

Intuition

by Verity Carney

Husserl's theory of intuition which is central to his phenomenology is even more relevant in today's world of multi-media communication. The human species produced and occupied within late modern industrial societies are so much more perceptively complex than before technologies allowed the capacity for the production of representations of semantic realism. Just as written language marked the beginning of subjective consciousness just 5 000 years ago replacing the bicameral mind, the development of visual communications in the form of: didactic narrative (movies/serials); poetics of image (art/advertising); semiotics (as a device for attention/cognition of intended meaning and the stimulus to desire) have produced a more eidetically intuitive and phenomenologically cognisant being than were our not too distant ancestors.

What intuition and eidetics suggest is that we are using a part of our brain to process data and meaning for making judgements of right in a way that is not provoked by conscious volition or linear reason as is immediately evident to us yet upon reflection stands to the scrutiny of considered logic. What is that reason - where is it ontologically located. Neo-classical theory says in the interaction between a quantifiable pleasure principle (utility maximisation) and a quantifiable 'desire' for profit. Value theory says between the material conditions of social reproduction and capital accumulation. But what is the outcome of this claim to reason anyway - value as it is made real by price in exchange. How interesting. When man developed written language he developed grey matter on the outer top left hemisphere of his brain. Written language developed out of the need for law myth and trade. The proliferation of the image (as analogous or didactic representation) has occurred for the same reasons - but also for the creation of desire. What are we now developing now is holographic thought that is increasingly visual in the digest of images and thereby using left and right hemispheres for concurrent thought and interpretation.

Phenomenology is the continental branch of epistemological theory concerned with the true and the real and by what means these are ascertained or certified. Essentially then it is about human understanding - how do we come to know what we know. For Husserl however it was also about the meaning of what is known – a truth generated by intuit rather than experiential/repeatable logico deductive efficiency.

But by what process of mind can intuition serve to sort out true from false - the genuine from spurious? To guarantee a fulfilled rather than empty meaning in a moment of realisation that intuitively presents valid meanings rather than meanings for one reason or another. And thereby capture the essence of a thing, fact, a known [\[1\]](#).

Levinas writes, “the eidetic intuition or Husserl’s famous Wesensschau - is “seeing”, the thing itself” the unique ideation invariant that fulfils and is constituted through a meaning-complex. The bottom line of science, then is intellectual intuition, direct mental “seeing” of essences. For phenomenology intuition is the epistemological fulcrum upon which all meanings, all fields of meaning, all worlds of meaning, and finally the one meaningful universe, are consciously reviewed and validated from the ground up. Intuition defines the field of phenomenology and is at the same time the meticulous labour of consciously returning all meanings to their original home - consciousness.”
(xix)

The thing about perception is that it requires interest. That a gaze may be cast to inspect details of the object etc, one must be curious (have some partial prior knowledge) in order to recognise, and cognize. Interest is invoked from familiarity that may have come via a prior or vicarious experience of that thing - when that thing is a particular commodity’s price/value then that experience comes in the form of a multitude of different possibilities of having acquired that information. Interest is reducible to anything that falls somewhere between need and desire. Although, items and artefacts of need are more subject to the rigour of judgements of right than those of pure desire. However in an age of cultural commodification, items of desire (identity, signification, pastiche and fetishism) receive, greater or lesser concerns for the transubstantiation between value, depending on their signification. And these

then exist in the subjective conscious process of consideration and consent in social interaction and transaction such as the formation of equivalence in exchange.

[1] Old struggle between Athens and Jerusalem - shared notion of purpose - telos - Greek Reason and revealed religion were in agreement regarding the fundamental status of final causality as an integral dimension of the true and the real.