

# THE INITIATION OF THE PHILOSOPHY OF LOVE

by ATTILA SERESS

## I. The Science of Love

2001

ISBN 978-963-89462-2-5

translated by Hordós Marianna 2015

no controlled by the author

### Contents

#### Part I: The Science of Love

To the reader	2
Foreword	5
Chapter I.	
Intelligent human behaviour	7
Chapter II.	
What motivates a person to understand the other?	10
Chapter III.	
Intelligence as a tool for understanding the other person	11
Chapter IV.	
The other individual as a perception	14
Chapter V.	
Understanding the other person	16
Chapter VI.	
Human individuality	18
Chapter VII.	
Is there a limit on understanding the other	20
Additional Remarks	23

## To the Reader

Dear Reader, you are about to be introduced to a mediator between the nowadays ever so varied intelligences, who relies only to a relatively extent on mechanical intelligence to reach his goal. However, at the same time the aforementioned mediator is a poor devil trying to make new acquaintances. Still, this could be seen as an honest venture, since he is friendly to the reader, therefore they may end up having an exchange of ideas. Thus, the purpose is to get to know each other better, to take a trip to the realm of intelligences; yet another book is being composed by you, dear reader, and myself, and at the end of the dialogue we can conclude that we have created a new twist of fate through the book.

A note to those who are sitting to my right, very solemnly: what I attempt to do presently is to describe the role of the realm of intelligences in the art of love; I do not strive to provide a description of it. May I remind those who can read even when surrounded by some sort of a dreamworld, or those who can even speed read, that the bulk of my book is a systematic catalogue of excruciatingly detailed forms of ideas. In addition, those who will not recognise themselves will probably note that the author creates the following complication: opens up a beehive of ideas. For this reason I would like to apologise in advance in case our thoughts on the theory of love differ. By the way, I try to avoid preaching dogmas, rather, what I write down is what I bring to the surface when I reach down into my inner self. I would personally like to invite you, dear reader, for a chat to get acquainted, in other words, let our different but inquisitive personalities embark on a trip to the mysterious land of love.

Christian tradition uses the term "agape" for spiritual love. The secret must not be revealed, cannot be disclosed: the secret of love is personal to each and every individual. However, perhaps even non-believers may grasp that our poor devil, in love with love itself, is completely mesmerised by the topic therefore he shares the perceptions and experiences that he has been exposed to in his mesmerised state. I believe that to be fair this state of affairs has to be explained in advance, simply because it may probably be rather difficult to follow the train of thought, which is not too detailed.

Our opinions are likely to differ and as a mediator, who already has a notion of future means of communication, I would like to start negotiations between those who have faith in love and those who reject it. Perhaps among the numerous natural languages there will

spread a language which is not meant to be new and constructed, instead, it is a novel way of human language use. It may expand beyond being used only by language talents and, through expansion, ultimately, may become a medium for expressing thought for the whole mankind. All the better, since if we manage to find a new common way of expressing ourselves then, simultaneously, it may dawn on us how similar in nature we are. In order to be able to embrace a general form of philanthropy, the common denominator of mankind, we should strive to use language creatively, which is best served by a form of language that unites what is universal in all natural languages in a modern, realistic way. The syntax or grammar of this universal form of verbal expression relies heavily on intelligence and the individual must consciously infuse his or her intelligence into his or her own language use. That is very much like learning a new language: we make a conscious effort to address the other person in his or her tongue.

Our social interactions are becoming more and more intellectually complex and pondering over the different possible ways to communicate using the systems offered by mechanical intelligence two clearly defined questions preoccupy people's minds. First, in a world of brightly shining intelligence can we keep our human self and existence, second, in a globalised world do we still have a chance to find what is common in all of us. We are discussing this trait common to all humans through scrutinising the philosophy of love as, if we fail to establish the common human trait in the love felt towards each other, the quest to remain a human being in the globalised world of bright, mechanical intelligence is doomed. As a first step we must find a way to identify the common, generalised human intelligence which may bridge the gap between cultures through creating a new way of communication, and only then can we come to a well-founded understanding of the phenomenon called love.

Our discussion centres around the following two questions: do we have a way to view the human being through our intellect and is the love we exercise towards other people real. The answer to the second question will depend on the answer to the first.

The goal of the essay below is merely to initiate a discussion because I believe that, due to the collective nature of the topic, the art of love cannot be explained by one person alone. I would like to call upon the reader. My dear reader, please feel free to comment on

the present work or even to complete parts lacking in the discussion. I am not writing this to argue, have debates, refute comments, my aim is to stay positive and make the art of loving love unfold in front of the eyes of the reader. Finally, it must be noted that occasionally in my essay I use the word "freedom" in its most trivial sense.

## Foreword

Despite its many facets, human evolution has been following certain well-definable laws. The beginning of The Gospel of John describes the first part of the journey leading from God the Father to the physical manifestation, from the union with nature to a conscious sense of self. At that point the road turns into another direction leading from isolation towards a new identity while, at the same time, human individuality is preserved. However, the human mind is seeking evidence for possible ways to reach freedom and our conscious self is constantly doubting itself. Our modern existence brings the following questions and doubts to the surface: are we free or do we live in a cage, are we imprisoned by our own self or by somebody else, is freedom imposed upon us from outside or can we free our own soul, is it possible for us to find solid foundations to lay the bricks of our own freedom on?

If we closely observe the thinking process it turns out that thinking is not based on any prerequisites, it feeds itself and it is our deepest and most inalienable possession despite the fact that reflection by itself does not require that it be done by individuals: recognising that there exists individuality is already a result of thinking, too. Thinking is a broad, general, self-supporting mechanism and embedded in it are the seeds of the first morsels of our freedom. Loving an act whose motivation stems from moral and rational-ideological intuition must surely be a manifestation of unconstrained reality since there is no confusion in the mind about whether the intellect has relied on its own resources or not. It goes without saying that each individual grabs and brings a separate new fragment of the universal intuitive world to earth. It is equally obvious that though some individuals serve the ideals of others, the conclusions people individually reach via thinking characterises each human being separately. Thus, each person carries their own individual intelligence, which is a unique slice of the general field of thinking. However, if our intelligence consisted only of the generalised, we would not be able to experience freedom.

On the other hand, freedom can only allow us to realise ourselves, in other words, it only helps bring out our own personality. Who we are is channelled through reflection towards our moral-ideological intuition as first and foremost what we find in ourselves is our own thinking. If we make an attempt to apply all that to the other person's experience of freedom we realise that we are held back by the integrity of the other individual's freedom,

guarded by the person him- or herself. There is another view on freedom gaining more and more ground these days, which, contrary to the above, builds on mechanical intelligence to create the integrity of freedom through distorted and phony love. Thus, unreal intelligence is one such independent component of thinking that can individualise itself to the extent until, on the face of it, it cannot be associated with a general pattern of action. It produces love-like properties but gradually withdraws itself from the influence of loving as it will not cease to individualise itself further and further. The theory of loving love, or, to put it differently, the art of love must also include this possibility so it emphasises that freedom must be complemented by love. It is through freedom that the art of love finds love. The existence of love which is not grounded in freedom is debatable, given that there exists such a wide array of intelligences. Like the science of freedom can be grasped through self-developed conclusions by thinking, the scientific foundations of love can also be revealed by observing the intelligence.

In a similar vein, the reality of love is manifested by the meeting of free human minds, when their sense of self is wrapped around the other and one intuitive self matches another person's intuitive self. One internalises what the other has found out and, as a result, the moral intuitions underlying his or her actions are based on the other free person's self. When I realise myself I harmonise my individual intelligence with the world of uniform intuition but in reality I overcome only one specific aspect of life. In other words, my free will carries only a given limited amount of spiritual intuitions and those who fail to grasp the motivation behind my intention which I have understood will find my actions mysterious. I realise myself through free will if I reveal my secret to people and true love results if I have an understanding of the other person's inner self, that is, I carry the other person's secret in my intention. Philosophy based on emotion will only lead through a certain point in life because, though my emotions may stem from the other person, it still locks me up inside myself. If my actions are motivated purely by emotion, I monopolise a piece of the other person's soul. Having an understanding of the other person, realising his or her secret as an act through moral intuition is a case of unconstrained love when emotions are liberated between two people. Finding happiness or finding happiness again and staying permanently happy is only possible if I realise the secret of another person in a community with at least one other member or in a community forever growing. In real love those who have not

recognised it will not see the secrets but they will remain open secrets, or to put it differently, in my free will I bear the other person's secret publicly. The true motivation for an act is only accessible for those who understand the mystery. If the medium of human interaction coincides with the real world where acts of unconstrained love take place, if the common space is created through people's acts which carry one another, we can claim a community of love has been formed.

Real joy is always a message from the other person, from the one next to me, and that is where a new revelation may come from as well, if I search constantly, I may find redemption in the other. I do not expect external, artificial events to bring me the everlasting entirety of the gospel. Instead, I carry that in myself in my spiritual thinking. The origins of the isolating effects of mechanical intelligence are there in the heart of each and every human being, as loving our own selves is fuelled by the actions of the environment directed towards us. Misinterpreted love leads to the development of artificial human systems, in which I become a prisoner of fake love. However, there is a way to freedom if I can identify the source of falsity, which is never rooted in the other person, rather, in my own heart. This is basically recognising the joyous nature of thinking because I have recognised that this is the only way for me to purify my heart in today's world.

#### **I. Intelligent human action**

Can we gain the love of our brethren, fellow human beings in our relationships with them, or are relationships between people encoded and fatally governed by the binding laws of society?

There are few other topics that have been discussed so extensively throughout the history of mankind as the phenomenon called love. When we attempt to set down in writing the art of loving love, we must humbly stop and pay tribute to the teachings of ancient wisdom, acts of love of the "invisible man" and the impact of Christian doctrines. Nevertheless, reverence must be complemented by definite firmness given that philosophical contemplation has already shown that mankind has reached the age of freedom. People living in periods preceding the age of freedom were not in a position to establish teachings about love that could include the issue of personal integrity, in other

words, that could include teachings about the threshold-effect of human interaction, the reason being that they lacked an intellectual perspective on what it is that makes us human. Currently, philosophical constellations already allow for that, though.

These days human sciences reflect deeply on physical, biological and psychological characteristics that define a human being, as well as the skills related to the power of the self in human individuality, the decision-making process and their embeddedness in society. Still, all that knowledge has not yet been connected to the notion of freedom, simply because human sciences, given that by their very nature they focus on partial fields, are bound to ignore the foundations of freedom. An important characteristic of the aforementioned fields of study has not been recognised, namely that they have already defined the human being and, at the same time, the scientific means of expression has not been amalgamated into one unified language of wisdom. Us, anthroposophical thinkers are familiar with this code which can ask and answer questions on man and one of our main aims is to integrate the philosophy of freedom into the art of unconstrained love via metamorphosis.

An approach to freedom which strives exclusively to show what an individual is capable of doing within his or her own boundaries ignores the fact that the misconceptualisation of freedom paves the way to assessing and making judgements about other people's individual freedom-conceptions. That is exactly the very first question that comes up within the art of love: how should we react to the other individual's freedom? Finding our own freedom is not enough, we must respect the other person's freedom as well, given that love which is not founded on a conceptualisation of freedom may be phony or unreal. Thus, where shall we draw the line that separates truly unconstrained love from phony love?

Social phenomena these days highlight the problem of freedom in every possible context. The freedom of the other person, his or her original intentions must be respected even if the individual does not behave in accordance with his or her own personal fatal path tendencies because in the age of freedom people want to try themselves, they want to be unconstrained in their actions even if they have no well-founded concept of freedom. However, love must cross that boundary and this boundary cannot serve as a starting point



for the art of loving love. That is because we should observe how, in our imperfect conceptualisations of freedom, we bump into the walls we build around us. I love the other person but have no understanding of his or her protected zone of integrity. It is only natural that this should be so, since as it is a matter lying within the realm of the other person's freedom-conceptions. Instead, we create an image of how we bump into the walls around the other person.

We can only advance if we respect the boundaries of the freedom of the other individual we love because that way we have a perspective on all the phenomena related to the boundaries of freedom. Even if the other person is a free spirit, he or she can still be characterised with respect to what paths of fate are crossing in his or her life. That is exactly the meaning of the term intelligence: the ability for individual thinking and its relation to fate path tendencies. The philosopher often finds himself in trouble when trying to find the accurate term for expressing a concept he considers important. At present, what is of importance for us is that it should be not only the boundaries of freedom that we establish, or, in general, it should not be only the fate of an individual we consider. Rather, we should cross the boundaries of the spirit of the other person in such a way that his or her sense of freedom would remain intact. Now, that can only be achieved through entering the persons intellect, unique and individually defined, as thinking in itself is a process void of prerequisites, leading on to generality. Thus, the starting point for launching the art of love is the other person's intellect. In other words, the starting point is the other person's intelligence.

While it may well be that some underlying motivation behind some act of the other person is unknown to me, it is certain that the only way for me to access and cross his or her boundaries of freedom is through thinking. When I can define the motivating factor underlying my own actions, that is where freedom begins and unconstrained love will be grounded in the solution to the puzzle of intelligence.

Like I am not free in my actions if I do not know what motivates them, I am incapable of loving if my acts of love are only driven by my intelligence and I fail to shape my intelligence in such a way that it is in harmony with the other person's intelligence. If we look at it from this perspective, it is clear why I have to keep asking myself in every single

moment of my existence throughout my life the question which may lead to the experience of real love: what is it that I should do myself in order to be able to use my intelligence in such a way that my actions could be comprehensible for the other person? A sensible and comprehensible act will not yet manifest real love of the other: it is his or her intelligence that chooses how he or she interprets anything that I initiate. One must reach the level of truly intelligent human acts, which are manifestations of love not only from our but from the other person's perspective as well.

## **II. What motivates a person to understand the other?**

The difference that we are seeking in the other person, the surplus available for us within ourselves divides our whole individual self into two parts and we realise the mismatch between us and the other individual.

A naive person takes social interaction to be a law of nature and, in most cases, finds him- or herself contemplating differences between people when he or she finds him- or herself in a situation where he or she cannot assert his or her will. In those situations people are making attempts to understand the other person's intentions. However, understanding other people's intentions, unless they are based on instinct, depends primarily on comprehending the ideas underlying those intentions. The way an individual creates a given trigger for action through thinking when certain circumstances arise is founded in one's intelligence. In real life it is hardly ever the case that the other person's intentions can be scientifically scrutinised, so by principles of practicality in most cases we can at best just attribute those intentions to the other person instead of familiarising ourselves with them. Naivety is manifested in determining categories through our own intelligence. Life may equip us with many or few categories for evaluating other people's actions, still, a naive person puts these categories to use instinctively and that, in turn, may be the foundation sensible behaviour is based on. In cases when I detect more in the other individual than what is part of my own personality a question may arise as to whether or not I have the right to judge him or her according to the categories I am equipped with. If I have received enough categories for life that by itself suffices for me to understand the other person. However, the fact that I am lacking something and I discover the very same thing in the other person suggests that one can never be

equipped with enough categories. That is how another question arises: can my established categories be the right ones? Thus, examining the opinions formed on personality types leads on to examining the nature of our relationship with intelligence.

The realistic views of a naive personality also apply scientific methods but they fail to consider the role of their own intelligence in the whole process. Our intelligence is not necessarily some physiological phenomenon that is naturally switched on in our body like, for instance, laryngeal movement when we swallow water. Our intelligence is turned on by the difference we discover in the other person. Our notions undergo modification in the presence of other people due to the fact that our intelligence also connects to the spirit of others. This connection is self-evident in everyday human interaction when we exchange ideas. The exchange of ideas, however, is only an indicator that human intelligences can be compared, it does not tell us anything by itself about general patterns of interconnected individual intelligences.

One possible motivating factor behind understanding the other person could be that I discover the role of the other individual's intelligence in my life. Thereby we can reach a philosophical conceptualisation of love which defines love as a phenomenon created by the mutual interaction of intelligences and by the impact they may have on one another. Naivety can certainly be overcome this way, yet we are in no position to pronounce that love exists at this stage because no evidence has been presented for that so far.

I may love someone but from his or her perspective, in his or her judgement, my love may be a manifestation of hate – the other person may ridicule the art of loving love.

It may as well happen that the brightest of intelligences simply ignores the other person so it is impossible to direct love towards him or her. If I want to clarify my relationship with the other person, I have to discover his or her intelligence within myself.

### **III. Intelligence as a tool for understanding the other person**

Life draws a line between our self-knowledge, and the impression others have of us and their knowledge of us as there are always individuals who will not share their

opinion of us. I cannot learn all the people's views on my personality so my self-knowledge will only partially match the way others see me. This is because, if our life runs its course naturally, we can never see their intelligence at work in others. In everyday life we use our intelligence to aid us in our actions but it is not possible to fully observe how. In everyday life, the opinion of others about us is never completely told. While I act, the way my intelligence works may potentially communicate information for others which is inaccessible to me. It has to be accepted that the reasoning and meaning underlying my action will be interpreted differently by another person. If nothing else, this already follows from the fact that every person has a different perspective for observation. I would like to understand the other but I am not acquainted with all his or her friends so there is no way for me to learn what those people in his or her environment may experience as a result of his or her presence.

One can never completely know oneself as that would require knowledge of the opinion of all the people involved. As it happens, we cannot rid ourselves of views formed by other intelligences, these views belong to us just like the assessment we formulate of ourselves by thinking. Also, even if I were observant and were to interpret my experiences with my own thinking correctly, I cannot fully understand my own intelligence because it works through actions and it is not possible to observe a working intelligence in action.

If I replay acts in my head, the scenario changes. but even then I rely on my own intelligence and ignore those that do not belong to me. It seems that the gap between individual intelligences cannot be bridged. As mentioned above, this gap is created by life itself and by a natural course of life. It seems that we are imprisoned in one another without any hope to set ourselves free. We have absolutely no right to deprive ourselves of the opinions of other intelligences and no other person has the right to limit our free will.

Thus, we are on a quest to find a universal principle that can set the individual free from the opinions of other intelligences and, at the same time, neutralises differences.

During the process of thinking it may arise that thinking acts independently, thereby feeding itself independently. In such a situation the only way to explain thinking is

through itself. In such a situation individuality vanishes because the state of mind for this type of thinking is open to each person. Given this reasoning, thinking has a strong potential for generality. If thinking remains intelligent at this stage, the effects of a general state of intelligence will prevail. It is general because it is freely accessible for anyone if the individual can reach the above mentioned exceptional state of mind and thinking: it is available for any sentient being.

It is necessary to introduce what is termed generalised intelligence, whose properties are explained in what follows. While the intelligence we rely on in everyday life typically bears the trademark of routine, generalised intelligence can be observed freely. This follows from the fact that thinking, in the state described above, is inherently active and defines itself. Though it is intelligent thinking, it is still free. One way to describe this is to say that thinking closely observes generalised intelligence and this active observation fed by thinking itself shares the properties of the very target of observation: generalised intelligence. Observation does not separate, rather, it becomes cognition, an integral part of thinking.

Thus, intelligence has a dual nature: it is individual and generalised at the same time. It must be individual because any intellect other than our own will interpret ours according to its own methods and everybody must have the right to do so.

Let us now turn to the systems of individual and generalised intelligence.

If in my thinking I position my intelligence higher than the other's intelligence, then I am only capable of loving him or her in accordance with mine and not with his or hers. How is it possible, then, for us to position our own intelligence below the other person's so that we could love the other in accordance with his or hers?

Once I have made explicit for myself the intelligence accessible and effective in me through thinking, I can reach the next phase, which is the stage of generalised intelligence and anything that has not been explicit for my consciousness will continue to work as before. The process described is applicable to any minute subpart of intelligence regardless of what the opinion of us of other intelligences is. Any instance of reaching the level of generalised intelligence is making our own intelligence explicit

simultaneously. Our own individual intelligence is the tool that aids thinking to grasp generalised intelligence. This process follows from the fact that the above described ascension to the next level can be described as an intelligent act. Neither social conventions nor unknown opinions of different intelligences may disturb the process. We are free to organise our thinking. Now, it must be taken into account that I also have the right to form an opinion of others. These opinions are integrated into my intelligence and, as a result, I can make what I assume other people's intelligences are explicit with the method described above.

This way I can love any observed intelligence according to his or her intelligence through rising to the level of generalised intelligence.

Thus, we have shown that this method of understanding the other person marks the possibility for free acts of love.

#### **IV. The other individual as a perception**

I act and my action receives an interpretation by others. But my action is interpreted intelligently, through other people using their own intelligence. I act but how is it possible for me to discover the other person's intelligence so that I could perform an act of love through my action? It may also occur that I am in no position to understand the other person, yet I have to act somehow in a given situation.

In order to be able to answer the above question, first we need to overview the relationship between two people.

In a conversation I cannot give a reason for everything said but I can certainly phrase what I want to say or my questions and I do that with the help of thinking. In human interaction it is us who decide on the extent to which we keep our thinking in its original course. In a conversation we might reach a point where we are thinking together with the other person. In those situations we must have made use of at least some of our own intelligence, otherwise we would never have reached the state of thinking together. This state has two components: on one hand, we make statements, on the other, we ask. When we make statements we reply to the other person's question

about who we are. I ask the very same question from myself: *who am I?* That is how we allow our personality to unfold through conversation. With questions like that the other person moves a part of our intelligence, otherwise we would not be asking, *who are you*. This intelligence switched on and at work also characterises the other, if it did not play a role, the other person would not be asking the same question from me. In sum, up to this point we have seen how the interaction between intelligences defines possibilities for love in many ways.

At the current stage of my life I have entered into a special relationship with my intelligence, which I have reached through thinking. Further, I can rise onto a certain level of generalised intelligence in my thinking and I can come to terms with my own individual intelligence. Everything that has found its way into my intelligence through my perspective on generalised intelligence is an asset in situations when I am in unknown territories. That is because I already possess some starting point to provide a reason for my acts in the eye of others. The part that appears in a given new situation can be integrated afterwards. In cases when I am in a given situation there and then, in the presence of another person, I can recognise the other's intelligence because my thinking focusses on a given pattern of intelligence different from mine.

We watch the other person, who is a mystery, and we discuss that but do our senses focus on the other person as well? How do we perceive the intelligence we are interacting with?

The work we have done on our intelligence shows that our perceptions, steeped in thought, are also about the other person. In accordance with our relationship to generalised intelligence, the intelligence inside us, awakened by the person we observe and set to motion within our thoughts, connects to the other person's intelligence in reality. We may tie our perceptions with the rope of thought to our own intelligence. That is how we gain self-awareness. Similarly to the way I can relate my own intelligence to the generalised through making explicit the intelligence I focus on by observing another person in me, I will arrive at an at least partial understanding of the other's intelligence. There is no knowing what the dimensions of the other person's intelligence

may be as the other is also continuously developing or changing. If we are capable of retaining our own self-awareness, we can compare different intelligences to our own.

This way we acquire such perceptions from the other person through which it is righteous to claim that we possess self-knowledge which is active in every human being. That is why the two questions: *who am I?* and *who are you?* are so easily seen as two sides of the same coin complementing each other.

I only perceive the other person if I recognise myself in him or her. I am identical with the other person but I can only recognise that with the help of the above described cognitive method. Anything that the intelligence awakened inside me adds to my perceptions through thinking by terms related to the other person is, in fact, the awakened consciousness of the other person inside me. I perceive the other because I am also there inside him or her and, at the same time, I have conscious ideas about the other, too. I harmonise those conscious ideas with who I perceive myself to be so I can reply to the question: *who am I*. This way we have discovered one of the characteristics of *I exist*: in order for me to reach generalised intelligence I have to walk down the same path as you.

## **V. Understanding the other person**

I am in contact with another individual and something changes in me. A naive person simply enjoys life and whatever has changed in him or her will be attributed to the influence of the other person when what the other reveals via communication is being matched against the existing catalogue of personality types. One is naive if fails to realise that the personality types he or she has established are not well-founded, or to put it differently, has blind faith in his or her intelligence and his or her own experiences and knowledge of life. Anything that the naive person dreams about him- or herself is projected onto the other and is only awakened if his or her intelligence proves insufficient to solve some situation in life. If that point comes, the individual wakes up through his or her ideas. Many might say that one can never understand another person for the simple reason that it is impossible for us to understand and know ourselves completely either. Can we not know ourselves? It seems certain that once we have



woken up from naivety we realise that though our existence is constrained if we use thinking we may see beyond our limits. In fact, the easiest way to learn about myself is if I have an understanding of the ideas motivating my actions since I perceive my actions or I might even consciously know what I do why. Thus, once I have completed some work on my individual intelligence and have achieved some level of self-knowledge, then, based on other people's consciousness awakened inside me, my thinking may reveal the motivation, the real underlying reasons behind others' actions.

Therefore, understanding another individual is only possible if, within the boundaries set by life, I observe the other's actions and through my thinking, i.e. through the work I have put into developing my intelligence, I associate notions with those observations and realistically get inside the head and personality of the other.

There are two pitfalls, however, that may hinder the individual in this respect: either the sufficient amount of self-knowledge is lacking or, even if self-knowledge is available, thinking has not reached the level of generalised intelligence, rather, what has been observed about the other becomes more individualistic, that is, personalised, which cannot lead to real love. Instead, what develops is a copy of love rooted in phony love. In the former case, when my self-knowledge is lacking, I live my life according to the principles of the naive part of my human nature. Love comes naturally but I have no knowledge of what underlies it. Another scenario which results from the lack of sufficient self-knowledge is when my actions are not in harmony with the motivation in my mind in the sense that I have distorted my intelligence, mutilated my self-knowledge. If this arises, I am only capable of loving those people whose intelligence has suffered a similar change: I am only capable of understanding the same type of people.

The reason why there are so many debates on love, why there are so many misunderstandings is that there are too many approaches to the role of thinking by itself, not to mention the view shared by many that there is no need to approach life and love from a scientific perspective because these two occur naturally anyway. Yet, if so, the question arises as to how? On the other hand, if, following initial ancient myths, the scientific foundations of natural sciences have been laid down as an advancement, then perhaps a scientific approach to the art of love may also be a step forward.

## VI. Human individuality

It has been shown above that our perceptions of other people can be compared to our observations, and we find the same *I exist* characteristic in other true persons as well: I also exists in you and in you I also exist. One might argue that none of this really matters in everyday life since this is a triviality known to all. Instead, the essence is the effectiveness of everyday life, that I can use the love in me beneficially in life. As a reply to this type of criticism, it may be pointed out that anyone who has considered that despite the surface differences in our physical, vital and psychological abilities, which, by the way, are rather dividing in nature, every human being shares the same essence deep down, that we may call the "Self", will also soundly recognise that love is not subject to the laws of our fragmented differences and that love is a debt (related) to the other person. It is an unconditional debt given that there is something unconditionally identical in every individual. Approaches to love which are based on the interaction of situations, similarities in character and preferences ignore just what has been described above, i.e. the problems generated by the differences in intelligence. From the present perspective such a way of life follows, which is a direct opposite of the conceptualisation found at the starting point because, though an advocate of that conceptualisation may exercise love in life through practical means, perhaps even may use love in the right way, still, that person will be incapable of loving an intelligence not identical to his or her own. The present work discusses the scientific foundations of the art of love and admits we have no right to pass a judgement on the life value of differing, potentially artificially individualised intelligences when laying down those foundations.

The counterargument according to which life is too short to allow for time to observe others intrinsically carries the same logical flaw. If we methodically think over this view we realise it leads to an automatised love yet what may wake us up is the individuality of the other, his or her different personality and as a result we may conclude that we must find the time to love. Furthermore, those who do not think over such considerations can only exercise love according to their inbuilt abilities which, as a source of love, are far from certain to last till the end of their lives. That is exactly what we examine: what are the requirements in life set for us by our differing human individualities.

Human nature is dual in character: deep down there is a core common to all people but the effects of our physical, vital and psychological abilities separate us from one another. Once I have learnt the other person's secret and integrated it into my will, thereby understanding why I love that person, the gap may be bridged. However, we have not yet discussed whether it is possible to bridge the moral-ideological gap between two people. If the way we operate in connection with this issue were explorable, ready for discussion, we would melt into one another without any shade of individualism, like angels. I may tell the other how I perceive him or her, what my intuitions are about him or her and these ideals of mine about the other reveal something to me about myself as well. It is through my individuality dissolved in generalised humanness that I learn: I sense the other. Whatever is uniquely individual in me will grow through my emotions, whatever is generalised human in me I will use in open interaction. This way love will have something for me, too. The result of gaining moral intuitions from others in relation to myself is that my emotions will get deeper and more varied. Through my feelings I integrate others into myself. When we exercise love, the acts of love will have a reciprocal-effect on us as well. That is how loving others may lead to realistic self-knowledge. If we discard our feelings, sooner or later our intelligence will become impoverished since emotions add newer and newer colours to our intelligence. On the other hand, it is retaining our individuality that maintains the dual nature of love: we melt into one another in a more general sense of love and at the same time keep our mysterious nature. In love emotions are revealed, too, but they mean something different to the ones who love. Even in case a person opens up to the other completely, the intuitions related to the other will retain some of their personal characteristics. Our conceptions are still imaginary in nature, so they always communicate something to our personality, something that only we can perceive. The joy of love is supplied by experiencing our moral-ideological intuitions. The source of that feeling is not to be found within me, instead, it originates in the other person since my intuitions are about the other but I also develop through the process.

The image I create of the other person is somewhere between my moral-ideological intuitions and my emotions. The picture itself is an individualised, personalised, individually different notion, which cannot be communicated to the other. The danger of

associating only images to our perceptions of other human beings and neglecting intuitions completely lies in creating an individuality which is barely accessible in everyday life: how could I love someone who individualises him- or herself to the extreme? That exactly is a main characteristic of the image. With the help of the philosophy of love we may overcome counterarguments which consider the scientific scrutiny of the art of love daydreaming, since those who see the present discussion as dreamy obviously cannot free themselves from the image-like nature of the representations of the other persons in their minds. Until I do nothing else but gather images of another individuality I am only driven by self-love because my images are a collection of my personal conceptions. The first step is to rise to the level of the solution to the problem of intelligence, in other words, I have to find out the other's secret, and only then will I breathe life into my own conceptions. The present philosophical approach does not dispense with emotions, rather, it shows that in terms of love, our images keep us captured in the dreamworld of our feelings unless our conceptions of the other person are granted an actual life of their own.

An emotional life completely void of thought is bound to lose all contact with people little by little. For a person striving to reach entirety, understanding others goes hand in hand with developing and nourishing a world of emotions.

## **VII. Is there a limit on understanding the other?**

In connection with the above the question arises as to whether our existing abilities to understand the other and the way of life conducted according to those abilities justifies for others the way we exercise love? First, however, this question must be divided into two parts. The scientific question is limited to the following: is there a limit on getting to know other people, and the answer to that, does that tell us anything about the nature of love? The second question relates to our actual way of life, for a discussion see the second part of the book, titled "The reality of love". Thus, the discussion on the art of love is concluded by a reply to the question on understanding the other person.

Needless to say, we have very little information available in life compared to the amount of existing information imaginable. Yet, by being humans among humans,

shaping our own lives, the only realistic phrasing of the question is the following: in our current situation, do we have a sufficient amount of knowledge at our disposal? Or, to be more precise, what does our current knowledge have to add? Since our self carves out a piece of the life context of mankind, questions on understanding can only be asked in the same context. In another life context we would be different and so would our questions. In our lives, dilemmas related to understanding always surface in the form of questions first, and they take the shape of how we may associate notions with all our perceptions. Thus, we might say that it is futile to discuss the limits of understanding in reply to an unasked question. If I am part of a human community where I have a given place, I shall ask according to that standpoint. Thus, if I attach moral-ideological intuitions to my perceptions in the above sense, thereby answering my question, my participation in the life of the community will become real. So, the solutions to the issues related to intelligence described above are also part of the foundations of real love. The ability to reply to the question on human understanding may have an important effect on the quality of love. In any case, if someone gives the right answer to oneself, he or she may awaken a true desire to feel real love in him- or herself. However, exploring the levels of understanding is not a central issue in the art of love.

Therefore, there is no need to discuss the limits of understanding. Instead, focus can be shifted to a more general issue, namely, what can understanding do. In fact, understanding the other person is a manifestation of love. The examination of the reality of love must be separated from the scientific approach. In this respect, it can be concluded that it might be sufficient for reaching love if we provide an answer to ourselves to our questions about understanding others. To put it differently, in the framework of the art of love there is not much point in examining what the different people are capable of.

The results of our thinking that we attach to our perceptions show us reality because reality does not include anything that should be approached from outside these two areas. The physical world around us, our life situations and our psychological personality traits all enter the realm of our cognitive activities through perceptions. Similarly, any psychological or mental perception is not interpreted as real unless it is associated with the other half, thinking. Our place in the life of mankind divides our unified existence into

two: we perceive the world and we think. If we restore unity, we are rooted in reality and the solution to the issues on intelligence outlined above is the right answer given to our questions on understanding. That may be transformed into real love, love, which can be built on a truly sound basis in the current state of mankind. Understanding has no such limits that would hinder exercising real love. The only existing type of understanding is a reflect of reality. According to the present work, understanding beyond reality makes no sense. Love is what we want to achieve through our understanding. Love is a moral drive acquired from the other person.

Do we perceive love or is it just a notion in our mind? Associating perceptions of the other person with moral-ideological intuitions related to him or her will transform into real love if and only if we want it to. We bring love into the world on the back of our intention. It is us who restore unity and reality and love is transported into that reality through free will. Whether or not love becomes an integral part of the human world depends on us, humans. Thus, the only type of love we may understand fully is the one we exercise. Cosmic love radiated towards us by the world is our ability to open up morally. The cooperation between the possibility for moral openness and our intention to love others creates the reality of true love. The way love targets and surrounds us may be understood through realising our moral self.

The two facets of love are love in reality and true, real love. True human love is what we accept from the love channelled towards us and love in reality is what we, humans radiate around ourselves. The task of man is to unite the two.

Man on Earth recreates what has created him yet there is just one problem: what is it that we give to Earth? By understanding we construct the unity of existence: what man devises is reality. Understanding is destined to create reality: human love is reality impregnated. There is no knowing in advance what one's love is like. First man creates what later transforms into love, subsequently integrates it into reality and it is only then that we see the result of whether the other free human spirit has accepted our love or not. Understanding cannot compile a recipe book on the art of love. During the process of solving the intelligence-dichotomy the individual internalises wisdom and if decides to

exercise love, his or her wisdom is reflected as love in people around him, but only if they are open to accepting that love.

Loving a completely different intelligence is only possible through a currently interpreted intelligence, even if that intelligence has overindividualised itself beyond any limits. In case we encounter one such intelligence in a person, it is the will power awakened from generalised intelligence that can love this intelligence on a cosmic-human scale. That is what man can create in reality.

The only existing type of understanding is what reflects reality and in real life the only type of love that exists is what man introduces into the world.

### **Additional remarks**

The reader might be somewhat disappointed due to a certain sense of lack, which can at least partly be disposed of if he or she continues to write what has been initiated above by the author. The reader is encouraged to make corrections, go into more detail, include more on the topic, relate it to other works, make further comments. The essence of the present essay can only be grasped if the reader views it as an initiation.

The present work is to be continued, there will be a second part called "The reality of love".

Not going into any detail about the system of connections between the different intelligence types was deliberate on my part as otherwise the present work could not be taken to be an invitation. Anyhow, the results on the understanding of the topic may be found scattered in this study. A person individualises his own intelligence from generalised intelligence. The question is, at which levels can a common denominator for seemingly different intellects be found, where the topmost level is generalised intelligence. Level zero is logics, which helps in clarifying numerous situations where love is blocked by different everyday views. An intelligence that ignores the generalised component can only be loved through a reintegration of the generalised part. Those intellects which have separated themselves from the general together can only

experience mutual love in the way described above if they manage to interpret generalised intelligence. If they cannot, they but copy true human love.

Those who exercise love just by themselves without philosophising over it are fortunate and their understanding is based on direct knowledge. Above the art of love has attempted to explain what requirements may emerge for thinking if those intelligences that got separated from general intelligence are also discussed.