarizing his discoveries and adding many new ones on this fascinating

[page 358]

subject of self. Original in scope and content, a culminating contribution of his *cognostic* and *cognistic* study, he wrote of it, "Someone, somewhere, a hundred years from now will understand it."

In that same unusually fruitful year he restated his experience with additions as follows: (Adapted.)

I am entering into the first glimpses of a Cosmos that is unutterably more wonderful than the cosmos hitherto known or imagined. A Cosmos that underlies all kinds of existences hitherto known or conceived. Immanent in all these alleged incarnate and incarnate beings, in the whole Mechanical System and Biotic System—immanent in and yet aloof from all these things is another and far more wonderful Cosmos. This Cosmos of

Consciousness as organized cognosis is a "Cognocosmos" that abides in all worlds and times. It is an infinity of interconnected cognostic states and processes, psychotaxically related and coordinated into a system of being that abides forever, enthroned in that other cosmos which we have hitherto known, but not partaking of its mutations. This infinite and universal Cognocosmos abides as a self-conscious identity while its Mechano-Biotic Body of Universes undergoes perpetual change.

By cognosis every cognitive state is found to contain an uninterpreted conscious state. This by having invariably occurred as a concomitant to any given stimulus or movement has become the sign of it and comes to have that meaning to that creature in which it occurs. This is the psychurgic law of cognition. Now, if the cognitive complexus is introspected according to art, the uninterpreted conscious state hidden therein may be detected and identified, may be known to be non-cognitive, may be known not to be partaking in any cognitive illusion or error, and may be directly and immediately known by a non-cognitive mode of knowing.

Having identified the non-cognitive conscious state in the typical intellections, ethesias, urgations, and introspections, it may thereafter be easily re-functioned (so far as the cognitive

[page 359]

part is concerned), producing thereby less obstruction to its apparition, for its manifestation is transitory. By and by after physiological quiescence and subsequent practice of psychurgic introspection, this conscious state may be caused to take notice of itself and thereby become conscious of changes that take place in it—changes not of one's volition—and thereby become conscious of the qualities, durations, intensities, clusterings, successions, and mutual modifications of these states. The Awareness is a witness of that consciousing process. It is the very inmost secret of nature and life, Consciousness *consciousing* Consciousness, and I call it cognosis, but it is the regnancy that has superimposed a Cosmos of Consciousness upon the mechanical system of the universe.

Any conscious state contains behind the "Veil" a Consciousness-state that may be caused, if you know how, to reveal the whole nature and potency of the cosmically existent Consciousness and its associated and other kinds of coordinate Being. Consciousness per se by cognosing itself will make this revelation; it will not be your doing it: a non-individualized nature is revealing itself to itself and you witness through the Awareness the Revelator and the revelation. This is in fact and deed an actual contact with the superhuman; the result is a knowing that is absolutely known. It is not speculative mystery nor a dream vision

seen through the eyes of faith; it is the most veritably known and surely certain of all knowledge.

All this is what happened to me when I discovered cognosis, when the new type of mind was born in me. Never will I forget it. Although over a third of a century has elapsed since my mind saw the first glow of the gray dawn, over fifteen years since it turned red, seven years since the horizon began to grow white, and nearly three years since the full and direct rays of the Light shone upon me—not yet (1910) has the ineffable joy of that occasion ceased to make my heart beat fuller and faster. Veritably it seemed to me that the half-awakened and still awakening “soul of the world” was not unaware of what was happening when this revelation first knowingly occurred in a mind of the

[page 360]

human race, and it seems to me, day by day, that this “world soul” is still and consciously aware of every step. Every morning I awake at an early hour to my daily mentative work and as I sit down at my desk to record my dawning insights regarding psychurgic matters, I feel an *inrush* of ectic joy that like a large wave engulfs my own little entic ripples of enthusiasm and sweeps them into every shore of my being. I know of no other joy that so completely meets the Approvals, is so completely satisfying, so triumphantly and ecstatically blissful, just as it was when the light of the New Cycle first dispelled the cognitive darkness in my brain. I repeat, I feel I was not alone in my joy; I speak of it as of psychologic significance. It seems to me that wonder has not yet ceased to open wider its eyes; surprise still stands contemplatively transfixed just as it stood when the Veil began to lift; curiosity still stands tiptoe on the Height, eager for more although scarcely able to bear any more; and Reverence still kneels in ecstatic adoration.

So it is when a Pupil is first thrust into Cognosis land: the mind only slowly awakens to the wonder of the new experience; there is a dazed realization that something momentous has happened, but only after several years of life in the new order does he begin to realize some phases of it concretely.

This incomplete and very imperfect explanation may give some sort of idea of the *nature* of cognosis and thereby a better understanding of the nature of cognosis (cognition), but this understanding is not the equivalent of *experiencing* cognosis.

Life as hitherto understood is cognistic only, but now the life process includes cognosis, which is not local, relative, temporal, or individual but universal, impersonal, and eternal; that is, cognosis brings life into alignment with a different order of Existence. It turns out that life is something more than mind, but it is a different kind of life than belonging to our customary experience and is

sharply contrasted with it. This other kind of Being is not what might be supposed. It is not, for instance, what has been called "spirit" or "soul" or "the next world,"

[page 361]

but is quite different. Ordinary language cannot convey a correct understanding of cognosis. It is hard for the unprepared mind even to understand psychurgy, because it is so unlike our customary and naive mental methods.

Cognosis must be so taught as to reveal clearly that it is a natural phenomenon, and to it no person can claim sole access, as a mediator or vicegerent, and thereby base upon it a priest-craft. I must expound the teaching of that which is not myself or my personality or thought; namely, the nature and activities of Consciousness as known to Consciousness itself, directly. Consciousness as cognosis talks a different language. Cognitive language cannot be used. Happily cognosis uses a more directly immediate mode of communication, a universal language understandable by the consciousness in all creatures and worlds, and he who takes the first step in cognosis has already learned its language. As its activities are not subject to our cognitive volition, its own initiative must be awaited, and progress is slow unless much time is spent getting ready. Flashes of cognosis are transitory at first, hardly to be discriminated from introspection; but with a re-functioning of the cognitive response to it, facility in not prohibiting its influx is achieved, and sooner or later the new vision of the Cosmos is attained. In and through cognosis we make an adaptation to eternal and universal environment. Cognition is secular, cognosis is intrinsically religious. In it we find something not humanly transitory upon which to lean but something universally regnant. In it and in alethiocracy—the rule of truth as validated knowledge—lies the central point of the world's attention during the coming centuries.

Is it not strange that Consciousness, the most potent and important of all known causes, has been regarded by science and philosophy as a mere abstraction? A modern scientist has asked, "Is there such a thing as Consciousness?" Another writes, "For though the individual Consciousness represents the fullest and most concrete generalization of philosophy, yet none the less, it is not concrete, it is not real. It lacks the thisness, the allogical

[page 362]

immediacy that alone can give it flesh and blood—in a word, life. The individual consciousness, the object properly of psychology, is itself no more than a general type." It has been assumed that just as there is no such actual creature as mankind, or Man, but only

this and that individual man, so also there is no such actual thing as Consciousness but only this and that cognitive or knowing state; that Consciousness per se does not actually have a concrete manifestation but is merely an abstract term. Now, just as in every individual man there is an actual life going on, so in each cognitive state there is Consciousness going on, else we would not be aware of it. While consciousness lasts it is *doing something*: it is not merely the sign of some particular cognitive meaning to the creature in which it occurs, but it is also *modifying* other conscious states that are coexistent. It is initiating and causing biochemical and histological changes in the brain; it is directing and setting in motion the subconscious processes; it is directing the will and causing and controlling the bodily molar motions.

There is found in every living thing a vast kingdom of Consciousness states just as real as the plants and animals in which they reside, and they constitute the most important factor in living things. Consciousness states have relations of a kind that is disparate from relations of cognitive states. Cognitive states constitute the kingdom of mind, and within it is a kingdom of Consciousness per se-the Cosmos of Consciousness!

Psychurgy will strike the public as something novel. It will seem less novel than when I first discovered it and taught it to my teachers (1873-6) or when I first publicly announced it (1894). My lectures and various articles, and the more recent work on practical psychology and efficiency, have been preparing the way for psychurgy; but cognostology has not had its way smoothed. It is new, with a novelty so extraordinary that only a few will understand it and fewer still attain it. Most persons will sincerely mistake introspective analysis or introspection or "knowledge about" cognosis for actual cognosis. Preconceptions

[page 363]

and wrong interpretations of their own mental life also prevents the new experience. How often I have labored all day with a man trying to explain it, only to find that he cannot even introspect! And such a person will nearly always remark about cognosis, "That is just what I do when I get quiet," although he will not have the faintest notion of what I mean. If the investigator has not the power of cognosis, then that new and momentous domain of the Cosmos (the Cognocosmos) that contains the Cognostic Self will not open to him.

To the inexperienced it is very difficult to differentiate between introspection and apperceptive contemplation or analysis; and it often happens that such a self-analysis is mistaken for introspection. The difficulty lies in saying precisely what is meant; and the interpretation made here of actual phenomena that do occur

may happen to be wrong, but the description will still serve to indicate to the *practicing* pupil *what* experience was attended to.

The very newness of these realms makes them difficult to be understood; the new subject cannot be taught except by actual experiencing, because cognitive language and its meanings are not applicable to non-cognitive and meaningless things. The pupil will begin with the Old Introspection, and by practice and growth and favorable periods and insights the Awareness will enter more and more into the introspection and become part of it long before he is able to identify and use it separately. The first form of cognosis to be attained will be "entognosis." This is not any form of cognition, not even introspection in any of its modes. It is not a cognition of cognosis (cognicognosis). It is not even ceptation, which merely witnesses that the mutual modification of cepts is the cause and nature of qualitation, while entognosis is a direct and immediate experiencing of the self-activity going on within a cept; it experiences (entognoses) the moment of Consciousness per se, which is the ens of a cept, and experiences (entognoses) its urging, which is *taking place of its own accord*. Thus Consciousness reveals to itself its own

[page 364]

nature and modes by entognosis, the data of which are "entognocepts" (entognology); and they are absolutely known criteria of truth, constituting the basis of a new and more fundamental epistemology.

When Consciousness asks of itself what it knows about itself as a kind of Being, the mode of inquiry is "ontognosis," and the data are "ontognocepts" (ontognology), constituting a new and more fundamental ontology. Ontognosis is the *knowing* part of the Three Kingdoms of Being telling about Being.

When Consciousness as a subject witnesses itself as object, the process is "Awaring." When the entire content and activity of ontognosis and entognosis and ceptation is witnessed by Consciousness, the witnessing part (subject) is the "Awareness," technically called cognognosis (that is, a cognosis of gnosis).

Entognosis is a window into one of the Eternals (the Beginning-less Realities) through which you may look upon that which in all ages and worlds is the Mind Builder, furnishing the cepts therefore. According to its nature and modes of activity, it is the "Teacher" of all evolving creatures in all times and worlds. In entognosis you experience, directly and immediately (that is, without a mediator) the Supremest Regnancy of Existence; you feel its nature, so you will know just what it is like; and you will experience its Self-Activity as a non-individualistic going-on independently of your own volition. You will entognose one phase

of self-active and self-conscious Being. In entognosis, “your” consciousness is conscious of the only self-active Eternal—of the only Eternal that is alive—of the only Eternal that can *know*—the one by which all the others, including itself, are known:
Consciousness!

Psychurgy is an art of using the mind and body as a *whole* (physiologic, subconscious, urgative, esthetic, intellective, introspective), and of using its environmental interactions more efficiently and effectively. Psychurgy is a *mind-art*. The new domain has given rise to a Consciousness-art, which is not applied to the mind and is not psychurgy (although psychurgy makes use of

[page 365]

it). The new power is not the mind but that which makes the mind. It is a hitherto unrecognized self-activity that builds the histologic structure in which mind is embodied, and this power in Consciousness per se. When this power becomes conscious of itself, it is cognosis—Consciousness becoming conscious of its own states and processes.

The beneficent and successful using of mind is not prevented if we happen not to know the ultimate nature of Consciousness any more than the using of electricity was prevented when we knew less about its nature than now. A definition of electricity in terms of the phenomena and uniformities (laws) it presents to observation has proved sufficient for a high technical and commercial development. Likewise definitions of mind and Consciousness in terms of the phenomena and uniformities (laws) presented objectively and subjectively and cognostically will be sufficient for the development of an art of research and its application to all human affairs. “The identification of cognosis with a form of Consciousness may be considered one of my important interpretative steps, but the fact that a state is enregistered as more mind and brain is the important thing, whether my explanation is right or wrong. Cognosis as a criterion of truth serves as the basic validation. “The indubitable facts are: Consciousness actually organizes, distributes, constructs, architecturally shapes, initiates and controls the movements of matter in organisms; the structural form is determined by the Consciousness content of cognition; Consciousness wields cognosis and cognition; and morphology and activities are determined by cognosis and cognition and not by matter and motion. These are the most optimistically melioristic facts known to me. They are the base of the psychurgic philosophy and religion.

What I have discovered is of extreme importance to that greatest factor in progress, the ability to discover and validate and apply knowledge. After I had wandered into the new regions, all I had to do to find out new things was to "look and listen" and report upon what was going on around me. It was

[page 366]

so interesting and valuable that I gave my whole life to the new things I found.

Cognosis, child or modern science!

The end of the quest for certainty led Elmer Gates into the countless "new beginnings" of the new and startling Cosmos of Consciousness!