

"I am Id." These are mental constructs on Freud's part. But given these, Freud can now give you in good Cartesian terms a rational explanation of the way the human psyche works, and one checks this against human behavior.

Cartesianism and Baconianism, then, are opposed. Baconianism is fact-finding. Cartesianism, is, if you will, theoretical physics in a peculiar sense; a theoretical physics that builds on hypothetical constructs through the use of reason. Note the consequences of this system. First, it places emphasis here on the rational argument; notice, **not** on the ideas, for the ideas do not belong to the individual; they are God's; you are merely using these to start with. What you want is the chain of ideas; what links them together logically.

Now see what a theory is. A theory in this sense is this chain of argument. And in this system see what the role of mathematics is. Mathematics is a logical tool. It is only in mathematics that Descartes and his followers would insist that you can avoid semantic traps that are set for the unwary in the use of ordinary language; when you use words that mean different things to different people and therefore you get trapped.

You probably all know Jonathan Swift's little parody in Gulliver's travels where he takes this to its ridiculous ultimate extreme. I forget the people who do this, but they never speak; they carry great sacks on their backs and when they want to say something they reach in and pull out the object. So, they do not have ambiguity. They do not use words at all, but use the thing itself to make a point.

For the Cartesians, mathematics is the most refined tool of logical discourse, and this is its primary role. Note too, that Cartesian science is democratic; democratic in a very odd sense; democratic in the sense that all individuals have the same innate ideas, or should have the same innate ideas. Everybody, therefore, is capable of grasping these fundamental truths about the universe. This is the origin of the term "commonsense." It was that intellectual faculty common to all of mankind. So, democratic in this way, but dogmatic as well. For, it is dogmatic in terms of individual reaction to the innate ideas. Let us assume that we are going to argue. I have an innate idea which is clear. I see it very clearly; it seems to me indisputable. I know it is true. But this is