

1. [Analytic of the Cognition](https://old.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/6uuvyo/1_analytic_of_the_cognition/) (first, [second](https://old.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/6uuw38/2_analytic_of_the_cognition/) and the [third part](https://old.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/6uuwc4/3_analytic_of_the_cognition/))

2. [Physics](<https://old.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/6xrza9/physics/>)

3. [Aesthetics](<https://old.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/5r7387/characters/>)

4. [Ethics](<https://old.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/765do0/ethics/>)

5. [Politics](<https://old.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/5r33if/religions/>)

6. [Metaphysics](<https://old.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/71x27c/metaphysics/>)

Philosophy of Salvation Volume 1, Critique.

[Preface](https://old.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/7dtzhx/preface_appendix/)

1. [Analytic of the Cognition](https://old.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/60uhme/1_summary_of_kants_transcendental_idealism/) ([second](https://old.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/60ugu4/2_visualizations/) and [third](https://old.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/60uggy/3_the_only_intellectual_heir_of_kant_schopenhauer/) part, [conclusions](https://old.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/60ug6i/4_conclusions/), [final remarks](https://old.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/8nuikv/5_final_remarks/))

2. Physics

3. Aesthetics

4.

[Ethics](https://old.reddit.com/r/Efilism/comments/4yzwmn/main%C3%A4nders_criticism_of_schopenhauers_ethics/)

5. [Politics](<https://old.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/85c66k/politics/>)

6.

[Metaphysics](https://old.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/62r2kx/denial_of_the_will_to_live_accounts_from/)

Philosophy of Salvation Volume 2.

* [The true trust](https://old.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/63ce8t/the_true_trust/)

* [Aphorisms](<https://old.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/6iull9/aphorisms/>)

The set of essays "Realism and Idealism":

1. [Realism](<https://old.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/69dnbz/realism/>)

2. [Pantheism](<https://old.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/69dn9x/pantheism/>)

3. [Idealism](https://old.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/69dn82/idealism_i/) (first and [second part](https://old.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/69dn01/idealism_ii/))

Of the essay "Buddhism":

Ex oriente lux!

* [The esoteric part of the Buddha-teaching](https://old.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/6b34o4/the_esoteric_part_of_the_buddhateaching/)

* [The exoteric part of the Buddha-teaching](https://old.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/6gztm2/the_exoteric_part_of_the_buddhateaching/)

* [Character image of Buddha](https://old.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/798utb/character_image_of_buddha/)

The final essay:

* [The 12th essay](https://old.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/6o6wm5/critique_of_the_philosophy_of_hartmann_0/)

Man kann die *beiden Bände* von Die Philosophie der Erlösung [hier lesen](<https://archive.org/details/PhilippMainlanderSmtlicheWerke>).

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	4
Introduction	6
Preface	12
Comment to "Preface"	14
Analytic of the Cognition	18
(1) Part 1 of 3	18
(2) Part 2 of 3	32
(3) Part 3 of 3	46
Physics	48
Aesthetics	56
Ethics	60
Politics	66
Metaphysics	80
PHILOSOPHY OF SALVATION VOLUME 1, Critique	87
Preface	87
Analytic of the Cognition	88
(1) Summary of Kant's transcendental idealism	89
(2) Visualizations	104
(3) The only intellectual heir of Kant: Schopenhauer	113
(4) Conclusions	129
(5) Final remarks	142
Ethics	146
Mainländer's criticism of Schopenhauer's Ethics	146
Comment to "Mainländer's criticism of Schopenhauer"	151
Politics	154
Metaphysics	162
PHILOSOPHY OF SALVATION VOLUME 2	169
The True Trust	169
Comment to "The True Trust"	172
Aphorisms	174

The set of essays “Realism and Idealism”	177
Realism	177
Pantheism	184
Comment to “Pantheism”	189
Idealism (Part 1)	190
Idealism (Part 2)	201
Of the essay “Buddhism”: Ex oriente lux!	211
The esoteric part of the Buddha-teaching	211
Comment to “The esoteric part of the Buddha-teaching”	225
The exoteric part of the Buddha-teaching	227
Character Image of Buddha	238
The 12th (Final) Essay	247
Critique of the philosophy of Hartmann (0)	247
Preface	248
1. Introduction	253
2. Psychology	261
4. Metaphysics (Excerpts)	270
Third speech: The divine and the human law	271

Introduction

https://old.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/5r8wn2/the_immanent_philosophy_of_philipp_mainl%C3%A4nder/

> Jesus answered her, "Everyone who drinks this water will be thirsty again. But whoever drinks the water that I give him will never be thirsty again."

The woman said to Him, "Sir, give me this water." (John 4:13-15)

Schopenhauer is not merely a figure in the history of philosophy: his philosophy has the potential to replace religion. Mainländer wants to be his "Paul" and saw it as his life-task to purify Schopenhauer's immortal thoughts.

>Mainländer saw his philosophy of redemption as timely, as the solution to the most urgent problem of modern humanity. This problem came from a terrible tension in the modern soul: on the one hand, a deep need for religion; on the other hand, a loss of religious faith. Since suffering is the eternal fate of mankind, there is still the great need for deliverance from it; but the traditional sources of religious belief are no longer credible to the general educated public. No one believed anymore in the existence of a heaven beyond the earth where a paternal God rewarded the virtuous and punished the wicked. Hence Mainländer saw the purpose of his philosophy as the formulation of a modern doctrine of redemption, a doctrine that should be completely consistent with the naturalistic worldview of modern science. His philosophy, he was proud to say, would be "the first attempt to ground the essential truths of salvation on the basis of nature alone". ^1

This reconciliation with science of Mainländer has been much more successful than anyone in the 19th century could ever have expected. The teachings of Kant-Schopenhauer on space and time are in contradiction with Einstein's theory of relativity, but Mainländer circumvents this and comes to results that comply with special relativity. Also, before the 20th century the universe was believed to be spatio-temporally infinite. Yet Mainländer asserts that the universe has had a *beginning* and that the universe is finite in size. This is why a German scholar remarked that the scientific worldview has "mainländerized" in his favor. ^2

>I felt serene that I had forged a *good sword*, but at the same time I felt a cold dread in me for

starting on a course more dangerous than any other philosopher before me. I attacked giants and dragons, everything existing, holy and honorable in state and science: God, the monster 'infinity', the species, the powers of nature, and the modern state; and in my stark naked atheism I validated only the individual and egoism. Nevertheless, above them both lay the splendor of the pre-worldly unity, of God ... the holy spirit, the greatest and most significant of the three divine beings. Yes, it lay 'brooding with wings of the dove' over the only real things in the world, the individual and its egoism, until it was extinguished in eternal peace, in absolute nothingness. –

--

^1 Weltschmerz, p. 208.

^2 Ulrich Horstmann: ^{Ich gestatte mir noch eine als Anregung gedachte Nachbemerkung, die auf der Verwunderung dar-über basiert, wie sehr sich das natur- und kulturwissenschaftliche Weltbild in den letzten Jahrzehnten mainländerisiert hat, ohne daß die beteiligten Parteien, also die Mainländer-Interpreten auf der einen und die Bewohner des szientifischen Paralleluniversums auf der anderen Seite merklich dar-auf reagiert hätten.)

You can see on the side-bar links towards the different translations. (Update: The side-bar is visible by choosing for the old reddit.)

Mainländer has written two philosophical works.

The first one is called The Philosophy of Salvation (Volume 1). This is his main work. It has two parts: the first part is his Exposition. The second part is a Critique of the philosophy of Kant and Schopenhauer, and sheds light on how he came to the results of part one.

Both parts have the same structure:

1. [Analytic of the Cognition](https://www.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/6uuvyo/1_analytic_of_the_cognition/)
2. [Physics](<https://www.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/6xrza9/physics/>)
3. [Aesthetics](<https://www.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/5r7387/characters/>)
4. [Ethics](<https://www.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/765do0/ethics/>)
5. [Politics](<https://www.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/5r33if/religions/>)
6. [Metaphysics](<https://www.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/71x27c/metaphysics/>)

If one wants to start with the beginning, so with the Analytic of the Cognition, I would personally recommend to not start with the Exposition version, but with the [Critique version](https://www.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/60uhme/1_summary_of_kants_transcendental_idealism/). The latter is a thorough explanation of *how* he comes to the results in the Exposition. In addition, the essay Idealism has been described as “illuminating” by many (Max Seiling, Sommerlad, Frederick C. Beiser, and the readers here) for understanding his epistemological position.

His second philosophical work is called The Philosophy of Salvation Volume 2. Volume 2 is a collection of 12 essays.

1. [Realism](<https://www.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/69dnbz/realism/>)
2. [Pantheism](<https://www.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/69dn9x/pantheism/>)
3. [Idealism](https://www.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/69dn82/idealism_i/)
4. [Buddhism](https://www.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/6b34o4/the_esoteric_part_of_the_buddhateaching/)
5. The Dogma of the Trinity
6. The Philosophy of Salvation
7. [The true trust](https://www.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/63ce8t/the_true_trust/)

8. Theoretical Socialism
9. Practical Socialism
10. The regulative Principle of Socialism
11. [After-discussion](<https://www.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/6iull9/aphorisms/>) (a collection of aphorisms)
12. [Critique of Hartmann's *Philosophy of the Unconscious*](https://www.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/6o6wm5/critique_of_the_philosophy_of_hartmann_0/)

Those who have read Schopenhauer know that the key to what the thing-in-itself is lies in our self-consciousness. How do we experience our self-consciousness?

> Answer: Absolutely and entirely as one who wills. Everyone who observes his own self-consciousness will soon become aware that its object is at all times his own willing. By this, however, we must understand not merely the definite acts of will that lead at once to deed, and the explicit decisions together with the actions resulting from them. On the contrary, whoever is capable of grasping any way that which is essential, in spite of the different modifications of degree and kind, will have no hesitation in reckoning as manifestations of willing all desiring, striving, wishing, longing, yearning, hoping, loving, rejoicing, exulting, detesting, fleeing, fearing, being angry, hating, mourning, suffering, in short, all affects and passions. For these are only movements more or less weak or strong, stirrings at one moment violent and stormy, at another mild and faint, of our own will that either checked or given its way, satisfied, or unsatisfied. They all refer in many different ways to the attainment or missing of what I desired, and to the enduring or subduing of what is abhorred. They are therefore definite affections of the same will that is active in decisions and actions. Even what are called feelings of pleasure and displeasure are included in the list above; it is true that they exist in a great variety of degrees and kinds; yet they can always be reduced to affections of desire or abhorrence and thus to the will itself becoming conscious of itself as satisfied or unsatisfied, impeded or allowed its way. Indeed this extends even to bodily sensations, pleasant or painful, and to all countless sensation lying between these two extremes. For the essence of all these affections consists in their entering immediately into self-consciousness as something agreeable or disagreeable of the will. If we carefully consider the matter, we are immediately conscious of our own body only as the outwardly acting organ of the will, and as the seat of receptivity for pleasant or painful sensations. But, as I have just said, these sensations themselves go back to immediate affections of the will which are either agreeable or disagreeable to it. Whether or not we include these mere feelings of pleasure or displeasure, we shall in any case find that all these movements of the will, those variations of willing and not-willing, which with their constant ebb and flow constitute the only object of self-consciousness. (Schopenhauer, On the Freedom of the Will)

Mainländer and Schopenhauer both use this key, self-consciousness, which is an “I” who “wants”. The fundamental difference between them, is that Schopenhauer throws away this “I” and proclaims it to be a mere illusion. The empirical world is a projection of the metaphysical will.

Mainländer considers both this “I” and this “will” to be real, meaning, the things-in-themselves are *individual wills to live*. The closed collection of all individual wills is the world, and nothing exists outside of it, everything which *exists* is individual will to live.

> The immanent philosophy, which acknowledges no sources but the for everyone’s eyes existing nature and our inside, rejects the assumption of a hidden basic unity in, behind or above the world. She knows only countless Ideas, i.e. individual wills to live, which, as sum, form a closed collective-unity.

Pantheism is therefore strongly rejected, and should all wills disappear then *absolutely nothing* remains.

Metaphysics

§ 22

The immanent philosophy may not condemn; she can’t. She doesn’t call for suicide, but serving truth alone, must destroy counter motives with violence. Because what says the poet?

- > Who would fardels bear,
- >To grunt and sweat under a weary life,
- >But that the dread of something after death,
- >The undiscovered country from whose bourn
- >No traveller returns, puzzles the will,
- >And makes us rather bear those ills we have
- >Than fly to others that we know not of?

This undiscovered land, these believed mysteries which have opened the hand of so many, who had already firmly clamped the dagger – this frightful land, the immanent philosophy had to destroy it *completely*. There once was a transcendent area – it no longer is. The life-weary, who asks himself: existence or non-existence? must find reasons for and against in *this* world (the complete world: he should take his still blinded brothers in regard, who he can help, not that he delivers shoes and plants cabbage for them, but by helping them to achieve a better state) - on the other side of the world is not a place of peace, nor a place of torment, but only nothingness.

This can be a new counter motive and a new motive: this truth can draw one person back into the affirmation of the will, pull others powerfully into death. The truth may however *not* be denied. And if up until now the idea of an individual continuation after death, in a hell or in a heaven, has kept off many from death, whereas the immanent philosophy leads on the other hand many into death – so *must* it be from now on, since every motive, that enters the world, appears and works with necessity.

Comment to "Introduction"

**Everything in this document that is in dark cornflower blue 2 is a comment by YuYuHunter . The color was deemed mostly acceptable based on subjective preference in what makes something more readable.*

Apologies if the color is not agreeable to you.

*Sometimes the person asking is quoted. If it isn't there, the text from that person is in black.**

User sunques:

Would you consider M closer to Realism or Idealism? His immanence seems closer to Realism although he believes matter to be "Ideal".

Do you think he would claim that the world is real only because the Individual Wills are real and not the other way around?

Closer to realism than Kant and Schopenhauer, but like S he says that philosophy has to be idealistic just in order to be honest. Matter is indeed ideal: it is a form for perceiving objects.

Kant and Schopenhauer claim that their idealism doesn't "attack the *empirical reality* of the world, but only says that that reality is not unconditional", but Mainländer says that these are empty promises of their lips, and that their idealism hits the empirical reality in its core.

In their transcendental idealism the whole world is the projection of a single point (an X with Kant, a numberless Will with Schopenhauer), the only thing which is real, and this point goes through the prism of space and time in our brain which makes appear to us the (ideal) world.

Mainländer agrees that time and space are not properties of the things-as-they-are, that time and space are ideal. But he doesn't agree that they are *pure forms of perception* lying in our heads before any experience.

The individual wills work upon each other, they are always in motion (a will in rest is unimaginable). The point of motion is real, says M, we perceive it as the present, and connecting this to a line is *time*. Time exists only in our head, like with K and S, but there is movement.

>Do you think he would claim that the world is real only because the Individual Wills are real and not the other way around?

Yes, even if there would be no observers the individual wills would exist and work with each other. Through space we see where and how they work in each other.

>Pantheism is therefore strongly rejected, and should all wills disappear then absolutely nothing remains.

Pantheism: a doctrine that identifies God with the universe, or regards the universe as a manifestation of God.

Immanent: existing or operating within; inherent. (of God) permanently pervading and sustaining the universe.

>"...without having to believe in a unity in, above or behind the world"

Would you consider the main difference between the two being that of unitariness? It seems that the "Rotting Body of God" concept can be seen as a form of Pantheism, or Pandeism, as well as Immanence.

Under pantheism he understands: the idea that the whole world is one basic unity. Or: The world is the manifestation of this unity.

This unity was often called "God" hence the name pantheism. Later others called this unity "the absolute" etc and pantheist Schopenhauer called this unity "will". He writes about the concept pantheism:

>Against pantheism I have mainly only this: that it does not mean anything. Naming the world God does not mean explaining it, but instead only enriching language with a superfluous synonym for the word 'world'. Whether you say 'the world is God' or 'the world is the world' amounts to the same. Of course if one proceeded from God as though he were the given and the thing to be explained, and therefore said: 'God is the world', there is an explanation of sorts, insofar as something unknown is traced back to something better known; still it is merely a semantic explanation. However, if one proceeds from what is actually given, hence from the world, and now says 'the world is God', it is plain as day that nothing is said by this or at least the explanation is of something unknown by something less known. (Paralipomena, § 69)

So the term God makes the term unnecessarily confusing:

Pantheism merely says that the world is one unity. One unity can hardly be found in this world so pantheists, like Schopenhauer, say that the world which we see is the manifestation on the one unity.

(Or: the one unity is real, the world which we see is its representation)

Mainländer rejects the co-existence of one unity together with the world. The world is a collection, not a unity. So he rejects pantheism. One unity has once existed, it no longer exists.

Immanent means that you don't go beyond the boundaries of experience, which Schopenhauer does a lot. (What an unnecessary mention of God of that definition! Mainländer's definition is much clearer, in the first quote in the opening post.) Mainländer is proud that he doesn't: therefore the name *the immanent philosophy*.

>Would you consider the main difference between the two being that of unitariness?

Yes indeed.

> It seems that the "Rotting Body of God" concept can be seen as a form Pantheism, or Pandeism, as well as Immanence.

This is why the term God must be used so carefully, Mainländer is extremely careful when he does that. I think that the writer of that blog played way too much with the terms of God, talking about a rotting body of a suicidal God etc, something he tried to rectify in his second post.

Mainländer says there once was a pre-existence, now there is existence which dissolves into non-existence. That is clearer without using old terms which mention god.

>Nature seems to express the truth that only the Ideas are real, and not the individuals. However, we may question Schopenhauer's excessive reliance on Plato's theory of Ideas by taking into account the fact that, within nature, examples of the extinction of some species can be found. - Schopenhauer, a Guide for the Perplexed

This qualm is what gives Mainlander's POV a lot of credence. It would be foolish to assume that the Dodo bird's "Idea" still exists somewhere outside of space and time. So in effect, Mainlander turned Platonism on it's head!

Yes, as M would say "an assumption which is rejected by every clear empirical mind".

^(Translated already: more than fits in one reddit post. Sadly enough, when it finally gets interesting: when M shows with Kant's own contradictions what time and space actually are, the post gets too long. I'll have to split.)

Preface

<https://old.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/6wbafq/preface/>

“Whoever has once tasted the Critique will be ever after disgusted with all dogmatic twaddle which he formerly put up with.” Kant

He who investigates the development of the human mind, from the beginning of civilization to our own days, will obtain a remarkable result: he will find that reason first always conceived the indisputable power of nature as fragmented, and personified the individual expressions of power, thus formed gods; then these gods were melted together into a single God; then, by means of the most abstract thought, made this God into a being that was in no way conceivable; but at last it became critical, tore apart its phantasm, and raised the real individual, the fact of inner and outer experience, to the throne.

The stages of this path are:

1. Polytheism
2. Monotheism – Pantheism (a. religious pantheism, b. philosophical pantheism)
3. Atheism

Not all cultures have traveled all the way. The intellectual life of most people’s has remained at the first or second point of development, and only in two nations the last stage was reached: India and Judea.

The religion of the Indians was initially polytheism, then pantheism. (Later on religious pantheism seized very fine and notable minds and built it into philosophical pantheism [Vedanta philosophy].) Then Buddha appeared, the splendid prince, and grounded his magnificent Karma-doctrine of atheism on the *belief* in the individual’s *omnipotence*.

Likewise, the religion of the Jews was first rogue polytheism, then rigid monotheism. In their religion, like in pantheism, the individual lost every trace of independence. When, as *Schopenhauer* very aptly remarked, Jehovah had sufficiently tormented his powerless creature, he threw it on the dung. Against this, the critical reason reacted with elementary violence in the sublime personality of Christ.

Christ gave the individual his immortal right, and based it on the *belief* in the movement of the world from life into death (end of the world), founded the atheistic Religion of Salvation. That pure Christianity is, at bottom, genuine atheism (*i.e. denial* of a with the world *co-existing personal* God, but affirmation of a *pre-worldly perished deity* whose breath permeates the world) and is monotheism on the surface only, this I will prove in the text.

Exoteric Christianity became world religion, and after its triumph, the above-mentioned intellectual development has not taken place in any nation again.

On the other hand, in addition to the Christian religion, in the community of the Western nations, Western philosophy came up, and has now come near to the third stage. It connected itself to the Aristotelian philosophy, which had been preceded by the Ionian school. Visible

individualities of the world (water, air, fire) were seen by the latter as the principles of everything else, similar to how separated observed activities of nature were shaped into gods in ancient religions. The in the Aristotelian philosophy, by combination of all forms obtained basic unity, became in the Middle Ages (pure Christianity had long since been lost) the philosophically defended God of the Christian Church; for scholasticism is nothing but philosophical monotheism.

This was then transformed into philosophical pantheism by *Scotus Erigena*, *Vanini*, *Bruno*, and *Spinoza*, which was built, under the influence of a particular philosophical branch (critical idealism: *Locke*, *Berkeley*, *Hume*, *Kant*) into pantheism without process (*Schopenhauer*) on one hand, and on the other hand into pantheism with development (*Schelling*, *Hegel*), i.e. pushed over the top.

Presently, most educated people of the civilized nations, like the noble Indians in the time of the Vedanta philosophy, wander in this philosophical pantheism (it is no matter whether the basic unity in the world is called will or idea, or absolute or matter). But now the day of reaction has come.

The individual demands, more loudly than ever, the restoration of his torn and crushed but immortal right.

The present work is the first attempt to give it to him fully.

The Philosophy of Salvation is the continuation of the teachings of *Kant* and *Schopenhauer* and affirmation of Buddhism and pure Christianity. Both philosophical systems are corrected and supplemented, and these religions are reconciled with science.

It does not base atheism upon any belief, like these religions, but, as philosophy, on *knowledge* and therefore atheism has been scientifically established by it for the first time.

It will also pass on to the knowledge of humanity; for she is ripe for it: she has become mature.
P.M.

Comment to "Preface"

User mainquestionlander:

>It would be much appreciated if I could get some brief answers.

With pleasure! I didn't manage to keep the answers brief however. If I left something unclear, feel free to let me know.

>From what I had read prior to seeing your translations, I was thinking Mainlander would read more like Emil Cioran, but Mainlander reads much more dry and academic.

Indeed, he is an "old-fashioned" type of philosopher. Aesthetics and Aphorisms deal with more straightforward pessimistic issues.

* 2) What does Mainlander mean when he speaks of the "individual?"

For animals and humans I think that's clear: we see other individuals, and regarding the inner experience: our self-consciousness is constantly concerned with our individual self, we don't share our self-consciousness with others. Many philosophers said that amount is just an illusion, or just something we perceive but which has nothing to do with that what exists independently from an observer. They argued for example that only one basic substance exists (and all the diversity of individuals we see, are merely expressions of this basic substance).

Mainländer strongly rejects this. This basic substance, or God, is given all reality without justification. The individual is a mere puppet in the hands of this unity. But in Mainländer's view, the persons around us, the stones around us, are the only thing which are real. He calls them individualities.

He considers pantheism (which gives all reality to the unity, and no reality to the individual) and monotheism, therefore to be the same thing. All might is given to the unity, and the individual is a mere nothing in its hands. It is in this sense that Mainländer talks about "restoring the right of the individual", who has all reality.

* 1) How exactly is true Christianity atheistic?

So Mainländer sees monotheism as every system which makes the individual a mere toy without any power. Atheistic is a every system which gives *all* reality to the existing individuals.

Secondly, under true Christianity Mainländer understands the teaching of Christ alone, as it is set out in the Gospels. (The interpretation of Paul, and of the Catholic Church, immediately moved closer to monotheism.)

So let us look at what Jesus says. The Jews at the time of Jesus were strict monotheists, just like muslims today. You can imagine how people would react if theism were openly attacked. Instead Jesus abolishes the monotheistic relation slave--master of the individual towards God. The religious leaders reacted to that exactly like how Islamic scholars would:

>"He was even calling God his own Father, making himself equal with God." (John 5:18)

This is not enough. After saying that the Son and Father are one, he places a third divine being above both of them:

> Verily I say unto you, All their sins shall be forgiven unto the sons of men, and their blasphemies wherewith soever they shall blaspheme: but whosoever shall blaspheme against the Holy Spirit hath never forgiveness, but is guilty of an eternal sin. (Mark 3:28-29)

The teaching of Jesus is in *that* sense atheistic, that the individuals alone are real. But that they are led by "a deity whose breath permeates the world", does, in Mainländer's view, not make it monotheism. Christianity takes the best position regarding the relation of the individual towards the unity.

The essay "Realism" is about all this of, the relation of individual towards the universe and its interconnection.

* 3) What does Mainlander mean when he speaks of "Idealism?"

He uses it in another way than is commonly understood. Idealism is for him every philosophy which starts with the fact that only our own consciousness is given to us.

> Idealism however is every view of nature which sees the world as an image, a mirror in the mind of the I, and emphasizes and establishes the dependency of this mirror-image on the mirror: the cognition. One can therefore also say, that critical idealism makes the *perceiving I*, its foothold, the main issue. (Essay: realism)

> The true philosophy must be idealistic, i.e. she may not jump over the perceiving subject and talk about things, as if they are, independently from an eye that sees them, a hand that feels them, exactly such as the eye sees them, the hand feels them.

> 1) How does Mainlander come to the conclusion that what primarily exists are individualities?

His epistemology comes to a few results that imply this: firstly, that things-in-themselves exist independently from an observer, secondly, that Locke put the boundary between primary and secondary qualities at the right place, meaning that number is a property of things in themselves, and at last, he agrees with Schopenhauer that the path to the thing-in-itself is via our self-consciousness, whose content is always in the form "***I*** who wants". Schopenhauer deduces from this that the thing-in-itself is what we call will, Mainländer that it is *individual* will.

> 2) How does he come to the conclusion that reality is "God killing himself?"

Here I would like to stress that others have "gone crazy" with this idea, Mainländer is very careful to never indulge in metaphysical speculations. He never said things like "suicide of God".

Mainländer merely says that the universe has had a beginning, which is hardly a controversial claim given what we know of cosmology today. He calls what was before the universe, relative nothing, basic unity (so, negation this world of plurality), God. This are mere names for what we know nothing of. Since right now only the world exists, the basic unity is "dead".

>But now it's breaking apart?

Mainländer talks about a "weakening of the force" which is widely interpreted as being what we observe as the degradation of energy.

>"God killing himself?"

Nevertheless, despite of what I said, Mainländer wrote that we can interpret the world *as if* it were a conscious choice of "God" to become nothing. He stresses the -as if- many times. He explains this in the post called Metaphysics. This is his only metaphysical speculation in his work, and Mainländer says that he did it "under the strict conditions set out by Kant" and "I was allowed to do it by the great man of Königsberg".

>Interesting, so what part of his philosophy makes him notorious as a pessimistic philosopher (as well as an antinatalist)?

The pessimism is never far away, except for the parts that deal with epistemology, in every other part the pessimistic view on life is always present. So it's not a specific part, the pessimism is everywhere, it's that he writes things like: "Life is hell, and the sweet still night of absolute death is the annihilation of hell", "the will, ignited by the knowledge that non-being is better than being, is the supreme principle of morality." In aesthetics, he considers a wise someone who has complete contempt for death.

As an antinatalist, his work eulogizes virginity.

Just imagine a part like "The true trust" in the hands of an optimist and you'll see why he is considered to be extremely radical.

>I imagine it has something to do with his idea of the denial of the will-to-live?

This is actually less radical with Mainländer than with Schopenhauer. The latter saw the denial of the will as a mortification of the will, Mainländer argues that overcoming sexual urges is enough.

Mainländer also speaks about a will to death, I think that part also belongs to those that "make him notorious as a pessimistic philosopher":

>That vision is, to put it mildly, macabre. We now enter the darkest recesses of Mainländer's imagination, which fabricate for us a grim cosmology of death. What he sees from his exalted standpoint of the whole of things is that everything in nature and history strives for one thing: death. There is in all things in nature, and in all actions in history, "the deepest longing for absolute annihilation". (Frederick C. Beiser, *Weltschmerz*)

>I must apologize that I do not understand a great deal of what you've written.

For instance, what exactly compels him to believe that non-existence is superior to existence? And what compels him to believe that that is the basis of morality?

But to make an edit, I cannot stress enough how much these translations are appreciated. Although there are a relatively few number of people who seem to be viewing this sub, I imagine those that do have quite a number of important thoughts to express. So please, continue!

P.S. Is your username referencing Yu Yu Hakusho?

Also, did you make a typo? It seems like Mainlander would have contempt for life?

I am not sure I will succeed in clearing all confusion. To start with

* And what compels him to believe that that is the basis of morality?

For Mainländer all ethics is merely "art of happiness". So the meaning of "morality" with Mainländer is very different from what is normal in Western philosophy. In that respect, his

ethics is no different than that of the stoics and epicurists, it's just that he believes his ethics to be more effective than they are.

So why is believing that non-existence superior important for attaining the highest peace of mind in life? Because

>he who has overcome the fear of death, he and only he can generate the delightful, most aromatic flower in his soul: unassailability, immovability, unconditional trust; because what in the world could move such a human in any way? Need? He knows no fear of starvation. Enemies? At most they could kill him and it is death what cannot frighten him. Bodily pain? Should it become unbearable, then he throws his body away.

* It seems like Mainlander would have contempt for life?

He writes about contempt for death: he means overcoming fear of death. Being totally indifferent about it.

* For instance, what exactly compels him to believe that non-existence is superior to existence?

This is actually something he gives very little attention to, to the surprise of some. He writes that those who have thought for a moment, "purely *objectively* about life", do not need his judgement on this issue. On the other hand, one time he appeals to the people who have lived the best possible life (Buddha, Solomon, Goethe, Humboldt), and still claimed that it was all emptiness, struggle.

* I cannot stress enough how much these translations are appreciated.

I'm very happy to hear that!

* Is your username referencing Yu Yu Hakusho?

Yes, I originally made this account for a comment on the other manga of the author of YYHakusho, Hunter x Hunter.

Analytic of the Cognition (1) Part 1 of 3

https://old.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/6uuvyo/1_analytic_of_the_cognition/

>The more well-known the data are, the more difficult it is, to combine them in a new but nevertheless correct way, since already a large amount of minds has tried to do so and have exhausted the possible combinations. (*Schopenhauer*)

§ 1

The true philosophy must be *purely immanent*, that means, her complete material, as well as her boundaries, must be the world. She must explain the world from principles which by itself every human can recognize and may not call upon otherworldly forces, of which one can know absolutely nothing, nor forces in the world whose being cannot be perceived.

The true philosophy must furthermore be idealistic, i.e. she may not jump over the knowing subject and talk about things, as if they are, independently from an eye that sees them, a hand that feels them, exactly such as the eye sees them, the hand feels them. Before she dares to take a step, to solve the mystery of the world, she must have carefully and precisely researched the cognition. It may be that:

1. that the knowing subject produces the world from its own means;
2. that the subject perceives the world exactly as it is;
3. that the world is partially a product of the subject, partially of a from the subject independent ground of appearance.

The subject as starting point is the beginning of the only certain path to the truth. It is possible, as I may say here, nay, must, that skipping the subject would lead to the same result; but proceeding in such manner, where everything depends on chance, is unworthy for any considerate thinker.

--

§ 2

The sources, from which all experience, all findings, all knowledge, flow are:

1. the senses,
2. the self-consciousness.

A third source there is not.

--

§ 3

We start with examining sensuous knowledge. – A before me standing tree casts the lightning rays hitting it back linearly. A few of them fall on my eye and make an impression on the retina, which is transmitted to the brain by the stimulated optic nerve.

I touch a stone, and my sensory nerves direct the received sensations to the brain.

A bird sings and thereby brings forth a wave motion in the air. A few waves reach my ear, the eardrum vibrates, and the auditory nerve transmits the impression to the brain.

I inhale the scent of a flower. It affects the mucous membranes of the nose and stimulates the olfactory nerve, which transmits the impression to the brain.

A fruit affects my taste buds, and they lead the impression to the brain.

The *function* of the senses is therefore: transmission of the impressions to the brain.

--

§ 4

The sense impression that are moved outwards by the brain are called representations; their sum forms *the world as representation*. It falls apart in:

1. the visualizable representation, brief, objective perception;
2. non-visualizable representation.

The former relies on vision and partially on touch; the latter on hearing, smell, taste as well as partially on touch.

--

§ 5

We have to see, how the *visualizable* representation, the objective perception, emerges for us, and start with the impression, which the tree has made on the eye. More has not happened until now. There has been a certain change on the retina and this change has notified my brain. If nothing else happens, would the process end here, then my eye would *not* see the tree; for how could the weak change in my nerves be processed into a tree, and by what miraculous manner should I see it?¹

But the brain reacts on the impression, and that faculty, which we call the *Understanding*, becomes active. The Understanding² searches the *cause* of the change in the sense organ, and this transition of the effect in the sense organ to the cause is its sole *function*, is the *causal law*. This function of the Understanding is inborn and lies in its being *before* all experience, like the stomach must have the capability of digesting, before the first nutrition comes in it. If the causal law would not be the *aprioric* function of the Understanding, then we would not come to a visualizable perception. The causal law is, besides the senses, the first condition for the possibility of representation and lies therefore a priori in us.

But on the other hand the Understanding could not start to work and would a dead, useless cognitive faculty, if it would not be activated by causes. If the causes that lead to objective perception would, like the effects, lie in the senses, then they must be brought forth in us by an unknowable, omnipotent strange hand, which the immanent philosophy has to reject. Therefore only the assumption remains, that from the subject completely independent causes bring about changes in the sense organ changes, i.e. that independent *things in themselves* activate the Understanding.

As certain as it is, that the causal law lies in us, and indeed *before* all experience, this certain is on the other hand the existence of from the subject independent things in themselves, whose *activity* makes the Understanding exert its function.

^^1^^ For those thinking: why not? *An Inquiry into the Human Mind* by Thomas Reid is recommended, who gives according to Schopenhauer “a very thorough conviction of the inadequacy of the senses to produce the objective perception of things ... and especially that the five primary qualities of Locke (extension, form, solidity, movement, and number) absolutely could not be afforded us by any sensation of the senses. Thomas Reid’s book is very instructive and well worth reading ten times more so than all the philosophy together that has been written since Kant.”

^^2^^ This section uses the result of Schopenhauer’s discovery that without a primitive notion of causality we could not have objective perceptions. A much more elaborated explanation can be found in § 21 of Fourfold Root.

--

§ 6

The Understanding searches the cause of the sense impression, and, if it follows the direction of the lightning ray which had fallen in, does reach it. It would nevertheless perceive nothing, if not in it, *before* all experience, lie *forms*, in which it pours so to speak, the cause. That form is space.

When we speak about space, we generally highlight, that it has three dimensions, height, width and depth and that it is infinite, i.e. it is impossible to imagine, that space has a boundary, and the certainty that its measurement would not come to an end, precisely because of its infiniteness.

That the infinite space exists independently from the subject and that its limitations, spatialities, belong to the being of the things-in-themselves, is a by the critical philosophy vanquished, out of the naïve childhood of humanity originating notion, which to disprove would be useless labor. There is outside the knowing subject neither an infinite space, nor finite spatialities.

But space is also not a pure intuition a priori of the subject, nor has it obtained this pure perception a priori by finite spatialities, by putting them together into a visualization of an everything containing, single space, as I will show in the appendix.

Space as *form of Understanding* (we do not talk about mathematical space now) is a point, i.e. space as form of Understanding is only imaginable under the image of a point. This point has the capability (or it is the capability of the subject), of placing the boundaries of the things in themselves, that affect the relevant sense organ, into three directions. The being of space is accordingly the capability, to extend in three dimensions of undetermined length (*in indefinitum*). There were a thing in itself stops its activity, there space places its boundaries, and space has not the capability, to *bestow it with extension*. It is completely indifferent in

relation to extension. It is equally compliant to place the boundaries of a palace or a quartz grain, a horse or a bee. The thing in itself *determines* it, to extend it as far as it is active.

--

§ 7

The second form, which the Understanding takes as support, to perceive the found cause, is *matter*. ^3

It is equally to be thought under the image of a point (we do not talk about substance here). It is the capability to *objectify* every property of the thing in itself, every specific activity of it within the by space designed shape, precisely and faithfully; for the *object* is nothing else, than the thing in itself gone through the forms of the subject. Without matter no object, without object no outer world.

With the division executed above between senses in the sense organ and transmission line in mind, matter is to be defined as a point, where the transmitted sense impressions, which are the processed specific activities of visualizable things in themselves, are unified. Matter is therefore the common form for all sense impressions or also the sum of whole sense impressions of things in themselves of the *visualizable* world.

Matter is thus another condition for the possibility of experience, or an aprioric form of our cognition. It is juxtaposed, completely independent of it, by the complete activity of a thing-in-itself, or, with one word, by *force*. As far as a force becomes object of perception of a subject, it is *material* (objectified force); on the other hand every force is, independently from the perceiving subject, free from material and only force.

It is therefore important to note, that, as precisely and photographically faithfully the subjective form matter displays the specific activity-manners of a thing in itself, the display itself is nevertheless ***toto genere*** (in every aspect) different from the force. The shape of an object is identical with the sphere of activity of the thing in itself lying as its ground, but the by matter objectified force-expressions of the thing in itself are not, in their being, identical with it. Neither is there any similarity, which is why we can only with the greatest reservation call upon an image for clarification and say something like: matter presents the properties of the things, like a colored mirror shows objects, or the object relates to the thing in itself like a marble bust to a clay model. The being of force is simply *toto genere* different from the being of matter.

Certainly, the red of an object indicates a specific property of the thing in itself, but the red has with this property no equality in essence. It is completely unquestionable, that two objects, of which one is smooth and bendable, the other coarse and brittle, make appear differences, which rely on the essence of both things; but the smoothness, the coarseness, the bendability and brittleness of the objects have with the properties of the things in themselves no equality in essence.

We therefore have to declare here, that the *subject* is a *main factor* in the production of the outer world, although it does not misrepresent the activity of a thing in itself, but only precisely displays, what affects it. This is the difference between the object and the thing in itself, the appearance and that what appears. Thing in itself and subject make the object. But it is not *space*, which distinguishes object from thing-in-itself, and equally little it is *time*, which I will

come to show, rather, it is *matter* alone which brings forth the gap between appearance and that which makes it appear, although matter itself relates indifferently to it and cannot provide of its own resources the thing in itself a property, nor can it intensify or weaken its activity. It simply objectifies the given sense impression and it is all the same for it, whether it has to bring the most screaming red or the softest blue, the greatest hardness or smoothness into representation due to the as its ground lying property of the thing in itself; it can only represent the impression according to *its* nature. This is why it is here, that the knife must be inserted, in order to make the so exceedingly important section between the ideal and the real.

^**3** Matter; the secondary qualities of Locke. So color, temperature, hardness, softness, smoothness, coarseness.

--

§ 8

The labor of the Understanding is finished with finding the cause of a certain change in the sense organ and by pouring it into its both forms, space and matter (objectification of the cause).

Both forms are equally important and support each other simultaneously. I point out that without space we would have no behind each other lying objects, that on the other hand space only can bring its depth-dimension in application with the by matter furnished shaded colors, with shadow and light.

The Understanding has thus only to objectify the sense impression and no other cognitive faculty supports it in its work. But it cannot deliver *finished* objects.

--

§ 9

The by the reason objectified sense impressions are not whole, but *partial*-representations. As long as the Understanding alone is active – which is not the case, since all cognitive faculties, the one more, the other less, always function together, still a separation is here needed here – only those parts of the tree would clearly be seen, which meet the center of the retina or those places which lie very near the centrum. This is why we are continually moving the position of our eyes when we contemplate an object. One moment we move the eyes from the roots to the top, the other moment from right to left, then vice versa, or we let them slide countless time over a small blossom: only in order to make every part in contact with the centrum of the retina. Hereby we obtain an amount of single clear partial-representations, which the Understanding nevertheless cannot join together into one object.

In order for this to happen, we another cognitive faculty than the Understanding must be called upon, the *reason*.

--

§ 10

The reason is supported by three support-faculties: *memory, judgement-power* and *imagination*.

The entirety of the cognitive faculties are, as a whole, the human mind, which results in the following scheme.

[Link](<https://imgur.com/a/UTYoP6h>)

The *function* of the reason is *synthesis* or composition as *activity*. From now on I will use the word synthesis when discussing the function of the reason, on the other hand use the word composition for the product, that which is composed.

The *form* of the reason is the present.

The *function* of the memory is: preservation of the sense impressions.

The *function* of the judgement-power is: assembling what is homogenous.

The *function* of the imagination is: holding on to the by the reason composed perception as an *image*.

The *function* of the mind in general however is: the capability of following all faculties and to connect their knowledge into the point of self-consciousness.

--

§ 11

Together with judgement-power and imagination, reason stands in the most intimate connection with the Understanding for the production of *objective perception*, the only thing which we occupy ourselves with for now.

Initially the judgement-power gives the reason the partial-representation which belong together. The reason composes them (so for example those who belong to one leaf, one branch, to a trunk) bit by bit, while it lets the imagination hold onto what is composed, by adding to this image a new part and lets the whole be hold onto by the imagination again etc. Then it composes the inhomogeneous parts which belong together, so the trunk, the boughs, the branches, leaves and blossoms in a similar manner, and it indeed repeats its compositions in singly as well as in whole parts as far as is necessary.

The reason exerts its function on the as it for continually forward moving point of present, and time is not necessary to do so; although synthesis can take place in time too: more on this later. The imagination carries the particular composition always from present to present, and reason adds part to part, always remaining in the present, i.e. on the forth-rolling point of present.

The usual view is that the Understanding is the synthetic faculty; nay, there are many, who really believe: synthesis does not take place at all, every object is immediately grasped as a whole. Both views are incorrect. The Understanding cannot compose, since it has only one

single function: transition of the effect in the *sense organ* to its cause. The synthesis itself however can never be absent, not even when one only contemplates the top of a needle, sharp self-observation will make this clear to everyone; the eyes will always move themselves, even if it is almost unnoticeable. The deception arises mainly from this, that we are indeed conscious of finished compositions, but almost always exert the synthesis unconsciously: first of all because of the great rapidness with which the most perfected sense organ, the eye, receives impressions and the Understanding objectifies them, the reason composes them; secondly because we remember us so little, that we, as children, had to learn how to use the synthesis gradually and with great effort, like how the dimension of depth is initially totally unknown for us.

The deception arises mainly from the fact that we are indeed conscious of compositions, but exert the Synthesis almost always unconsciously: first of all because of the great rapidity by which the eye receives impressions and the Understanding objectifies them, and the reason composes them; secondly because we barely remember us, that we, as children, had to learn gradually how to use the Synthesis and with great difficulty, as well as that the dimension of depth was initially unknown to us. Like how we flawlessly grasp an object one glance of the eyelid, with correct distance and the object itself, though it is an indisputable fact, that moon as well as the lounge and the mother's visage float before the eyes of the newborn, so do we now grasp during a short overview the objects, even the largest ones, as a whole, whereas we certainly saw as infants only parts of objects and as consequence of the marginal exercise of our judgement-power and imagination, we could not judge what belongs together, nor hold onto the vanished partial-representations. —

The deception furthermore arises from this, that most objects, if they are seen from a good distance, mark their whole image on the retina which thereby facilitates the Synthesis so much, that it slips our perception. But it presents itself clearly when an alert self-observer is in front of an object, in such a way that he does not have a full overview of it, so that the perceived parts vanish during the progress of the Synthesis. It appears even more clearly, when we closely pass by mountain ranges and want to grasp its complete figure. But it is recognized most clearly, when we ignore vision and function with touch alone, which I will show in the [appendix](https://www.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/60uggy/3_the_only_intellectual_heir_of_kant_schopenhauer/) in detail.

The Synthesis is an aprioric function of the cognition and as such a prerequisite a priori of the possibility of objective perception. It is juxtaposed, completely independently of it, by the unity of the thing-in-itself, which forces it to connect it in a fully determined way.

--

§ 12

We have not fully explored the domain of objective perception yet, but must nevertheless leave it for a short moment.

By the indicated manner the visible world arises for us. It is however important to remark, that by the Synthesis of partial-representations into objects thinking is not brought into the *objective perception*. The composition of a given manifold of perception is certainly the work

of reason, but not a work in concepts or by concepts, nor by pure aprioric ones (Categories), nor by normal concepts.

The reason does meanwhile not limit its activity to the Synthesis of partial-representations of the Understanding into objects. It exercises its function, which is always one and the same, also on other domains, of which we will consider the abstract first, the domain of reflection of the world in concepts.

The into whole objects of whole parts of objects composed partial-representations of the Understanding are compared by the judgement-power. The similar of similar-like gets put together and handed to the reason, which composes it to a collective-unity, the concept. The more similar it is what was put together, the more visualizable the concept is, and the easier is the transition to a visualizable representative⁴ of this concept. If on the other hand the amount of traits of the objects which are put together decreases, and thereby the concept wider, then the visualizable representation is farther away. Meanwhile even the widest concept is not completely detached from its mother's soil, even when it is a very thin and long thread which connects it.

In the same manner how the reason reflects visible objects in concepts, it builds with help of memory, concepts from all our other perceptions, of which I will come to speak in the following.

It is clear, that concepts, which are drawn from visualizable representations, are realized easier and faster than those, who have their origin in non-visualizable ones; like how the eye is the most perfected sense organ, so is the imagination the mightiest supporting faculty of the reason. When the child learns language, i.e. absorbs finished concepts, it has carry out the same operation, which is necessary in general to build concepts. Finished concepts make it only easier for her. When she sees an object, then she compares it with those she already knows and puts together what is homogenous. She does therefore not build the concept, but subsumes it under a concept. Does she not know an object, then she is helpless and must be given the right concept. –

Then the reason composes the concepts themselves into judgements, i.e. it connects concepts, which the judgement-power had put together. Furthermore it composes judgements into premises, from which a new judgement is drawn. Its procedure is thereby led by the four well-known laws of thought, on which logic is built. ⁵

On the abstract domain the reason *thinks*, and indeed always on the point of present and not in *time*. We have to address the latter now. When we do so, we enter an exceedingly important domain, namely that of *composition* of the reason based on *aprioric forms and functions of cognition*. All these compositions, which we will get to know, arise with help of *experience*, thus a posteriori.

⁴ See also § 28 of Fourfold Root.

⁵ From Fourfold Root, § 33:

1. A subject is equal to the sum of its predicates, or $a = a$.
2. No predicate can be simultaneously attributed and denied to a subject, or $a \neq \sim a$.
3. Of every two contradictorily opposite predicates one must belong to every subject.
4. Truth is the reference of a judgment to something outside it as its sufficient reason or ground.

--

§ 13

Time is a composition of the reason and not, as is normally assumed, an aprioric form of cognition. The reason of a child accomplishes this composition on the domain of representation as well as on the way of the inside. Now we want to let time arise in the light of consciousness and choose for this the last path, because it is the most fitting option for the philosophical investigation, though we have not dealt yet with the inner source of experience.

Let us detach ourselves from the outer world and sink into our inside, then we find in us a continual rising and sinking, brief, caught in a ceaseless motion. I want to call the place, where this motion affects our consciousness, the **point of motion**. The form of reason, i.e. the point of **present** swims on it. The point of present is always there where the point of motion is and it stands exactly **on** it. It cannot hurry ahead nor fall behind: both are inseparably connected.

Now if we examine with attention the process, then we will find, that we are indeed always in the present, but always at the expense of or through the death of the present; with other words: we move ourselves from present to present.

While the reason becomes conscious of this transition, it lets the imagination hold onto the vanished present and connects it with the emerging one. It slides as it were under the forth-rolling, floating intimately connected points of motion and present a firm surface, on which it reads out the traversed path, and gains thereby a row of **fulfilled** moments, i.e. a row of fulfilled transitions from present to present.

By this manner it obtains the essence and concept of **past**. If it hurries forward beyond the motion, while staying in the present – since it cannot detach itself from the point of motion or go ahead – and connects the coming present with the one following it, then it gains a row of moments, which will be **fulfilled**, i.e. it gains the essence and concept of **future**. When it connects the past with the future into an **ideal firm** line of undetermined length, on which the point of present continues to roll, then it has **time**.

Like how the present is nothing without the point of motion, on which it floats, so is also time nothing without the underlay of time, or with other words: the **real succession** would also take place without **ideal succession**. If there would be no cognizing beings in the world, then the unconscious things-in-themselves would nevertheless be in relentless movement. If consciousness emerges, then time is only the prerequisite for the possibility of **cognizing** the motion, or also: time is the **subjective** measuring rod of motion.

Above the point of motion of single cognizing beings stands the point of present. The point of the single-motion stands *next* to the points of all other single-motions, i.e. the whole of all single motions build a general motion of uniform succession. The present of a subject indicates always precisely the point of motion of all things-in-themselves.

--

§ 14

We come, with the important a posteriori composition time in the hand, back to objective perception.

I said above, that the Synthesis of partial-representations is independent from time, since the reason accomplishes its compositions on the itself moving point of present while the imaginations holds onto what is composed. The Synthesis can however also take place within time, when the subjects moves its attention on it.

It is not different with *changes* which can only be perceived on the point of present.

There are two types of change. One is *locomotion* and the other *inner change* (sprouting, development). Both are unified in the higher concept: *motion*.

Now, is the locomotion one such that the movement of the itself moving object can be perceived by contrast of the resting objects, then its perception does not depend on time, but is cognized on the point of present, for example the movement of a branch, the flight of a bird.

For the reflecting reason all changes do without exception certainly fill up a certain time, like objective perception itself; but like objective perception, subjective perception does not depend on the consciousness of time; since the subject cognizes them immediately on the point of present, which is important to remark. Time is an ideal composition; it does not elapse, but is an imagined firm line. Every past moment is as it were petrified and cannot be moved a hair's breadth. Likewise, every future moment has its determined place on the ideal line. But that which continually moves is the point of present: *he* elapses, time does *not*.

It would also be wrong to say: just this elapsing of the present is time; because if one follows only the point of present, then one will not come to the representation of time: then one will always remain in the present. One must have seeing forward and backward while having marked points in order to obtain the ideal composition time.

On the other hand, a locomotion, which cannot immediately be perceived on the point of present, as well as all developments, can only be cognized with time. The movement of the hands of a clock escapes our perception. Should I now cognize that the *same* hand initially stood on 6, but now on 7, then I must become conscious of the succession, i.e. in order to assign two contradicting predicates to the same object, I need time.

It is the same with a locomotion, which I could have perceived while staying in the present, but did not perceive (displacement of an object behind my back) and developments. For example, a tree blooms. Let us move ourselves in autumn and give the tree fruits, then we need time, in order to cognize the blooming and fruit-bearing as the same object. One and the same object

can be hard and soft, red and green, but it can have only *one* of the both predicates on *one* moment.

--

§ 15

We have explored the whole domain of objective perception.

Is it, i.e. the sum of spatially-materialized objects the complete world of our experience? No! It is but a section of the world as representation. We have sense impressions, whose cause the Understanding, exercising its function, seeks, but which it cannot shape spatially and materialized. And nevertheless we have the representation of non-visualizable objects and thereby the representation of a collective-unity, the universe. How do we come to it?

Every type of activity of a thing-in-itself gets, as far as it affects the senses for objective, visualizable perception (vision and touch), objectified by the Understanding-form matter, i.e. it becomes materialized for us. An exception never takes place, and therefore matter is the ideal subtract of all visible objects. It is in itself without quality, but all qualities must appear because of it, in the same way as matter is unextended, but encompasses all force-spheres.

As consequence of the ideal subtract of all visible objects being without quality the reason gets offered a homogenous manifold, which it connects into the unity of *substance*.

Substance is therefore, like time, a *composition* a posteriori of the reason based on an aprioric form. Now, reason adds with help of this ideal composition, to those sense impressions, that cannot be poured in the forms of the Understanding, matter, and obtains thereby also the representation of incorporeal objects. These, and the corporeal objects forms a whole of *substantive* objects. Now air, colorless gasses, scents and tones (vibrating air) become objects for us, although we cannot shape them spatially or materially, and the sentence has from now an unconditional validity: that everything, which makes an impression on our senses, must necessarily be substantive.

The unity of the ideal composition substance is juxtaposed on the real domain by the universe, the collective-unity of forces, which is totally independent from the former.

--

§ 16

Only the taste-sensations remain. They do not lead to new objects, but to those, which have emerged due to impressions on other senses. The Understanding merely seeks the cause and leaves the rest up to the reason. The latter simply exercises its function and connects the effect with the object which is present already, so for example the taste of a pear with the materialized morsels of it in our mouth.

In general only the reason can cognize the different effects coming from an object as coming from a single force-sphere, for the Understanding is not a synthetic faculty. –

If we summarize everything, then we recognize, that the representation is not sensible or intellectual, nor rational, but rather *spiritual*. It is the work of the whole mind, i.e. the *complete* cognition.

--

§ 17

As I have shown above, all sense impressions lead to objects whose sum makes up the objective world.

The reason mirrors this whole objective world in concepts and gains thereby, besides the immediate world of perception, a world of abstraction.

Finally, it also obtains a third world, the world of reproduction, which lies between the two mentioned ones.

The reason reproduces, separated from the outer world, everything perceived with help of memory, and indeed accomplishes either completely new compositions, or represents again the vanished representations, but faintly and weakly. The process is precisely the same as with immediate impressions on the senses. The reason remembers not the *complete* images, smells, taste-sensations, words, tones, but only the *sense impressions*. It calls, with help of memory, in the sensory nerves (and indeed not on their tips, but there, where they lead to that part of the brain, which we have to think of as Understanding) up an impression and the Understanding objectifies them. Let us take our tree, then the Understanding shapes the impressions, which the memory has kept, into partial-representations, the judgement-power puts them together, the reason composes that which is put together, the imagination holds onto the composition and a faint image of the tree stands before us. The extraordinary speed of the process, as said before, may not entice us to the false assumption, that an immediate remembering of objects takes place. The process is just as complex, as the emergence of objects due to real impacts on our senses.

Dreams arise in a similar way. They are perfected reproductions. They owe their objectivity in general to the rest of the sleeping individual and especially the full inactivity of the ends of the sensory nerves.

--

§ 18

Now we have to examine the remainder of important compositions, which the reason accomplishes, based on aprioric functions and forms of the cognition.

The function of the Understanding is the transition of the effect in the *sense organ* to its cause. It exercises it unconsciously, because the Understanding does not *think*. It can also not exercise it inversely and go from the cause to effect, for only a cause triggers it into activity, and as long as an object affects, i.e. as long as the Understanding is active at all, it cannot be concerned with anything more, than the found cause. Assumed that it could think and would want to go from cause to effect, then at that moment the object would vanish and could only be regained if the Understanding seeks again the cause of the effect.

The Understanding can thus extend its function in no way. But the reason can do it.

First it cognizes the function itself, i.e. it recognizes, that the function of the Understanding consists, of seeking the cause of a change in the sense organ. Then the reason travels back from *cause* to effect. It thus cognizes two relationships:

1. the causal law, i.e. the law that every change in the *sense organs* of the subject must have a cause;
2. that things-in-themselves affect the subject.

Hereby the causal relationships of irrefutable validity are exhausted, for the knowing subject cannot know, whether other beings perceive in the same manner, if they are subjected to other laws. Meanwhile, as praiseworthy as the critical reason's cautious approach is, so reprehensible would she be by giving up further examination in understanding causal relations. She does not let herself be misled and brands the body of the knowing subject to be object amongst objects. Based on this knowledge it comes to a third important causal relation. Namely, it extends the causal law (relation between thing-in-itself and *subject*) to *general causality*, which I present in the following wording:

Thing-in-itself affects thing-in-itself and every change in an *object* must have a cause, which precedes the effect in time. (I intentionally separate thing-in-itself and object from each other, since we do indeed know, that thing-in-itself affects thing-in-itself, but things-in-themselves can be perceived from the subjects only as objects.)

The reason connects thus via *general causality* object with object, i.e. general causality is prerequisite for the possibility of cognizing the in which relation things-in-themselves stand among each other.

This is the place to determine the concept of cause. Since thing-in-itself affects thing-in-itself, there are only moving causes (*causæ efficientes*), which can be separated in:

1. mechanical causes (pressure and impact),
2. stimuli
3. motives.

The mechanical causes occur mainly in the inorganic kingdom, the stimuli in the plant kingdom, motives in the animal kingdom. Since man can furthermore, because of time, look into the future, he can set goals, i.e. for humans and only for them there are final causes⁶ (*causæ finales*) or ideal causes. They are, like all causes, active, because they can always only be active, when they stand on the point of present.

The concept occasional cause can be limited to being merely the reason, which a thing-in-itself is for another, to affect a third one. If a cloud passes by which covered the sun, and then my hand immediately becomes warm, then the passing by of the cloud is the occasional cause, not the cause itself, of the warming of my hand.

^^6^^ final cause: the reason *for what* something exists. The distinction between between efficient and final causes comes [from Aristotle](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Four_causes). Since Francis Bacon final causes were abandoned in the science of nature in favor of efficient causes.

--

§ 19

Reason furthermore extends general causality, which connects two things (the affecting and the affected one) into a fourth causal relation, which encompasses the activity of *all* things-in-themselves, into *community* or *reciprocity*. It says, that every thing continually, directly and indirectly, affects all other things in the world, and that *simultaneously* it is affected by all others, directly and indirectly, from which follows, that no thing-in-itself can have an absolutely independent activity. Like how the law of causality lead to the settlement of a from the subject independent activity and general causality to the settlement of a from the subject independent impact from a thing-in-itself on another, so is also community only a subjective connection, thanks to which the *real dynamic interconnection of the universe* is *cognized*. The latter would be present too without a knowing subject; the subject could however not *cognize* it if it would not know how to accomplish the composition of community in himself, or with other words: community is the prerequisite of the possibility, to grasp the dynamic interconnection of the universe.

--

§ 20

There is still one composition the reason has to produce: *mathematical space*.

(Point-) Space separates itself from the present in an essential manner, namely, being fully sufficient, to bring forth objective perception, whereas the present does not suffice, to cognize all motions of the things.

Mathematical spaces arises by the reason using the point-space to extend, and composes then arbitrary spatialities in a whole of *undetermined* extension. She proceeds in doing so, like with shaping a complete object, from partial-representations.

Mathematical space is the only composition on aprioric basis, which does not help in determining the thing-in-itself. Accordingly, it is not juxtaposed on the real domain by a thing-in-itself, nor a sum of them, but rather the *absolute nothingness*, which we can represent to ourselves in no other way than by empty mathematical space.

(2) Part 2 of 3

https://old.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/6uuw38/2_analytic_of_the_cognition/

§ 21

Among the manifold relations, which the reason maintains with the Understanding, there is finally also rectifying the *deception*, i.e. rectifying the error of the Understanding. We see the moon larger at the horizon than aloft, a staff broken in water, a star which has vanished already, all stars in general at places where they are actually not situated (because the earth's atmosphere refracts all light and the Understanding can search the cause of the sense impression only in the direction of the in the eye falling rays); we also deem, the earth does not move, the planets stand sometimes still or move backwards etc., things which are all rectified by the thinking reason.

--

§ 22

Now we want to summarize in a compact way the results.

Human cognition has:

- a. diverse *aprioric* functions and forms and indeed:
 1. The causal law,
 2. (Point-) Space,
 3. Matter,
 4. Synthesis,
 5. Present.

They are juxtaposed on the *real* domain, completely independent from them, by the following determinations of the thing-in-itself:

1. Activity in general,
2. Sphere of activity,
3. Pure force,
4. The unity of every thing-in-itself,
5. Point of motion.

The human cognition has:

- b. diverse *ideal* compositions, resp. connections accomplished by the reason, based on aprioric functions and forms:
 1. Time,
 2. General causality,
 3. Community,
 4. Substance,
 5. Mathematical space.

The first four of them are juxtaposed on the real domain by the following determinations of things-in-themselves:

1. Real succession,
2. The impact of a thing-in-itself on another,

3. Dynamic interconnection of the universe,
4. Collective-Unity of the universe.

Mathematical space is juxtaposed by absolute nothingness.

We have furthermore found, that the object is appearance of the thing-in-itself, and that *matter alone* brings forth the difference between them.

--

§ 23

The thing-in-itself, as far as we have researched it up till now, is *force*. The world, the sum of things-in-themselves, is a whole of pure forces, which are made by the subject to objects.

The object is appearance of the thing-in-itself, and although it depends on the subject, we have nevertheless seen, that it forges in no way the thing-in-itself. We may therefore trust experience. What the force is in-itself, that is no concern for us now. We stay for now on the soil of the world as representation and examine the force in general, and will call as little as possible upon Physics. –

The causal law, the function of the Understanding, searches always only the cause of a change in the *sense organ*. If nothing changes in the latter, then it rests completely. But if on the other hand a sense organ changes due to a real impact, then the Understanding immediately becomes active and searches the cause of this effect. When he has found it, then the causal law steps as it were aside. It never occurs to the Understanding, and this is important to note, to apply it further, and to ask the cause of the cause, for he does not think. Nor will he misuse the causal law; it is also clear that no other faculty can do this. The causal law imparts merely the representation, i.e. the perception of the external world.

If under my eyes the found object changes then the causal law serves only the purpose of searching the cause of the new change in the *sense organ*, not the change in the object: it is, as if a completely new thing-in-itself has exercised an effect on me.

Based on the *causal law* we can also never ask for the reason of for example the movement of a branch, which was a moment ago motionless. Based on it, we can only perceive the motion and only, because the transition of the branch from the state of rest to motion, has changed my *sense organ*.

Can we not ask for the cause of the movement of the branch at all? Certainly we can do it, but only based on *general causality*, a composition of the reason a posteriori, because only due to the latter we can cognize the impact of an object on object, whereas the *causal law* spins only the threads between *subject* and thing-in-itself.

So we ask with full right for the reason of the movement of the branch. We find it in the wind. If it occurs to us, then we can also continue to ask further: the cause of the wind, then the cause of this cause etc. , i.e. we can build *causal rows*.

But what has happened, when I asked for the cause of the moving branch and found it? I jumped as it were from tree and seized another object, the wind. And what happened, when I

found the cause of the wind? I have simply left the wind and stand at something else, like the sunlight or heat.

From this follows clearly:

1. that the application of general causality *always leads* away from things-in-themselves
2. that causal rows are always only the connection of *activities* of things-in-themselves, so do never contain the *thing themselves* as its limbs.

If we furthermore try (everyone for himself) to pursue further the causal row of heat which we started with above, then it will become clear for everyone that

>3) it is as hard to build *correct* causal rows as it initially seems easy, no, that it is for the subject completely impossible, starting from a change somewhere, to reconstruct a causal row *a parte ante* (with regard to what precedes) having an unhindered proceeding *in indefinitum* (and so on indefinitely).

The things-in-themselves lie consequently not in a causal row, and I cannot ask for the cause of the *being* of a thing-in-itself based on the causal law, nor general causality; because when a thing-in-itself changes, which I have found with the causal law, and I ask with help of general causality for the cause of the change, then general causality immediately leads me away from the things-in-themselves. The question: what is the cause of somewhere a thing-in-itself in the world, may not only not be asked, but cannot be asked at all.

From this it becomes clear, that the causal relations cannot lead to the *past* of the things-in-themselves, and one shows an unbelievable lack of reflection, if one holds so-called infinite causal rows to be the best weapon against the three proofs for the existence of God. It is the bluntest weapon possible, nay, not even a weapon at all: it is the Lichtenberger knife. And how remarkable! Just that which makes this weapon a nothing, makes also the imagined proofs untenable, namely causality. The opponents straight out assert: the rows of causality are infinite, without actually ever having tried, to build a row of fifty *correct* members; and the issuers of the proofs made without more ado the *things* in this world *members* of a causal row and ask exceptionally naïvely: what is the cause of the world? To both parties must be declared: General causality does *not* lead to the *past* of the things-in-themselves.

The seed is not the *cause* of a plant, for seed and plant do not stand in a *causal*, but in a *genetic* relation to each other. One can however ask for the causes, which brought the seed in the earth to germination, or for the causes, which made the plant have this particular length. But by answering these questions, then everyone will find, what we had found above, namely: that every cause *leads away* from the plant.

Is there then no method at all, to delve into the past of things? The mentioned genetic relation answers this question positively. The reason can build *development rows*, which are really something else than *causal rows*. The latter arise with help of *causality*, the former simply with *time*. Causal rows are the concatenated activity of not one, but many things; development rows on the other hand have to do with the being of one thing-in-itself and its modifications. This result is very important.

--

§ 24

If we follow now, supported by nature science, the *only* path which leads to the *past of the things*, then we must lead back all rows of organic forces to the chemical forces (carbon, hydrogen, nitrogen, oxygen, iron, phosphor etc.). That it will become possible, to lead also these basic chemical forces, the so-called elements, to a few forces, is an unshakable conviction of most nature scientists. Meanwhile it is for our research totally unimportant, whether this will happen or not, since it is an irrefutable truth, that on the *immanent* domain we can*not* get rid of *multiplicity*. It is therefore clear, that only three basic forces do not bring us further than a hundred or a thousand. So let us remain with the amount, which the nature science determines in our time.

In our thoughts on the other hand we find no obstacle, rather logical coercion, to at least bring back multiplicity to its most basic expression, *duality*, because for the reason is that which lies as ground to all objects force, and what is more natural for her than composing them into a metaphysical unity which is valid for all times? Not even the most diverse activities of force can obstruct her, for she has her eyes set only what is general, the plain activity of every thing-in-itself, so the consubstantiality of all forces, and her function consists after all only in connecting, what judgement-power offers her.

Here we may not yield, instead, we must, staring at the truth, curb reason to safeguard her from an assured downfall.

I repeat: On the immanent domain, in this world, we can *never* go beyond multiplicity. Even in the past we may, as fair researchers, not annihilate multiplicity and must at least stay at the logical duality.

And nevertheless reason does not let herself be deterred, to point out again and again the necessity of a basic unity. Her argument has been put forward already, that for her, *all* forces, are in essence consubstantial and may therefore not be separated.

What can be done in this dilemma? At least it is clear: the truth may not be denied and the immanent domain must be kept in its full purity. There is only one way out. We are already in the *past*. So then we let the last forces, which we may not touch upon, if we do not want to become fantasists, float together on *transcendent domain*. It is a *vanished, past, lost* domain, and together with it also the *basic unity* is *vanished and lost*.

--

§ 25

By melting the multiplicity into unity, we have before everything, destroyed the *force*; since force has only validity and meaning on immanent domain, in the world. Just from this follows already, that we can form us no representation of the *being* of a *pre*-worldly unity, let alone any concept. But this total unknowability of this pre-worldly unity becomes totally clear, when we let pass all aprioric functions and forms, and all obtained compositions a posteriori of our mind, before it.

It is the Medusa head, before which they all petrify.

First of all the senses flop, because they can only react on the activity of a force and the unity as not active as force. Then the Understanding remains totally inactive. Here, yes in essence *only* here, the saying: the Understanding stands still, has full validity. It can neither apply its causal law, since no sense impression is present, nor can it use its forms space and matter, since it lacks content for these forms. Then the reason passes out. What should she compose? What use has her synthesis? what her form, the present, which lacks the real point of motion? What service can time give, which needs the real succession as underlay to be something at all? What could she begin with general causality, whose task is, connecting the activity of one thing-in-itself, as cause, with the impact on another, as effect? Can she use the important composition community there where a simultaneous interlocking of diverse forces, a dynamic interconnection, is not present, but only a basic unity staring with Sphinx eyes at her? What purpose has substance, which is merely the ideal subtract of the most diverse activities of many forces?

And thus all are paralysed!

We can therefore determine the basic unity only negatively and indeed, from our current standpoint, as: inactive, unextended, indistinguishable, unsplit (basic), motionless, timeless (eternal).

But let us not forget, and we rightly hold onto the fact, that this mysterious, simply incognizable unity with its transcendent domain is lost and no longer *exists*. We will raise ourselves to this knowledge and travel back with fresh courage to the existing domain, the only one with validity, the clear and knowable world.

--

§ 26

It follows from the forgoing, that all development rows, we may start wherever we want, end *a parte ante* in a transcendent unity, which will always be sealed off for our knowledge, an x, equal to nothing, and we may therefore very well say, that the world has emerged out of nothing. Since we have to give this unity one positive predicate, the predicate of *existence*, though we can form not even most the poorest of all concepts about this existence, and since on the other hand it is for our reason impossible to think an emergence out of nothing, we have to deal with a *relative* nothing (*nihil privativum*⁷), which must be characterized as a lost, incomprehensible primordial-existence, in which, everything which is, once was, in a for us unfathomable way.

From this follows:

1. that all development rows have started, (which by the way follows already with necessity from the concept development);
2. that there can therefore be no infinite causal rows *a parte ante*;
3. that all forces have *begun*; because what they were on transcendent domain, in the basic unity, that completely escapes our knowledge. We can only say, that there had mere existence. We can furthermore apodictically say, that they were *not* force in the basic unity; because force is the being, the essential, of a thing-in-itself on *immanent* domain. What the basic unity was in its being, where after all everything which exists was contained, – that is, as we have clearly seen, shrouded for all times for our mind with an impenetrable veil.

The transcendent domain is factually no longer present. But if we go with our imagination back in the past until the start of the immanent domain, then we can put as image the transcendent domain next to the immanent domain. They are nevertheless separated by a deep gap, which can never be transgressed by any device of the mind. Only one small thread spans over the bottomless abyss: it is the *existence*. We can move *all* forces of the immanent domain over to the transcendent domain: this weight it can bear. But the moment when they forces have arrived on that other field, they stop, for human thought, being forces, and therefore the important sentence is valid:

Although everything which is, has not emerged out of nothing, but existed already *pre*-worldly, nevertheless everything which is, every force has emerged as force, i.e. they had a determined beginning.

^*7** *nihil privativum*: the absence of an object, such as shadow, cold. If light were not given to the senses we could not represent darkness. (Kant, last page of the Transcendental Logic.) Nihil privativum means here the absence *every* reality known to us.

--

§ 27

We came to these results by going back from some present existence into its past. Now we want to examine the conduct of the things on the forth-rolling point of present.

First we take a look on the inorganic kingdom, the kingdom of *basic* chemical forces, like oxygen, chlorine, iodine, copper etc. As far as our experience reaches, it has never happened, that somewhere any of these forces, under the same circumstances, has shown other properties; there is also no case known where a chemical force was *annihilated*. If I let sulfur react into all possible compounds and let it go back, then it has its old properties again and its quantum has neither increased nor decreased; at least everyone has, regarding the latter, the unwavering certainty, that this is the case, and with right: for nature is the only source of truth and her statements alone must be respected. She never lies, and if asked about this issue, she answers every time, that no *basic* chemical force can decay.

Nevertheless we must admit, that skeptical assaults against this stamen can be made. What could reproached against me, if I, just generally assaulting without even invoking a single property of matter, due to the impermanence of the in it objectifying force could be concluded, say something like: It is true, that until now, no case is known, where a basic force has been annihilated; but do you dare to assert, that experience will teach the same in all coming times? Can something be said a priori about *force*? Certainly not; because force is totally independent from the knowing subject, is the true thing in itself. The mathematician may draw conclusions from the nature of mathematical space's limitations – although it exists only in our imagination – of unconditional validity for the *formal* of things-in-themselves. It is also the same, whether I talk about a determined *real* succession in the being of a thing in itself, or move it to the *ideal* succession, i.e. bring it in a relation to time; because the ideal succession keeps exactly up with the real succession. But the nature scientist may conclude

nothing from the nature of the *ideal* composition substance what affects the force; because I cannot repeat often enough, that the being of matter is in every aspect, *toto genere*, different from force, though it precisely expresses its properties in matter up to the smallest detail. There were *real* force and *ideal* matter touch, is the important point, where the boundary between the ideal and real must be drawn, the difference between object and thing in itself, between appearance and ground of appearance, between world as representation and will as force. As long as the world exists, this long will every thing be extended in three direction; as long as the world exists, this long force-spheres will be in motion; but do you know what kind of new – (new for you, not new in nature) – laws of nature will be discovered by later experience, which will place the being of force in a totally different light? For it is absolutely certain, that statements about the being of force are not possible a priori, but only by *experience*. Is however your experience complete? Do you hold already all laws of nature in your hand?

What could be reproached against me?

That in general such skeptical assaults can be made regarding the sentence above, this must make us cautious and consider it again in the Physics, and in the Metaphysics where all threads of our researches on the purely immanent domain will come together. Here however, in the Analytic, where we meet the thing-in-itself from a general point of view, we must take the lowest point of view, and must unconditionally accept the statement of nature, that a *basic* chemical force *does not decay*.

If we take on the other hand a chemical compound, for example hydrogen sulfide, then this force is already *perishable*. It is sulfide nor hydrogen, but a third, a firmly in itself closed force-sphere, but a destroyable force. If it is dismantled in its basic elements, then it is annihilated. Where is now this peculiar force, which made a completely specific impression, different from sulfide as well as hydrogen? It is *dead*, and we can very well imagine, that this compound in general, under certain circumstances, will never appear again.

In the organic kingdom the same is entirely the case. We will deal with the difference between chemical compound and organism in the Physics; here it does not matter to us. Every organism consists of basic chemical forces which are, like sulfur and hydrogen in hydrogen sulfide, lifted in a higher, closed and unitary force. If we bring an organism in the chemical laboratory and research, then we will always find, regardless of whether it is an animal or a plant, only basic chemical forces in it.

Now, what does nature say, when we ask her about the in an organism living higher force? She says: the force is there, as long as the organism lives. If it dissolves, then the force is *dead*. Another testimony she gives not, because she cannot. It is a testimony of the greatest importance, which only a confused mind can distort. When an organism dies, then bounded chemical forces become free again without any damage, but the force, which mastered the chemical forces until then, is dead. Should it live separated from them? Where is the destroyed sulfide hydrogen? Where the higher force of burnt plants or killed animals? Do they float between heaven and earth? Do they fly towards a star in the milky road? Nature alone, the only source of truth, can give disclosure and nature answers: they are *dead*.

As impossible as it is for us, to imagine a creation out of nothing, this easily we can image all organisms and chemical compounds to be annihilated forever.

From these observations we draw the following results:

1. all *basic* chemical forces are, as far as our experience reaches for now, indestructible
2. all chemical compounds and all organic forces are however destructible.

The mix-up of substance with the chemical basic forces is as old as philosophy itself. The law of the persistence of substance is:

>“The substance is without beginning and imperishable”

According to our research substance is an *ideal* composition, based on the aprioric form of Understanding matter, and nature a sum of forces. The imagined law would be in our language:

>All forces are without beginning and imperishable.

We have found however in fair research:

1. that *all* forces, without exception, have had a *beginning*;
2. that only *a few* forces are imperishable.

At the same time we make the reservation, to investigate this imperishability of the basic chemical forces in the Physics and Metaphysics.

--

§ 28

We have seen, that every thing-in-itself as a force-sphere, and that it is no idle deception, which the aprioric form of Understanding space conjures out of its own means. We have furthermore recognized, with the exceedingly important composition community, that these forces stand in the most intimate dynamic interconnection, and came hereby to a totality of forces, to an in itself closed collective-unity.

Hereby we have assumed the *finitude of the universe*, which has to be established more precisely. Let us first become conscious of the meaning of this matter. This is not about a closed *finite* immanent domain which is nevertheless encompassed by an *infinite* transcendent one; but instead, since the transcendent domain does in fact no longer exist, about an now alone existing immanent domain, which should be *finite*.

How can this apparently brazen assumption be proven? We have only two paths before us. Or a proof with help of the representation, or with pure logic. –

The point-space is, as said above, completely indifferent whether is given a sand grain of a palace to place boundaries to. The condition is only that he is requested to do so by a thing-in-itself, or in absence of the latter, by a reproduced sense impression. Now we have the before us lying world: our earth beneath us, and the starred heaven above us, and to a naïve nature it may therefore seem, that the representation of a finite world is be possible. Science destroys this delusion. Every day she extends the force-sphere of the universe, or subjectively expressed, she forces daily the point-space of the Understanding, to extend its three

dimensions further. The world is thus for the time being immeasurably large, i.e. the Understanding cannot place its boundaries yet. If he will succeed to do so, we have to leave it undecided for now. We must proclaim that on the path of representation we cannot get to the goal, that with perception the finitude of the world cannot be proven. Only the merciless logic remains.

And indeed, it happens to be exceedingly easy for her, to prove the finitude of the world.

The universe is not a single force, no basic unity, but a sum of finite force-spheres. Now, I cannot give one of these force-spheres infinite extension; firstly because I would thereby destroy the concept itself, secondly make the plural singular, i.e. hit experience in its face. Next to a single infinite one no other force-sphere has place anymore, and the being of nature would simply be cancelled. A sum of *finite* force-spheres must however necessarily be *finite*.

Against could be argued, that there are indeed only finite forces in the world, but that however an infinitely many forces are present, consequently the world is no totality, but is infinite.

We respond: All forces in the world are or basic chemical forces, or compounds of them. The former are countable and furthermore all compounds can be brought to these few basic forces. No force, as shown above, can be infinite, even if we may designate every one of them as immeasurably large. Consequently the world is, in essence, the sum of basic forces, which are finite, i.e. the world is finite.

Who does something in us rebel against this again and again? Because the reason commits misuse with the form of Understanding *space*. Space has only meaning for experience; it is merely a condition a priori for the possibility of experience, a method to cognize the external world. The reason is, as we have seen, only then within its rights to extend space, when it reproduces, or for the mathematics of a spatiality's pure visualization. It is clear, that the mathematician needs such spatiality to demonstrate his proofs, but it is also clear, that the reproduction of mathematical space is for the mathematician the cliff, where reason becomes perverse and commits misuse. Because when we want to grasp the by logic guaranteed finitude of the world in an image, and for this purpose let space extend, then the perverse reason is immediately triggered to extend space beyond the boundaries of the world. Then the protests becomes loud: we have indeed a finite world, but in a space, which we cannot end, because the dimensions continually extend themselves further (or better: we have indeed a finite world, but in *absolute nothingness*).

There is only one remedy. We strongly have to rely on the logical finitude of the world and the knowledge, that the unbounded mathematical space is a thing in our thoughts, exists in our head alone and has no reality. By this manner we are immune and withstand with critical prudence the temptation, to indulge in solitary lechery with our mind and thereby trait the truth.

--

§ 29

Likewise, critical prudence alone can protect us from other great dangers, which I want to set out right now.

Like how it lies in the nature of point-space, to extend from zero *in indefinitum* into three dimensions, so does it lie in its nature, to let an arbitrary pure (mathematical) spatiality shrink until it is point-space again, i.e. zero. This subjectivity capability, called space, cannot be imagined as having a different being, because it is a prerequisite for experience and exists for the external world alone, without which it has no meaning. Now however even the stupidest one understands, that a faculty which should on one hand place the boundaries of the most diverse objects (the greatest as well as the smallest), and on the other hand help to grasp the totality of all things-in-themselves, the universe, must *not be limited* in extending or regressing to zero; because if it would be limited in extending, then it could not place the boundaries of some real force-sphere; and if it would be limited in regressing a boundary to zero, then our cognition would malfunction with all those force-spheres which lie between zero and this boundary. In the last section we have seen, that the reason can commit misuse with the unboundedness in extending of point-space and can come to a finite universe in an infinite space. Here we have to examine the misuse, which the reason commits with the limitlessness of space in regressing to zero, or with other words: we stand before the *infinite divisibility* of mathematical space.

Let us imagine a pure spatiality, for example a cubic inch, then we can divide it *in indefinitum*, i.e. the withdrawal of the dimension in the zero point is always *impeded*. We divide for years, a hundred years, a thousand years – and always we will stand before a spatiality, which can be divided again etc. in infinitum. Hereupon relies the so-called infinite divisibility of mathematical space, like how the infinity of mathematical space relies on the in infinitum extending of point-space.

But what are we doing, if we take a certain spatiality and restlessly divide it? We play with fire, we are big children, who should get a slap on their wrists. Is our proceeding not comparable with children who, when the parents are gone, handle a loaded gun for no reason? Space is only intended for the cognition of the external world; it must place the boundaries of every thing-in-itself, whether it is as large as the Mont Blanc or as small as a microorganism: this is its purpose, like the loaded gun has the purpose of striking down an intruder. But now we extract space from the external world and thereby make it a dangerous toy, or as expressed above, as Pückler said: we indulge in “solitary lechery” with our mind.

--

§ 30

The division *in indefinitum* of a given pure spatiality has insofar an innocent side, if it is divided as thing in our thoughts, a spatiality, which lies only the head of the one who is dividing and without reality. However its dangerousness gets doubled, if the infinite divisibility of mathematical space gets, virtually wantonly, carried onto the force, the thing-in-itself. The insensible start is immediately followed by: the logical contradiction. Every chemical force is divisible, nothing can be argued against that, because so does experience teach us. But it consists not of parts, is no *aggregate* of parts, but we *really* obtain parts by the division itself. The chemical force is a homogenous basic force of thoroughly equal *intensity* and hereupon relies its divisibility, i.e. every detached part is not in the least difference from the whole.

If we ignore real division, which nature as well as man accomplish, whose result is always a determined force-sphere, then only the idle *frivolous division* remains.

The perverse takes somewhere a part of a chemical force, for example a cubic inch iron, and divided it in imagination forth and forth, and obtain eventually the conviction, that it would never, even after billion years of dividing, come to an end. At the same time logic says, that a cubic inch iron, so a *finite* force-sphere, can impossibly be composed of *infinitely* many parts, nay, that is inadmissible to talk about *infinitely* many parts of one object at all; because the underlay *for the concept infinity exists merely due to the unrestrained activity of a faculty*, and *never*, *never* on the *real* domain.

The perverse reason can thus fall down in hell with the restless division, but once it is down there, it must go on further. Going back to the finite force-sphere, from which it started, it impossible for her. In this desperation she violently detaches herself from her leader and postulates the *atom*, i.e. a force-sphere, which should no longer be divisible. Naturally, she can go back to cubic inch iron by assembling such atoms, but at what price: she has placed herself in contradiction with herself!

If the thinker wants to remain fair, he must be considerate. Considerateness is the only weapon against a perverse reason which wants to misuse our cognition. In the present case the *divisibility* of the chemical force is not questioned at all. But we do indeed renounce firstly an *infinite* divisibility of the forces, because this can only be asserted, if, in the most frivolous manner, the being of a faculty is transferred to the thing-in-itself; secondly, that a force is *composed of parts*. We thus reject the infinite divisibility *and* the atom.

As I said above, a faculty which should place the boundaries of *all* forces, which experience can offer, must necessarily have such a nature, that it can extend without being limited, and finds no boundaries on its way back to zero. If we nevertheless apply it one-sidedly, i.e. detached from all experience, for which it is after all intended, and make the conclusions, which we drew from its nature, inseparable from the *thing-in-itself*, then we obtain contradictions with the pure reason: a great evil!

--

§ 31

We finally have also to prevent with critical mind a danger which follows from time.

Time is, as we know, an *ideal* composition a posteriori, obtained based on the aprioric form present, and is nothing without the underlay of the *real* succession. It guided us to the beginning of the world, to the boundary of a lost pre-worldly existence, a transcendent domain. Here it becomes helpless, here it disembogues into a lost *eternity*, a word which is merely the subjective expression *for the lack of any real succession*.

The critical reason is modest; but the perverse reason is not. The latter calls time back to life and incites it to go on *in indefinitum* without real underlay, regardless of the prevailing eternity.

Here the misuse is clearer than anywhere else, what misuse can be made with a cognitive faculty. *Empty moments* are constantly connected and the line is continued, which had until the transcendent domain a firm, certain underlay, the real development, but floats now in the air.

We have nothing more to do, than invoke the pure reason and simply prohibit the foolish hustle.

Even if *a parte ante* the real motion, of which time is the subjective measuring rod, had a beginning, then thereby is in no way said, that it must have *a parte post* (with regard to what follows) an end. The solution of this problem depends on the answer to the question: are the basic chemical forces indestructible? For it is clear, that the real motion has to be endless, if the basic chemical forces are indestructible.

From this thus follows:

1. that the real motion has had a beginning;
2. that the real motion is endless. This judgement is cast with reservation of the results in the Physics and Metaphysics.

--

§ 32

These inquiries and the earlier ones establish in my conviction the veritable *transcendental* or *critical idealism*, which grants not with *words* alone, but *effectively* the things-in-themselves their empirical reality, i.e. allows them to have *extension* and *motion*, *independently from the subject*, independently from *space* and *time*. Its focal point lies in the *material* objectification of the *force*, and is from this regard *transcendental*, a word which signifies the dependency of the *object* on the *subject*.

Critical idealism it is on the other hand, because it reins the perverse reason (*perversa ratio*) and does not permit her to:

1. to misuse *causality* for the production of *infinite* rows;
2. to detach time from its indispensable underlay, the real motion and make it into a line of *empty* moments, that comes out of infinity and proceeds into infinity;
3. to hold *mathematical space* and *substance* to be more than mere *things in our thoughts*, and
4. to also assign infinity to this real space and absolute persistence to this real substance.

Furthermore critical idealism does permit the perverse reason even less the arbitrary *transferral* of such brain imaginations to the *things-in-themselves* and nullifies its brazen assertions:

1. the pure *existence* of things-in-themselves is contained in infinite causal rows
2. the universe is infinite and the chemical forces are infinitely divisible or are an aggregate of atoms;
3. the world development has no beginning;
4. *all* forces are indestructible.

The two judgements, which we had to cast:

1. the *basic* chemical forces are indestructible

2. the world development has no end,

were declared to be in need for review.

As an important positive result we have to mention, that our transcendental idealism led us to a transcendent domain, which cannot bother the researcher since it no longer exists.

Hereby critical idealism frees every considerate and devoted research of nature from inconsistencies and fluctuations and makes nature into the sole source of truth again, which no one, tempted by deceptive shadows and desert images, can leave without being punished: he will languish in wastelands.

>Speculating fellows,

>Are like the cattle on an arid heath:

>Some evil spirit leads them round in circles,

>While sweet green meadows lie beneath.

>^((Goethe, Faust I, line 1830)^)

Comment to “(2) Part 2 of 3”

User ammonx:

Great work! Although I have to say that your translations can be quite misleading for English speaking readers. Here is a good example:

"In our thoughts on the other hand we find no obstacle, rather logical coercion, to at least bring back plurality to its most basic expression, duality, because for the reason is that which lies as ground to all objects force, and what is more natural for her than composing them into a metaphysical unity, valid for today and the future?"

"Her"? ;) You probably meant die Vernunft (feminine grammatical gender). I also have problem (even in the German text) with this "valid for today and the future". I don't really know what it refers to. The function of reason (synthesis) is "valid for today and the future"?

Thanks, it's nice to see that someone who knows the German texts has read the translations.

May I ask how you discovered Mainländer? :) What have you read of him? And have you read a lot of Schopenhauer as well?

>"Her"? ;) You probably meant die Vernunft.

Indeed. Two "its"s referring to two different things would not provide the information to the English reader which the German reader can simply read.

> I also have problem (even in the German text) with this "valid for today and the future". I don't really know what it refers to. The function of reason (synthesis) is "valid for today and the future"?

Mainländer certainly refers to the supposed metaphysical unity.

> May I ask how you discovered Mainländer? :)

Through Schopenhauer or to be precise through some works about his philosophy that referred to "Schopenhauer's school". We have a great Polish translation of Mainländer's "Metaphysics" but without the context of his philosophy as a whole it's pretty useless ;) So then I've read the first tome of PdE.

> Mainländer certainly refers to the supposed metaphysical unity.

Thanks, it explains a lot. Still can't get used to his sentence structure.

Polish translation of Mainländer's "Metaphysics" = G. Sowinski, "Wokół nihilizmu", Kraków 2001, p. 35-71.

(3) Part 3 of 3

https://old.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/6uuwc4/3_analytic_of_the_cognition/

§ 33

The for our further investigations most important result up till now is: that the things-in-themselves are for the subject substantive objects and, independently from the subject, themselves moving forces with a determined sphere of activity. We obtained this by a careful analysis of the outward looking cognition, so on the ground of the objective world; because we could have just as well produced the on the inner path obtained time, with our body, or with our consciousness of other things.

More than the knowledge, that the as the ground of the object lying thing-in-itself is a force of a determined size with a determined capability of motion, cannot be found by looking outward. What the force is for and in itself, how it is active, how it moves – all of this we cannot cognize by looking outward. The immanent philosophy would have to finish at this point, if we were only a knowing subject; because everything it would say based on this one-sided truth on art, on human's deeds and the humanity's movement, would be of doubtful worth: it could be just as it well it could not be, brief, she loses its firm soil under herself as well as all courage and has therefore to terminate the inquiry.

But the outward path is not the only one, which is opened to us. We can penetrate in the innermost core of the force; because every human belongs to nature, he is force himself and indeed a self-conscious force. The being of force must be graspable in the self-consciousness.

So now we want to use experience's *second* source, *self-consciousness*.

When we sink in our inside, then senses and Understanding, the outward facing faculties, stop to function; they get as it were hung out and only the higher cognitive faculties remain active. We have in our inside no impressions, of which we first have to seek the from them different cause; nor can we spatially shape ourselves and we are completely immaterialized, i.e. the causal law finds no application and we are free from space and matter.

Although we are completely inspatial, i.e. cannot come to a visualization of the shape of our inside, we are nevertheless no mathematical point. We **feel** our activity-sphere exactly as wide, as it goes, but we only lack the method for shaping it. The communal feeling of our body with the force reaches until the most outer tips of our body, and we feel ourselves neither concentrated in one point, nor dissolving **in indefinitum**, but instead in a completely determined sphere. I will call this sphere from now on the **real individuality**: it is the first cornerstone of the purely immanent philosophy.

If we examine ourselves further, we find in ourselves, as it was set out already, in continuous motion. Our force is essentially unsettled and restless. Never, not even for the duration of the smallest part of a moment, we are in absolute rest: rest means death, and the smallest imaginable interruption of life would be the extinction of life's flame. We are thus essentially restless; we feel ourselves only in motion in the self-consciousness.

The state of our inner being, as real point of motion, always affects the consciousness, or as I said earlier on, present swims upon the point of motion. At all times we are conscious of our inner life in the present. If on contrary the point of motion would stand on the present, and consequently the present would be the main issue, then my being should at every intermittency of my self-consciousness (fainting, sleeping) be in total rest, i.e. it would be hit by death and it could not ignite my life back. The assumption, that actually the point of motion is dependent on the present (also the real motion of time), is as absurd as the assumption, that space furnishes the things with extension.

In case reason becomes conscious of the transition of present to present, it obtains, in the discussed manner, time and at the same time real succession, which I will call from now on, the **real motion**: it is the second cornerstone of the immanent philosophy.

It is the greatest deception, in which one can be entangled, if one believes, that we are, on the path to the inside, **cognizing**, like on the outward path, and that the perceiver is juxtaposed by that which is perceived. We find ourselves in the midst of the thing-in-itself, there can be no talk of an object anymore, and we immediately grasp the core of our being, through the self-consciousness, in **feeling**. It is an immediate comprehending of our inner being through the mind, or better, through sensitivity.

What is now the in the core of our inside unveiling force? It is **will to live**.

Whenever we enter the path to the inside – we may encounter ourselves in apparent rest and indifference, we may blissfully tremble under the kiss of the beautiful, we may hurtle and frenzy in the wildest passion or melt in compassion, we may be “sky cheering” or “saddened to death” – always we are will to live. We want to exist, exist forever; since we **want** existence, we **are** and because we want existence, we remain in existence. The will to live is the inner core of our being; it is always active, albeit it may not always appear on the surface. In order to convince oneself from this, bring the most exhausted individual in real danger of life and the

will to live will reveal itself, bearing in all traits with terrible clarity the desire for existence: its ravenous hunger for life is insatiable.

If, however, man really no longer wants life, then he immediately annihilates himself by the deed. Most of them only *wish* death, they do not *want* it.

This will is an in itself developed individuality, which is identical with the externally found itself moving sphere of activity. But is thoroughly *free from matter*.

I regard this immediate comprehending of the force on the internal path as being free from matter, as the seal, which nature puts on my epistemology. Not space, not time, distinguish thing-in-itself from object, but matter alone makes it mere appearance, which stands and falls with the knowing subject.

As the most important finding of the Analytic we firmly hold, the from the subject totally independent *individual*, *itself moving* will to live, in our hand. It is the key that leads us to the heart of Physics, Aesthetics, Ethics, Politics and Metaphysics. ^8

^*8^ Schopenhauer's deduction of the thing-in-itself can be found in § 18 of the first volume of *WWR* and in §§ 40-43 of Fourfold Root. The content of our self-consciousness is described in the first chapter of "On the Freedom of the Will" ([Link to that section of the first chapter, under "3"])(
https://www.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/6kfq08/faq_principium_individuationis/)

Physics

<https://old.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/6xrza9/physics/>

>The secret of the magnet, explain that to me!

>No greater mystery than love and enmity.

>(*Goethe*)

>Seek within yourself, and you will find everything; and rejoice, that without, (as it may be always called,) there lies a nature, that says yea and amen, to all you discovered in yourself.

>(*Goethe*)

§ 25

Now we have to examine the life of chemical Ideas, then the begetting, life and death of the organic ones.

The basic chemical Ideas *are*, and according to all observations which can be made, neither do they change their being, nor can they be annihilated. And because they can react with each other, they are, as materialism says, in incessant (not eternal) circulation. Compounds emerge and succumb, emerge and dissolve again: it is an endless changing.

If one looks only at the compounds, then we can very well speak about procreation, life and death in the inorganic kingdom.

If a basic chemical Idea reacts with another, then a new Idea emerges with a distinct character. This new Idea has again procreative power; it can react with others, and shape a new Idea with a distinct character. Let us take an acid, a base and a salt, for example SO_3 , FeO and $FeO.SO_3$. Ferrous oxide is neither iron, nor oxygen; sulfur trioxide is neither sulfur, nor oxygen; $FeO.SO_3$ is neither sulfur trioxide nor ferrous oxide; and nevertheless the single Ideas are contained in the compound. But the salt has no procreative power anymore.

In the inorganic kingdom procreation is merging, and the individuals are indeed completely merged in the begotten compound. Only when they sacrifice themselves they can force themselves to a higher level, give themselves a different motion, which procreation is all about.

The life of a chemical force consists in persisting in a determined motion, or, when the circumstances are favorable, in the expression of the desire for a new motion, a desire which is immediately followed by the deed. This persistence is only possible due to constant resistance, and already here the truth clearly comes forward, that life is a struggle.

Finally, the death of the chemical compound manifests itself as a comeback of the forces which were bound in it, to their original motion.

--

§ 34

Here the questions arise: in what way are the inorganic and the organic kingdom related? Does an unfillable gap really lie between them?

We have actually answered both questions already at the beginning of Physics; we nevertheless have to discuss them again in more detail.

We have seen, that there is only one principle in the world: individual itself moving will to live. Whether I have a piece of gold, a plant, an animal, a human before me, is, regarding their being from the most general point of view, really the same. Every one of them is individual will, every one of them lives, strives, wants. What separates them from each other, is their character, i.e. the way and manner, how they want life or their *motion*.

This must seem to be false for many; because when they place a human next to a block of iron, then they see in one dead rest, in the other mobility; in one a homogenous mass, in the other the most marvelously complicated organism, and when they examine more precisely, in

one a dumb, simple urge to reach the center of the earth, in the other many skills, a lot of will-qualities, a constant change of inner state, a rich spiritual and a delightful intellectual life, brief, a captivating game of forces in a closed unity. Their shoulders shrug and think: the inorganic kingdom can be nothing more, than the firm solid soil for the organic kingdom, it is what a well-built stage is for the actors. And if they consider man to be part of the "organic kingdom", then they are already very unbiased people, because most people detach humans from it and let them be the glorious lords of nature.

But it goes with those people, as I have shown above, as with those who get lost in the components of a locomotive and forget the main issue, its resulting motion. The stone, just like man, wants existence, wants to live. Whether life is here a simple blind urge, or there the result of many activities in the in an organ separated unitary will, that is, from the perspective on life alone, totally the same.

If this is the case, then it seems certain, that every organism is in essence only a chemical compound. This must be investigated.

As I set out above, two basic chemical Ideas can beget a third, which is distinct from the others. They are completely bound and their compound is something completely new. If ammonia (NH_3) would have self-consciousness, then it would feel itself neither nitrogen, nor hydrogen, but instead *unitary ammonia* in a particular condition.

Basic compounds can beget again, and the product is a third again, one which is totally different from the single components. If ammonium chloride ($\text{NH}_3 \cdot \text{HCl}$) would have self-consciousness, then it would not feel itself as chloride, or nitrogen or hydrogen, but instead simply ammonium chloride.

From this perspective there is really no distinction between a chemical composition and an organism. Both are a unity, in which a certain amount of basic chemical Ideas are merged together.

But the chemical compound is, as long as it exists, constant: it secretes no ingredients and does not absorb others, or brief: no metabolism takes place.

Furthermore procreation is in the inorganic kingdom essentially limited; and not only this, but the individual which procreates, is lost in the begotten compound; the type of a compound depends on the individuals which are bound together, it stands and falls with them, does not float above them.

An organism secretes from the compound sometimes this, sometimes that substrate and assimilates replacements, it is a continual maintenance of the type; then it procreates, i.e. the in some way from it detached parts have its type and maintain themselves, the perpetuation continues.

This motion, which separates organism from chemical compound, is growth in the widest sense. We must therefore say, that every organism is in essence a chemical compound, but *with a totally different motion*. But here, the difference lies merely in the motion, and here we have to deal, like everywhere, with individual will to live, so there is really no gap between the organic and the inorganic Ideas, rather, the kingdoms border each other.

The eye of the researcher gets fogged because of the organs. Here he sees organs, there he sees none; so he concludes, there is an immeasurable gap between a stone and a plant. He simply takes a lower standpoint, from which he cannot see the main issue, the *motion*. Every organ exists only for a determined motion. The stone does not need organs, because it has a unitary undivided motion, the plant on the other hand needs organs, because the determined motion it desires (resulting motion) can only be accomplished with organs. It is only about the motion, not how they arise.

And indeed, there is no gap between the organic and the inorganic.

Meanwhile, it might appear, that that the difference itself is still a more fundamental one, if one considers the organs to be a side-matter, and regards it from the higher standpoint of pure motion.

This is however not the case in Physics. From the standpoint of pure motion, there is initially no greater difference between plant and hydrogen sulfide than on one hand (within the inorganic kingdom), between water and water vapor, between water and ice, or on the other hand (within the organic kingdom) between a plant and an animal; an animal and a human. The motion towards all directions, the motion towards the center of the earth, growth, motion caused by visualized motives, motion caused by abstract motives – all these motions constitute *differences* between the individual wills. The difference between the motion of water vapor and ice can for me not be more wondrous than the difference between the motion of ice and the growth of a plant.

This what the case looks like from the outside. From the inside the case is even simpler. If I were allowed to use what will come already, then I could solve the problem with a single word. But here we place ourselves on the lower standpoint of Physics, even if it so low that we must long with every step for a Metaphysics, we may nevertheless not let both disciplines flow into each other, which would cause unholy confusion.

In Physics, the first motion presents itself, as we know, as the disintegration of the transcendent unity into multiplicity. All motions, which followed it, bear the same character. – Disintegration into multiplicity, life, motion – all these expressions mean one and the same thing. The disintegration of the unity into multiplicity is the principle in the inorganic kingdom just as well as in the organic kingdom. In the latter the implementation of it is much more diverse: it cuts much deeper, and its consequences, struggle for existence and the weakening of the force, are larger.

So we come back where we have started, but with the result that there is no gap which separates the inorganic bodies from organisms. The organic kingdom is merely a higher tier than the inorganic, is a more perfected form for the struggle for existence, *i.e. the weakening of the force.*

--

§ 35

As repulsive, no, laughable as it may sound, that man is in essence a chemical compound and that he distinguishes himself only by having a different motion – this true is this result nevertheless in Physics. It loses its repellent character, when we keep in mind that wherever

we search in nature, we find one principle only, the individual will to live, which wants one thing only: living and living. Since the organic kingdom is built upon the inorganic one in the immanent philosophy, she teaches the same as materialism, but is not therefore identical with the latter. The fundamental difference between the two of them is the following.

Materialism is not an *immanent* philosophical system.^{^1} The first thing it teaches is an *eternal matter*, a *basic unity*, which no one has ever seen, and no one ever will see. If materialism wants to be immanent, that means, being honest in the observation of nature, then it must declare matter to be a from the subject independent collective-unity, and say that it is the sum of this and that many basic substances. Materialism does not do this however, and although no one has yet been capable of making of hydrogen from oxygen, copper from gold, materialism nevertheless puts *behind* every basic substance the mystical basic being, the indistinguishable Matter. Not Zeus, nor Jupiter, or the God of the Jews, Christians and Muslims, nor Brahma of the Indians, brief no unperceivable, transcendent being is so ardently, in the heart so fully believed, as the mystical deity Matter of the materialists; because of the undeniable fact that the organic kingdom can be constructed from the inorganic kingdom, the mind of materialists joins the heart and they ignite together.

Despite the egregious, all experience in the face hitting assumption, of one basic matter, it is still not enough to explain the world. Materialism has to deny the truth for the second time, become for the second time transcendent and needs to postulate diverse mystical essences, the forces of nature, which are not identical with matter, but for all times connected with it. Therefore materialism rests upon *two* principles or with other words: it is *transcendent dogmatic dualism*.

In the immanent philosophy however *matter* is *ideal*, in our head, a subjective ability for the cognition of the outer world, and *substance* certainly an indistinguishable unity, but equally *ideal*, in our head, a composition a posteriori, gained by the synthetic reason based on matter, without the least reality and only present in order to cognize *all* objects.

There is independently from the subject *only* force, only individual wills in the world: one single principle.

Whereas materialism is transcendental dogmatic dualism, the immanent philosophy is *purely immanent dynamism*: it is impossible to imagine a greater difference.

To call materialism the *most rational* system, is completely incorrect. Every transcendent system is *eo ipso* (by itself) *not* rational. Materialism, merely as philosophical system, is worse than it seems. The truth, that the basic chemical Ideas are the sea, out of which all organic things are raised, thanks to which they exist and where they dissolve, shines a pure, immanent light upon materialism and gives it a captivating charm. But the critical reason will not let herself be misled. She investigates precisely, and discovers behind the blinding shine the old phantasm, the transcendent unity in or over or behind the world and coexisting with it, which appears here, and everywhere, in fantastic wrappings.

^{^1} Reminder that immanent means: *within* the boundaries of experience. Transcendent means: *beyond* the boundaries of experience. Transcendent must thus be well distinguished from transcendent*al*.

--

§ 36

Now we have to examine the relation of the single being towards the entirety, the world.

Here we encounter a great difficulty. Namely, if the *individual* will to live is the sole principle of the whole, then it must be totally independent. But if it is independent and totally autonomous, then a dynamic interconnection is impossible. Experience teaches us the opposite: it forces itself to every faithful observer of nature, it shows him a dynamic interconnection and the individual's dependency on it. Consequently (we are inclined to conclude so) the *individual* will to live cannot be the principle of the world.

In the artificial language of philosophy the problem presents itself like this: Either the single beings are independent substances, and the *influxus physicus* is an impossibility; for how could a totally independent being be impacted by another; how could changes be coerced? or the single beings are no independent substances, and there must a basic substance, which galvanizes the single beings, from which the single beings, as it were, obtain their life merely as a loan.

The problem is exceedingly important, no, one could declare it to be the most important of all philosophy. The self-sufficiency of the individual is in great danger, and it appears, according to the exposition above, that it is irredeemably lost. If the immanent philosophy is incapable of saving the individual, which it has so loyally protected up till now, then we are confronted with the logical coercion of declaring it to be a puppet, and to give it unconditionally back in the hand of somewhere a transcendent being. In that case the only choice is: either monotheism, or pantheism. In that case, nature lies and presses fool's gold, instead of real, in our hands by showing us *everywhere only individuals and nowhere a basic unity*; then we lie to ourselves, when we grasp ourselves in our most inner self-consciousness as a frightened or defiant, a blissful or suffering I; then no purely immanent domain exists, and therefore also the immanent philosophy can only be a work of lie and deception.

But if we succeed, on the other hand, to save the individual will, the fact of inner and outer experience, – then we are equally confronted with the logical coercion to break definitively and forever with all transcendent phantasms, they may appear in the disguise of monotheism, pantheism, or materialism; in that case – and indeed for the first time – *atheism has been scientifically proven*.

One can see, we stand before a very important question.

Let us meanwhile not forget, that Physics is not the place, where the truth can drop all her veils. She will reveal her sublime image on a later moment in all her blessed clarity and beauty. In Physics the questions can, in the best case, only be answered halfway. This is however for now enough.

I can be concise here. We have in the Analytic not obtained the transcendent domain through [subreption](<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Subreption>). We have seen, that no causal relation, neither the causal law, nor general causality, can lead back to the *past* of the things, but

time only. By its hand we followed the *development rows a parte ante*, found however, that we could, on the immanent domain, not escape multiplicity. Like how an aeronaut cannot reach the boundaries of the atmosphere, but will instead, as high as he might rise, always be encompassed by air, likewise, the fact of inner and outer experience: the individual will, did not leave us. On the other hand our reason rightfully demanded a basic unity. In this affliction we only had one resort: to let the individuals flow beyond the immanent domain in an incomprehensible unity. We are not in the *present*, where we can never go beyond the *plain existence* of the object, but in the *past*, and when we therefore declared the found transcendent domain to be not existing anymore, but instead to be pre-worldly and lost, we did not use a logical trick, but served in loyalty the truth.

Everything which is, was consequently in the basic pre-worldly unity, before which, as we remember, all our faculties collapsed. We could form “no image, nor any likeness” of it, therefore also no representation of the way and manner, how the immanent world of multiplicity existed in the basic unity. But we gained one irrefutable certainty, namely, that this world of multiplicity was once in a basic unity, beside which nothing else could exist.

This is where the key for the solution of the problem lies, which we are dealing with.

Why and how the unity decomposed into multiplicity, these are questions, which may be asked in no Physics. We can say only this, that whatever the decomposition may be lead back to, it was the deed of a basic unity. When we consequently find on immanent domain only *individual* wills and that the world is nothing but a collective-unity of these individuals, then they are nevertheless not totally independent, *since they were in a basic unity* and the world is the deed of this unity. Thus, there lies as it were, a reflex of the pre-worldly unity on this world of multiplicity, it encompasses as it were all single beings with an invisible, untearable bond, and this reflex, this bond, is the *dynamic interconnection of the world*. Every will affects all the others directly and indirectly, and all other wills affect it directly and indirectly, or all Ideas are trapped in “continual reciprocity”.

So we have the individual *with halve independence*, for one half active from his own force, for one half conditioned by the other Ideas. He impacts the development of the world with self-sufficiency, and the development of the world impacts his individuality.

All fetishes, gods, demons and spirits owe their origin due to the one-sided view on the dynamic interconnection of the world. If everything went fine, in ancient times, man did not think of fetishes, gods, demons and spirits. Then the individual felt his force and he felt himself like a god. If on the other hand other Ideas obstructed man with terrible, frightening activity, then *his* force *totally* vanished from his consciousness, he saw in the activity of other Ideas the everything destroying omnipotence of an angry transcendent being and threw himself for idols of wood and stone, with a shaking body and terrible anxiety. Today it will be different.

Since then (before the transcendent domain was separated from the immanent one, and indeed so that the former existed *alone before* the world, and the latter exists *alone right now*), with right the disjunctive judgement was cast: either the individual is independent, which makes the *influxus physicus* (the dynamic interconnection) impossible, or is not independent, in which case the *influxus physicus* is the activity of some basic substance.

But today this either-or has no justification anymore. The individual will to live is, despite its halve self-sufficiency, saved as the sole principle of the world.

The result of halve self-sufficiency is nevertheless unsatisfying. Every clear, unbiased mind demands the *supplementation*. We will obtain it in the Metaphysics.

--

§ 37

In the Analytic we determined the being of the pre-worldly basic unity in negations according to our cognition. We have found, that the unity was inactive, unextended, indistinguishable, unsplintered (basic), motionless, timeless (eternal). Now we have to determine it from the standpoint of Physics.

Whenever we consider an object in nature, it may be a gas, a liquid, a stone, a plant, an animal, a human, always we will find it in unsettled striving, in a restless inner motion. But motion was unknown to the basic unity. The opposite of motion is rest, of which we can form us in no way any representation; we are not talking here about seeming outer rest, which we certainly can very well represent to ourselves as the opposite of locomotion, we are talking about absolute inner motionlessness. We must therefore assign the pre-worldly unity *absolute rest*.

If we delve into the dynamic interconnection of the universe on one side and the determined character of individuals on the other side, then we recognize, that everything in the world happens with *necessity*. Whatever we may examine: a stone, which our hand drops, the growing plants, the animal acting on basis of visualized motives and inner urge, humans, who have to act obediently according to a sufficient motive, – they all stand under the iron law of necessity. In the world there is no place for freedom. And, as we will come to see clearly in the Ethics, it has to be this way, if the world wants to have a sense at all.

What freedom is in philosophical context (*liberum arbitrium indifferentiæ*), we can indeed determine it with words and say something like, that is the capability of a human with a determined character, to want or not want when confronted with a sufficient motive; but if we think about this for a single moment, then we recognize immediately, that this so easily accomplished combination of words, can never be verified, even if we were capable of fathoming the deeds humans for centuries. It goes with freedom just as it went with rest. The basic unity however we must assign freedom, simply because it was the basic unity. There the coercion of the motive is absent, the only known factor for every motion known to us, for it was unsplintered, totally alone and solitary.

The immanent scheme:

>*World of multiplicity — Motion — Necessity*

is juxtaposed by the transcendent scheme:

>*Basic unity — Rest — Freedom*

And now we have to make the last step.

We have found in the Analytic already, that the force, the moment it travels across the small thread of existence from immanent domain to transcendent domain, stops being *force*. It becomes totally unknown to us and incognizable like the unity, in which it succumbs. Later on in the section we found that what we call force, is individual will, and finally in Physics we have seen, that the *mind* is merely the function of a from the will excreted organ and is in deepest essence nothing else, than a part of a divided motion.

Our so intimately known main principle on the immanent domain, the will, and the to it subordinate, secondary and equally intimate principle, mind, lose, like force, when we want to carry it onto the transcendent domain, all and every meaning for us. They forfeit their nature and escape from our knowledge.

Thus we are forced to the declaration, that the basic unity was neither *will*, nor *mind*, nor a peculiar *intertwinement of will and mind*. Hereby we lose the last points of reference. In vain we tried to use our artistic, magnificent device for the cognition of the outer world, senses, Understanding, reason: they all paralyze. Without avail we hold the in us found principles, will and mind, as mirror before the mysterious invisible being on the other side of the gap, in hope that it will reveal itself to us: no image is cast back. But now we have the right to give this being the well-known name that always designates what no power of imagination, no flight of the boldest fantasy, no intently devout heart, no abstract thinking however profound, no enraptured and transported spirit has ever attained: *God*.

Aesthetics

<https://old.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/5r7387/characters/>

§ 13

The sublime state of being is founded upon the imagined will-quality firmness or undauntedness and arises from self-deception. But if a will is really undaunted and firm, then the sublimity, which can here simply be defined as *contempt for death*, inheres in the thing-in-itself and one talks with right of *sublime characters*.

I distinguish three kinds of sublime *characters*:

- 1) The heroes
- 2) The wise
- 3) The wise heroes

The hero is completely conscious, that his own life is endangered, and although he loves it, he will, if he has to, leave it behind. The hero is for example a soldier who has been victorious over the fear of death, and everyone, who puts his life at risk to save another.

The wise knows about the worthlessness of life, and this knowledge has *enlightened* his will. The latter is a requirement *sine qua non* for the wise, for what we have in eyes, is the actual

elevation **above life**, which is the sole criterion for sublimity. The bare knowledge, that life is worthless, cannot bring about the fruit of resignation.

The most sublime character is the wise hero. He stands on the position of the wise, but does not wait, like him, in resignation for death, but tries to use his life as a useful weapon, to fight for the good of humanity. He dies with the sword in his hand (figuratively or literally), and is every minute of his existence ready, to surrender good and blood for it. The wise hero is the purest manifestation on earth, and merely his view elevates the other humans, because they get trapped in the illusion, that they have, because they are humans too, the same capability to suffer and die for others, like him. He is in possession of the sweetest individuality and lives the real, blissful life.

--

§ 14

Related to the sublime state of being is the **humor**. Before we define it we want to sink into the being of the humorist.

We have found above that the real wise are indeed elevated above life, that his will must have enlightened itself through the knowledge of the worthlessness of life. If **only** this knowledge is present, without having inherited his inner being, or also: if the will knows, as mind, that he cannot find in life the satisfaction, which he seeks, but embraces in the next moment full of desire life with a thousand arms, then the real wise will not appear.

In this odd relation between will and mind lies the cause of the humorists. The humorist cannot maintain himself at the clear peak, where the wise stands, **permanently**.

The normal human gets fully absorbed by life, he does not break himself the head about the world, does not ask himself: where do I come from? Or: where do I go? He keeps his eyes fixed on his earthly goals. The wise, on the other hand, lives in a tight sphere, which he pulled around himself, and has become – by what manner is irrelevant – clear about himself and the world. Both of them rest firmly on themselves. But not the humorist. He has tasted the peace of the wise; has experienced the blessedness of the aesthetic state of being; he has been guest at the table of the Gods; he has lived in an ether of transparent clarity. And nevertheless an irresistible violence pulls him back to the mud of the world. He flees it, because he can approve of one goal only; striving to the peace of the grave, and must reject everything else as folly; but every time and always he gets lured by the sirens back into the whirlpool, and he dances in the sultry saloon, with deep desire for rest and peace in his heart; he could be called the child of an angel and the daughter of a human. He belongs to two worlds, because he lacks the power, to renounce of one them. In the banquet hall of the Gods the call from below disturbs him, when he throws himself in the arms of lust, then the desire to above spoils him the mere pleasure. Therefore his inner being gets thrown between the two and he feels as being torn. The basic mood the humorist is displeasure.

But that which does not yield or budge, that which stands firmly, what he has seized and will not let go, is the **knowledge**, that death should be favored over life, that “the day of death is better, than the day of one’s birth”. He is not a wise, and even less a wise hero, but he is for them the one, who has fully and completely recognized the greatness of these nobles, the sublimity of their characters, and the blissful feeling, which fulfills them, he sympathizes, he

co-feels it. He carries them as an ideal within himself and knows, that he, because he is a human, can also achieve this ideal within himself, when – yes when “the sun greets the planets in their course”.

With this, and the firm knowledge, that death is preferable over life, he focuses away from the displeasure and elevates himself above himself. Now that he is free from displeasure, he sees, which is very noteworthy, his own state of being which he has escaped, *objectively*. In it he misses his ideal and he smiles at the stupidity of his halfness: since laughing appears always, when we discover discrepancy, i.e. when we compare something to a mental yardstick and consider it too short or too long. Having entered the brilliant relation in his state of being, he does not lose sight of the fact that he will fall back in the ridiculous folly soon, since he knows the force of his love to the world, and therefore laughs only with one eye, and the other one whines, now the mouth jests, and behind the facade of cheerfulness lies deep gravity.

Humor is therefore a very curious and peculiar double movement. Its first part is the displeased fluctuating between two worlds, and in second part a pure contemplative state of being. In the latter the will also fluctuates between full freedom of the displeasure and tearful melancholia.

The same is the case, when the humorist takes a look at the world. With every appearance he compares his ideal and never does it match it. There he must smile. But straightaway he remembers himself, how strongly life lures him, how impossibly hard it is for him to renounce, since we are all through and through hungry will to live. Now he thinks, speaks or writes about others with likewise mildness, as he judges himself, and with tears in his eyes, smiling, joking with twitching lips, he is fulfilled with compassion for humanity.

>“I’m gripped by all of Mankind’s misery.” (Goethe)

Since the humor can appear in every character, every temperament, it will always be of individual color. I recall the sentimental Sterne, the torn Heine, the arid Shakespeare, the warm-hearted Jean Paul and the chivalric Cervantes.

It is clear that the humorist is more suitable than any other mortal, to become a true wise. If some day the unlosable knowledge ignites one form of his willing, then the jesting flies away from the smiling lips and both eyes become earnest. Then the humorist moves, like the hero, the wise and the wise hero, from aesthetic domain into ethical domain.

--

Ethics

§ 26

Although the hero’s basic mood is deep peacefulness, so pure happiness, he is seldomly fulfilled with overwhelming delight, mostly in great moments only; since life is a hard struggle for everyone, and for he who is still firmly rooted in the world - also when his eyes are completely drunk of the light of the ideal state – he will *not* be free from need, pain, and heartache. The pure *permanent* peace of heart of the Christian saints has no hero. Should it then, without faith, really be impossible to achieve? –

The movement of humanity to the ideal state is a fact; little reflection is required to see that life of the whole can as little as single lives enter in a *still stand*. The movement must be a restless one until there, where cannot be spoken of life at all. Therefore if humanity would be in the ideal state, there can be no rest. But where should it move to? There is only one movement left for it: the movement to *complete annihilation*, the movement from *being into non-being*. And humanity (i.e. all single then living humans), will execute this movement, in irresistible desire to the rest of absolute death.

The movement of humanity to the ideal state will also follow the other, from being into non-being: the movement of humanity is after all the movement from being into non-being. If we separate the two movements, then from the first one appears the rule of full dedication to the common good, the latter the rule of *celibacy*, which admittedly is not required by the Christian religion, but is recommended as the *highest* and most *perfect virtue*; for although the movement will be fulfilled despite bestial sexual urge and lust, it is seriously demanded to every individual *to be chaste*, so that movement can reach its goal *more quickly*.

For this demand righteous and unrighteous, merciful and hard-hearted, heroes and criminals, all shy away, and with exception of the few, who, as Christ calls them, are born as eunuchs, can no human fulfill it with pleasure, without having experienced *a complete reversal* of his own will. All reversals, enlightenments of wills, which we have seen up to this point, were reversals of wills, who still wanted *life*, and the hero, just like the Christian saint, sacrificed it only, i.e. he has contempt for death, because a better *life* is obtained. Now however the will should not only merely have contempt for death, but he should *love* it, because *chastity is love to death*. Unheard demand! The will to live wants to live and exist, being and life. He wants to exist for all eternity, and because he can only stay in it through procreation, his fundamental willing concentrates itself in sexual instinct, which is the most full affirmation of the will to live and significantly overrules all other urges and desires in intensity and power.

Now how can a human fulfill the demand, how can he overcome the sexual urge, which presents itself to every honest observer of nature as insurmountable? Only the fear of *great punishment* in combination with an *all advantages outweighing advantage*, can give man the force to conquer it, i.e. the will must enlighten itself at a clear and a completely certain knowledge. It is the already above mentioned knowledge, that *non-existence is better than existence* or as the knowledge, that life is the hell, and the still night of death is the annihilation of hell.

And the human, who has clearly and unmistakably known it, that all life is suffering, that it is, in whatever form it appears, essentially unhappy and painful (*also in the ideal state*), so that he, like the Christ Child in the arms of the Sistine Madonna, can only look with appalled eyes into the world, and then considers the deep rest, the inexpressible felicity of the aesthetic contemplation and that, in contrast to the awake state, the trough reflection found happiness of the stateless sleep, whose elevation into eternity is absolute death, – such a human must enlighten himself at the presented advantage – he has no choice. The thought: to be reborn, i.e. to be dragged back by unhappy children, peacelessly and restlessly on the thorny and stone streets of existence, is for him the most horrible and despairing, he can have, on the other side the thought: to be able to break off the long chain of development, where he had to go forward with always bleeding feet, pushed, tormented and tortured, desperately wishing for rest, the sweetest and most refreshing. And if he is on the right way, with every step he gets less disturbed by sexual urges, with every step his heart becomes lighter, until his inside

enters the same *joy, blissful serenity* and *complete immobility*, as the true Christian saints. He feels himself in accordance with the movement of humanity from existence into non-existence, from the torment of life into absolute death, he enters this movement of the whole *gladly*, he acts eminently ethically, and his reward is the undisturbed peace of heart, “the perfect calm of spirit”, the peace that is higher than all reason. And all of this can be accomplished without having to believe in a unity in, above or behind the world, without fear for a hell or hope of heaven after death, without mystical intellectual intuition, without inexplicable work of grace, without contradiction with nature and our own consciousness of ourselves: the only sources, with which we can build with certitude, – merely the result of an unbiased, pure, cold knowledge of our reason, “Man’s highest power”.

Ethics

<https://old.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/765do0/ethics/>

>To expect, that someone does something, without his being urged to do so by any interest at all, is like expecting a piece of wood to move towards me, without a cord that draws him.

>(*Schopenhauer*)

--

§ 1

Ethics is *eudemonics* or *art of happiness*: an explanation, which has endured many attempts to topple it, always without success. The task of Ethics is: to investigate happiness, i.e. the satisfaction of the human heart, in all its stages, to grasp its most perfect form and place it on a firm foundation, i.e. indicate the method how man can reach the *full peace of heart*, the highest happiness.

--

§ 11

Every deed of man, the most noble as well as the lowest one, is egoistic; it flows out of his determined individuality, a determined I, with a sufficient motive, and can in no way not take place. The cause for the difference between all characters, here, it is not the place go into detail on that; we simply have to accept it as a fact. It is for the compassionate as impossible to let his neighbors live in need, as it is for the hardhearted to help them. Both of them live according to their character, their nature, their I, according to their happiness, so egoistically; because if the compassionate does not dry the tears of others, is he happy? And if the hardhearted alleviates the sufferings of others, is he satisfied?

--

§ 18

History indisputably documents the fact of moral enlightenment of the will. One will not, on one hand, dispute the veritable and true love for their fatherland of the Greeks in the era of the

Persian Wars, or dispute that life must have seemed to be of great value to them; because what did this blessed people lack? It was the only branch of humanity, that had a beautiful happy youth, with all others, it went like with those individuals, who come because of circumstances, not to the consciousness of their youth and squander the detained pleasure while dying. And precisely because the Greeks knew to estimate the life in their land, they had to fulfill in passionate patriotism their civic duty; for they were a small people, and when they were assaulted by the military dominance of the Persians, everyone knew, that only, if everyone stood by with his own life, victory was possible, and everyone knew, what result a defeat would bring: lingering in slavery. Here, every will had to ignite, every mouth had to speak: rather death!

Furthermore, the truly firm faith caused the most sudden conversions. Let us remember the elevated appearances from the first three centuries of Christianity. Men, who had been, just a day before their conversion, thoroughly worldly people, suddenly thought of nothing else, but the salvation of their immortal soul and gladly threw their life away under the most horrific torture. Did a miracle take place? In no way! They had clearly recognized, where their well-being lied, that years of torment are nothing, compared to a tormentless eternity; that the happiest earthly life is nothing compared to eternal bliss. And the eternity of the soul, as well as a last judgement, as the Church taught it, were believed in. Here, every human had to undergo rebirth, the will had to ignite, like how the stone must fall on earth. Like how before he had to splurge, and anxiously had to keep every torment away from himself, now he had to give the poor his possessions in order to profess: "I am a Christ"; since it was simply an irresistibly strong motive that had entered his knowledge:

>Whoever acknowledges me before others, I will also acknowledge before my Father in heaven. (Matthew 10:32)

>Blessed are those who are persecuted because of righteousness, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. (Matthew 5:10)

The atmosphere was so full of the new teaching, that it brought forth a spiritual epidemic. Masses of people crowded themselves around the tribunal of Roman governors craving for the most agonizing death. As Tertullian tells, a praetor shouted to such a mass of people, "Damned! If you want to die, then you also have ropes and chasms." He did not know, that this was all about the Kingdom of Heaven and to reach it, according to the great promise, a martyr death is the easiest way.

--

§ 19

The individual, who is caught in moral rapture, it may be temporary or permanent, has eye only for his real or presumed advantage, and for everything else he is dead. Thus the noble one, who has ignited himself to the mission of his fatherland, sends back wife and children with the words: "go beg, if you're hungry", thus the righteous one rather starves on the streets, than tainting his pure, light soul with injustice; thus the Saint leaves his mother, his sisters and brothers, nay, he betrays them and says: "who are my mother and my brother?" for all bonds, that kept him shackled to the world, are torn, and only his eternal life captivates his whole being.

--

§ 20

We have seen, that a will can ignite itself only with the knowledge of a *great advantage*. This is very important and must be hold onto.

From the preceding follows, that a real Christ, whose will has thoroughly ignited itself to the teaching of the gentle Savior – so a Saint – is the *happiest* human imaginable; for his will can be compared to a clear water surface, that lies so deep, that even the strongest hurricane cannot cause ripples. He has the complete inner peace, and nothing on this world, be it that what men regard as the greatest evil, can cause distress or sadness. Hereby, we also want to remark, that although the reversal can happen only due to the clear knowledge of a great advantage, after it has been accomplished, the hope for the heavenly kingdom can vanish completely, as the testimony of “Godlike” men (as the mystics say) clearly proves. The reason is evident. They stand in such an inner joy, peace and unassailability, that they are indifferent to everything: life, death, and life after death. They have in their state of being the certainty, that it can never disappear, the Kingdom of Heaven, that lies in them, totally encompasses the heavenly kingdom that should come. They live inexpressible blissfully in the *present* alone, i.e. in the feeling of enduring inner *immovability*, even if this is only an illusion; or with other words: the fleeting state of the deepest aesthetic contemplation has become *permanent* in the Saint, it continues forever, since nothing in the world is capable, to *move* the *inner* core of the individual. And like with the aesthetic contemplation, where the subject just as well as the object, are elevated from time, likewise, the Saint lives timelessly; it is unutterably good in this apparent rest, this lasting inner immovability, though the outer man still has to move, feel and suffer. And this life, he will never forsake it:

>even if he could exchange it for an angel's life. (Frankfurter, ^XXXVIII)

--

--

[§ 26](<https://www.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/5r7387/characters/>)

--

§ 28

The enlightenment of the will, through the knowledge that humanity moves from being into non-being, and the other one, that non-existence is better than existence, or through knowledge of the latter judgement alone, two judgements which can be recognized independently from each other, with a lucid look on the world – is the philosophical *denial of the individual will to live*. The hereby ignited will wants until death the happy state of the peace of heart, without interruption, in death total annihilation, the total and complete salvation from himself. He wants to be ripped out of the book of life forever, with the fading movement he wants to lose life completely and with life the inner core of his being. This determined Idea wants to be annihilated, this determined type, this determined form, wants to be shattered forever.

The immanent philosophy knows no miracles and cannot tell about events in another, unperceivable world, events which should be the consequences of deeds in this world. Therefore there is for her only one certain denial of the will to live; it is with *virginity*. As we have seen in Physics, man finds complete annihilation in death, nevertheless he is only seemingly annihilated, if he lives on in children; in these children he has already resurrected from death: in them he has seized life again and has affirmed it for a duration that is undeterminable. The unsurmountable aversion of the sexes after the act of procreation, in the animal kingdom, appears in humans as a deep grief. In them a soft voice complains, like Proserpina:

>Soothing, soothing!

>Suddenly what avails me

>In the midst of these joys,

>In the midst of this manifest bliss

>With terrible pains,

>With iron hands

>Reaching through Hell!—

>*What crime have I committed,*

>*In my enjoyment?*

And the world jeers:

>You are ours!

>You were to return *sober*

>And the bite of the apple makes you ours!

--

§ 30

Those, who face death with the certainty of salvation, stand indeed unrooted in the world and have only the one desire: to pass from their deep peace of heart into complete annihilation, but their original character is not dead. It has only gone to the background; and even if it no longer motivates the individual to deeds, that would be in accordance with it, it will nevertheless give the remainder of his life a special color.

Based on this, all those, who have the certainty of their individual salvation, will not reveal one and the same appearance. Nothing would be more wrong, than to assume this. One, that has always been proud and silent, will not become talkative and affable, another, whose loving

being spread the most pleasant warmth, will not become shy and sinister, a third one, who has been a melancholic, will not become jovial and cheerful.

Likewise, the activity and occupation will not be same among them. One of them will distance himself from the world, search solitude and will chasten himself like religious penitents, because he recognizes that an always humble will can only be maintained in asceticism, another will continue to exercise his profession, a third one will dry the tears of the unhappy ones with word and deed; a fourth one will fight for his people or for humanity, will deploy his totally worthless life, since thereby the movement towards the ideal state, in which alone the salvation of everyone can take place, is accelerated.

Whoever turns completely towards himself in denial of the will, deserves the full praise of the children of this world, for he is a “*child of Light*” and walks on the right way. Only ignorant or malicious ones could dare it to slander them. But higher we must and should esteem him, who lets, *immovable from the inside*, the outer man churn and suffer, in order to help his darkened brothers: tirelessly, tumbling, bleeding and raising himself again, never letting loose the banner of salvation in his hand, until he collapses in the fight for humanity and the gentle, splendid light in his eyes vanishes. He is the purest manifestation on this earth, he is an enlightened one, a redeemer, a victor, a martyr, a wise hero. –

Only this they have in common, that they have shed of meanness and are insensitive to everything, which can motivate the natural egoism, that they have contempt for life and love death. – And one distinctive mark they will all bear: mildness. “They do not envy, they do not boast, they bear everything, they endure everything,” they do not judge and do not stone, they always apologize and will only friendly recommend the path, on which they have found this so priceless rest and most delightful peace. –

Comment to “Ethics”

User Mainlander3:

>So does Mainlander see suicide as the most ethical action?

No, on the contrary. He writes that “the immanent philosophy warmly turns towards those who are tired of life with friendly words of persuasion.” Everyone has obviously the right to end her or his life.

The “most ethical” life is using it trying to save others from suffering. Mainländer calls such people wise heroes. Examples are Buddha, St Francis of Assisi. They try to deploy their life in the most beneficial way for others.

>What is the point of living with this inner calmness?

Compassion with others can still motivate you. The point of living doesn't change, but they will feel like they serve the movement of the world, that everything is good as it is.

>Once it has been realized doesn't it make the most sense to end one's life?

The desire to end your life is gone once that state is reached.

nothing resembling knowledge. In order to have representations, i.e. knowing an *object*, the *intellect* refers every impression the body receives to its *cause*, and it moves this cause into the a priori represented space, to that place from which the effect originates, and thus recognizes the cause as acting, or *actual*, i.e. as an idea of the same kind and class as the body. This transition from the effect to the cause is, however, a direct, vivid, and necessary one, for it is knowledge of the *pure intellect*: it is neither a rational conclusion, nor a combination of concepts and judgments according to logical laws. The latter is rather the business of *reason*, which contributes nothing to perception.

Voltaire wrote a small story on wisdom with his typical humour. He considered it to be evident what wisdom entails, as well its relation with our well-being.

>On a day, Memnon conceived the foolish project to be perfectly wise. There are few men who have not once contemplated this folly. Memnon said to himself : in order to be wise, and consequently very happy, you simply have to be without passions ; and nothing is more easy, as everyone knows. First of all, I will never love a woman.

Politics

<https://old.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/5r33if/religions/>

§ 8

The pantheism of the Brahmins, which rebuilt the animism of the Indians, had merely the purpose, of supporting the pessimism: it was only the socket for the precious gem. The disintegration of the unity into the diversity was seen as a misstep, and it was taught that already three parts of the primordial-being have been raised from the world and that only one part is still embodied in the world. In these redeemed parts transferred the Brahmins that, which every human heart so deeply desires in the world but cannot be found in it: rest, peace and blessedness, and it taught, that only through mortification of the single wills man can be unified with the primordial being, on the other hand that the in every human living impure eternal ray from the primordial being, must stay as long in the torment of existence, through soul migration, until he is purified and ripe for the blessedness.

--

§ 11

The principal truth of the Indian pantheism is the between a starting and ending point lying unitary movement, not of only *humanity* but of the *universe*. Could it have been found by intellect alone? Impossible! What could they have known at that time about this movement? They only had an overview of their own history, which knew no beginning, nor displayed an end. When they took a look at nature, they would see sun and stars go up and down at fixed intervals, see that the day periodically follows night and night follows day, endless organic life which moves to the graves and stands up from graves. All this gives a *circle* not a *spiral*, and the core of the Indian pantheism is nevertheless, that the world springs from a primordial

being, where it lives, atones, purifies itself and ultimately, annihilating the world, will return into the pure primordial being.

The wise Indians had only *one* fixed stronghold: the *humans*. They perceived the contrast between their purity and the meanness of the rogues and the contrast between their peace of heart with the unrest and torment of the life-hungry. This gave them a movement with a beginning and an end, but this development of the *whole* world, they could reach it only through brilliant insight, divinatorily, with the instinct of their inner being.

Meanwhile, this truth of the unitary movement of the world, which could not be proven and must therefore be *believed*, was bought at the high cost of a basic unity *in* the world. Here lies the weakness of the Indian pantheism. A basic unity *in* the world is incompatible with the always and at every movement obtruding fact of inner and outer experience, *the real individuality*. The religious pantheism and the philosophical (Vedanta philosophy) pantheism after it solved the contradiction by force, at the price of the truth. They denied the reality of the individual and thereby the reality of the whole world, or more precisely: the Indian pantheism is pure empirical idealism.

It had to be this way. The unitary movement could not be thrown away: on it depended the *salvation*. But it required a basic unity *in* the world, since otherwise the unitary movement of all things could not be explained, and the basic unity in the world demanded on its behalf the reduction of the whole real world to a phantasm world, an illusion (veil of Maya); because if *in* the world a unity is active, no individual can be real; it is only a mere tool, not the thinking master.

The teachings of Samkhya rebelled against this, which denied the unity and proclaimed the reality of the individual. From it developed the most important religion of Asia: *Buddhism.*

At the core of Buddhism lies the doctrine of karma: everything else is fantastical make-up, for which the successors of the great man can be accounted. This above all praise elevated, although one-sided teaching will be discussed in more detail in the Metaphysics and in the appendix, to which I refer.

Also Buddha started with the worthlessness of life, like pantheism, but stayed with the *individual*, whose development was the main issue for him. He gave all reality to the *single being*, *karma*, and made it *all-powerful*. He gives himself, only under guide of his own character (better: under the guide of the sum of all evil and all good deeds, out of his character in previous lifecycles), his destiny, i.e. his way of development. No *outside* of the individual lying force has any influence on his destiny.

The own development of single beings is determined by Buddha as the movement from being from an incomprehensible primordial being into *non-existence*.

From this it becomes clear, that also Buddha's atheism must be *believed*, just like the unitary movement of the world and the in it hidden basic unity, what pantheism taught. Moreover the full *autonomy* of the individual was bought dearly with the denial of the in the world factually present, from individual totally independent rule of chance. Everything, which we call *chance*, is the *deed* of the *individual*, the by his karma achieved scenery. Buddha also denied, at the price of the truth, the reality of the work of all other things in the world, i.e.

virtually the reality of all other things, and there remained one single reality left: the himself in his skin feeling and himself in self-consciousness registering I.

Buddhism is therefore, like the Indian pantheism, extreme absolute idealism.

It had to be this way. Buddha positioned himself with right on the reality of the individual, the fact of inner and outer experience. But he had to give the individual full autonomy, i.e. deny a unitary development of the world, since it would otherwise, like pantheism taught, necessarily strand on one unity in the world: an assumption against which every empirical mind rebels. The self-omnipotence of the I demanded however a degradation of the rest of the world, the not-I, into a world of phantasm and illusion since if in the world only the I is real, then not-I can only be an illusion: it is decoration, mise-en-scene, scenery, phantasmagory in the hand of the only real, self-omnipotent individual.

Buddhism has, like pantheism, the poison of the contradiction with experience in it. Whoever denies the reality of all things, with exception of the individual, so the dynamic interconnection of the world and the unitary movement of the collective-unity; he denies the reality of all things and recognizes only one basic unity in the world with one single movement.

Buddhism is however much closer to the human heart than pantheism, since an unknowable unity can *not* take root in our soul, because nothing is more real to us than our perceptions and our feeling, brief, our I, which Buddha raised to the throne of the world.

In addition, the by Buddha taught individual movement from the primordial existence through existence (constantly being, rebirth) into *non-existence* is unmistakably true, whereas with Indian pantheism, in addition, the incomprehensible *misstep* of the primordial being has to be accepted: a heavy load.

Both teachings make *enemy-love* of their adherents possible; is the world only the representation of a basic unity and comes every individual deed directly from this unity, then is yes everyone, which offends me, torments and hurts me, short my enemy, completely guiltless. Not *he* gives me suffering, but *God* does it *directly*. If I want to hate my enemy then I would hate the whip, not my tormenter, which would be nonsensical.

And is everything which hits me, *my own* work, then quite the same, not my enemy offended me, but I have offended *myself* through him. If I would get angry at him, then I would act as irrational, as when I hit my foot if he slips and makes me fall.

--

§ 12

In the Persian Zoroastrianism the evil forces of animism are merged into a single evil spirit and the good ones into single good spirit. Everything which restricts the individual from *the outside*: darkness, drought, earthquakes, dangerous animals, storms etc. came from Ahriman. Everything on the other hand, which facilitates the individual from the outside, from Ormuzd. *Inside* however it was reversed. The more a human restricts his natural egoism, the more the light God manifests itself, the more he follows his natural urges, the more deeply he gets trapped into the nets of evil. This can only be taught from the knowledge that the earthly life is worthless. Zoroastrianism did also not know a movement of the complete universe,

namely through the unification of Ahriman with Ormuzd and the establishment of a light empire by the gradual extermination of all evil on earth. –

These three splendid old religions of the antiquity must have been of great influence on its adherents. They moved the view of the humans into their inside and gave rise to, Brahmanism threatens the unwilling with soul migration, Buddhism with rebirth, Zoroastrianism with unhappiness, however the first lured the hesitating with reunification with God, the second with total release of existence and the Zoroastrianism with peace on the shoot of the light God.

Especially Buddhism strongly moved the souls. Spence Hardy says about the population of Sri Lanka:

>The carelessness and indifference of the people among whom the system is professed are the most powerful means of its conservation. It is almost impossible to move them, even to wrath.

--

§ 13

The Semitic people of Asia, with exception of the Jews, so the Babylonians, Assyrians, Phoenicians, didn't have the power to deepen their religions into an ethical one. (...) The Jews however came to a pure religion, which is even more remarkable, since it brought forth Christianity. It was rigid monotheism. God, the unperceivable *outer*worldly being, the creator of heaven and earth, held the creature in his almighty hand. The by his arduous prophets promulgated will demanded unconditional obedience, full devotion to law, strict justice, continual *fear of God*. The god-fearing is rewarded in *this* world, the contract breaker terribly punished in this world. But this half independence of the individual towards Jehova is only its appearance. The actual relation between God and the individual was the same as in the pantheism of the Indians. Human is nothing but a toy in the hands of Jehova; even when God doesn't directly move him from within, he has obtained his essence, from which his deeds follow, obtained from God: he is His work only. Neither did the Jews, because of its monotheism, come to a movement of the whole world.

>Generations come and generations go,
but the earth remains forever. (Salomo)

The world has no goal.

--

§ 21

In this redemption and mortification process, which took place in the historical form of the Roman Empire, fell, like oil in fire, the *Good News of the Kingdom of God*. What did the Christ teach?

The old Greeks and Romans knew no higher virtue than justice. Therefore their efforts had only value in relation to the state. They clang upon life in *this* world. When they thought

about the immortality of their souls and the kingdom of shadows, their eyes became cloudy. What was the best life in the underworld compared to striving under the light of the sun?

The Christ however taught love of neighbor and enemy and demanded the unconditional turning away from life: *hate* against the own life. He demanded the nullification of the inner being of humans, which is insatiable will to live, left nothing in human free; he tied the natural egoism entirely, or, with other words: he demanded *slow suicide*.

But because man, since he is hungry will to live, praises life as the greatest good, Christ must give the urge to the earthly life a counter motive, which has the power, to free himself from the world, and this counter motive is the *Kingdom of God*, the eternal life of peace and bliss. The effectiveness of this counter motive was raised by the threat of hell, but the hell is in the background: to frighten the most rough minds, to enforce the heart, so that the hope of a pure eternal life filled with light, can take root for eternity.

Nothing could be more wrong than to think that Christ did not demand the *complete* and *total removal* of the individual from the world. The gospels leave no room for doubt. First, I want to give an indirect proof by the preached virtues.

>You have heard that it was said, 'Love your neighbor and hate your enemy.' But I tell you, love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you. (Matth. 5:43-44)

Can he love his enemy, if the will to live in him is still almighty?

> Not everyone can accept this word, but only those to whom it has been given. For there are eunuchs who were born that way, and there are eunuchs who have been made eunuchs by others—and there are those who choose to live like eunuchs for the sake of the kingdom of heaven. The one who can accept this should accept it. (Matth. 19:11-12)

Can he practice the virtue of celibacy?

The direct proof is given by:

> In the same way, those of you who do not give up *everything you have* cannot be my disciples. (Luke 14:33)

> If you want to be perfect, go, *sell your possessions and give to the poor*, and you will have treasure in heaven. Then come, follow me. (Matthew 19:21)

>It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for someone who is rich to enter the kingdom of God." (Matthew 19:24)

In these passages the complete detachment of human from all *outside* belongings is demanded, which binds him so to the world. The disciples of Christ give the most naïve and eloquent expression of the severity of this demand when they say to their master, in relation to the last statement, ask in shock:

>Then, who can be saved?

But Christ demanded *a lot, a lot more.*

> Still another said, "I will follow you, Lord; but first let me go back and say goodbye to my family."

> Jesus replied, "One who puts a hand to the plow and *looks back* is not fit for service in the kingdom of God." (Luke 9:61-62)

> If anyone comes to me and does not hate father and mother, wife and children, brothers and sisters—*yes, even his own life*—such a person cannot be my disciple. (Luke 14:26)

> Anyone who loves their life will lose it, while anyone who *hates* their *life* in this world will keep it for eternal life. (John 12:25)

Here the Christ also demands: first the tearing apart all sweet bonds of the heart; then from the from now on completely alone and independent free and unmarried standing human, *hate* against himself, against his own life.

Whoever wants to be a *real* Christian, may and can make with life no compromise. – Or: *tertium non datur* (a third there is not). –

The reward for the full resignation is Heaven, i.e. peace of heart.

> Take my yoke upon you and learn from me, for I am gentle and humble in heart, *and you will find rest for your souls*. (Matthew 11:29)

Heaven is peace of mind and certainly not an on the other side of the world lying, city of peace, a new Jerusalem.

> You see, the kingdom of God is *within you*. (Luke 17:21)

The true follower of the Christ goes through death to paradise, i.e. in absolute nothingness: he is free from himself, is completely released/redeemed.

From this follows too, that the hell is nothing but heartache, torment of existence. The child of the world only seems to enter hell through death: he has already been there.

> I have said these things to you so that in me you may have peace. *In the world you have affliction*. (John 16:33)

The relation of the individual to nature, of human to God, cannot be revealed more *profoundly* and *truer* than is done in Christianity. It appears concealed, and to remove this concealment is the task of philosophy.

As we have seen, gods originated only because, some activities in the undeniable violence of nature were personified. The unity, God, emerged through the fusion of gods. However always was destiny, the from the movement of all individuals of the world resulting unitary movement, either partially or completely captured, and in accordance to it *personified*.

And always the Godhood was given *full* control: the individual recognized its total dependence and views itself as a *nothing*.

In the pantheism of the Indians this relationship of the individual to the unity appears naked. But also in the monotheism of the Jews it is unmistakable. Destiny is an essentially unmerciful, terrible force, and the Jews had all reason, that they saw God as an angry, assiduous spirit, which they *feared*.

This relation did Christ *change* with *firm* hand. Connecting to the fall of man, he taught the *original sin*. Human is born sinful.

> For it is from within, out of a person's heart, that evil thoughts come—sexual immorality, theft, murder, adultery, greed, malice, deceit, lewdness, envy, slander, arrogance and folly. (Mark 7:21-22)

This way Christ took away from God all gruesomeness and ruthlessness and made of him a *God of love* and mercifulness, into a loyal *Father* of humans, which one can approach with trust, *without fear*.

And this pure God leads the humans so, that they will *all* be saved.

> For God did not send his Son into the world to condemn the world, but to *save the world through him*. (John 3:17)

> And I, when I am lifted up from the earth, will draw all people to myself. (John 12:32)

This redemption *of all* will take place in the course of the world, which we will touch upon, gradually while God little by little awakens *all* individuals. This direct intervention with the through sin stiffened mind is the *providence*.

> Are not two sparrows sold for a penny? Yet not one of them will fall to the ground outside your Father's care. And even the very hairs of your head are all numbered. (Matthew 10:29-30)

A section of the providence is the *work of grace*.

> No one can come to me unless the *Father who sent me draws them*, and I will raise them up at the last day. (John 6:44)

The movement of the world is no longer an outflow of a unitary power: it develops from *factors*, and these factors, from which it is produced, are strictly separated. On one side stands the sinful creature, whose responsibility for his unhappiness he bears himself, acts out of his own will, on the other side stands a merciful Father-God, which guides everything in the best way.

The individual destiny was from now on the product of the original sin and the providence (work of grace): the individual works for one half independently, for one half led by God. A great, beautiful truth.

This way Christianity stands between Brahmanism and Buddhism in the *right* center, and all three are founded upon the *right* judgement about the worth of life.

But not only did Christ teach the movement of the individual from earthly life into paradise, but also the unitary movement of the *whole world* from existence into non-existence.

>And this gospel of the kingdom will be preached in the whole world as a testimony to all nations; *and then the end will come.* (Matthew 24:14)

>*Heaven and earth will pass away*, but my words will never pass away. About that day or hour no one knows, not even the angels in heaven, *nor the Son*, but only the Father. (Mark 13:31-32)

Here too Christianity unifies the two one-sided truths of pantheism and Buddhism: it connects the real movement of the individual (individual destiny), which Buddha recognized only, with the real movement of the complete world (destiny of the world), which pantheism considers valid solely.

Therefore Christ had the deepest possible view which is possible in the dynamic interconnection of the world, and this places him above Buddha and the wise pantheists of India.

That he thoroughly knew Brahmanism and Buddhism on one hand and on the other hand the past history can have no doubt. Nevertheless this important knowledge is not enough to explain the origin of the greatest and best religion. For the individual destiny of humans all points of reference lay in the pure, marvelous personality of the Christ, but not for the determination of the destiny of the world, whose course he nevertheless proclaims without wavering, when he also openly admits his own ignorance, regarding the time of the end.

>About that day or hour no one knows — *nor the Son*, but only the Father.

With what apodictic certainty he does talk however about the one factor of destiny, that shapes, independently of men, the individual destiny!

>I speak of what I have *seen* with my Father. (John 8:38)

And then the splendid passage:

> *But I know him.* If I said I did *not*, I would be a *liar* like you. *But I do know him*, and I obey his word. (John 8:55)

Compare this with the judgement of the pantheist poet about the unknowable, hidden unity *in* the world:

>Who dares name the nameless?

>Or who dares to confess:

>I believe in him?

>Yet who, in feeling,

>Self-revealing,

>Says: I don't believe?

>The all-clasping,

>The all-upholding,

>Does it not clasp, uphold,

>You: me, itself?

>(Goethe, Faust; Martha's Garden)

Whoever investigates the teachings of Christ without prejudice finds only *immanent* material: peace of heart and heartache, single wills and dynamic interconnection of the world, single movement and world movement. – Heaven and hell; soul; Satan and God; original sin, providence and grace; Father, Son and Holy Spirit; – they are all dogmatic covers for knowable truths.

But these truths were in the time of Christ *not* knowable, and therefore must be *believed* and appear in such covers, that they would be *effective*.

--

§ 22

The new teaching worked tremendously. The beautiful, touching words of the savior:

>I have come *to bring fire on the earth*, and how I wish it were already kindled! But I have a baptism to undergo, and what constraint I am under until it is completed! Do you think I came to bring peace on earth? No, I tell you, but division. (Luke 12:49-51)

were fulfilled.

--

§ 23

The die-off of the Romans was accelerated by *Neo-Platonism*. It can be traced back to Brahmin wisdom. It taught about, really Indian, a primordial-unity, whose outflow is the world, though defiled by matter. In order to free the human soul from its sensual additives, it suffices not to practice the four platonic virtues, but the sensuousness must be *killed*. Such a purified soul must not again, as with Plato, go back to the world, but sinks in the pure part of the godliness and loses itself in unconscious potentiality. Neo-Platonism, which has a certain similarity with the Christian teaching, is the completion of the philosophy of the antiquity, and compared to Plato's and Heraclitus's systems, a monstrous step forward. The law of intellectual fertilization has in general never appeared more successfully, than in the first centuries after Christ.

Neo-Platonism seized those cultivated persons, which placed philosophy above religion, and it accelerated their die-off. Later it worked upon the Church Fathers and through this way on the dogmatic formation of Christian teachings. The truth is exceptionally simple. It can be summarized with the few words: "Stay chaste and you will find the greatest felicity on earth and after death salvation." But how hard she can find victory! How often she must change forms! How concealed she has to appear in order to take root at all.

--

§ 24

Neo-Platonism and Christianity turned the view of its adherents away from earth, for which reason, like I have said above, that they not only did not stop the decay of the Roman Empire but helped it. "My kingdom is not of this world" said Christ. The Christians of the first centuries heeded this statement well. They let themselves be slaughtered by thousands, before they surrendered themselves to the state. Everyone was only worried about their own soul's salvation and that of their faith brothers. The earthly things could go whichever way they wanted, - what could a Christian lose? After all only his life: and just the death is his gain; since the end of his short earthly live is the beginning of the eternal blissful life.

Comment to "Politics"

>Hell is full of Self-Will, if there were no Self-Will there would be no Hell.

I don't know if have encountered this text already, but I wanted to share it with you because this Christian text says exactly what you say here:

[It hath been said, that there is of nothing so much in hell as of self-will. The which is true, for there is nothing else there than self-will, and if there were no self-will, there would be no Devil and no hell. When it is said that Lucifer fell from Heaven, and turned away from God and the like, it meaneth nothing else than that he would have his own will, and would not be at one with the Eternal Will. So was it likewise with Adam in Paradise. And when we say Self-will, we mean, to will otherwise than as the One and Eternal Will of God willeth.](<http://www.ccel.org/ccel/anonymous/theologia.v.XLIX.html?highlight=eternal,will#highlight>)

>Yes. It's like Kierkegaard mentioned, Christians do not wish to know the real meaning of Christianity because then they would have to follow suit and relinquish egoism which is basically the embracing the self-in-the-world and it's reproduction.

Comments from user Sunques

"Again, morality assumes that people are more than machines and are capable of controlling their actions, setting goals, and giving conscious direction to their lives. Physicalists and

materialists, in spite of many valient efforts, have been hard put to accommodate free will and moral responsibility within the framework of physically closed systems." - Classical Indian Philosophy of Mind

I'll post this response here due to relevance:

Similar to Plato's concept of 'Utopia' in "The Republic", Zhuangzhi is proposing his vision of an ideal state (state-less state) of self-governing, sagely men and women. This, I think, is always a "guilty" fantasy or dream of all the wise. Only, in the case of Taoism it is sometimes socio-political allegory for esoteric alchemical practices.

A quote from the Tao Te Ching by Lao-Tzu, for example:

>"the sage-ruler empties the people's minds and fills their bellies, weakens their will strengthens their bones" - Tao Te Ching

>"...the soft overcomes the hard" - Tao Te Ching

This, in actuality, is referring to something called "skeleton meditation" where one is allowing ("doing nothing") the metaphysical energy channels deep within the body/being to flow unobstructed by the psychic disturbances of the normal human mind, called the "monkey mind" by the Buddhists. But most scholars, being average people with an optimism bias, will almost always interpret this in the manner of a scholar-historian looking for advice and evidence for a utopia. So the lines do often get blurred. Nevertheless, **I see all ideal socio-political prescriptions given by some of these sages as, at best, consolation for the "worldlings", or those who cling to being and will inevitably perpetuate it, and, at worst, fantastical dreams and/or delusions of sometimes too lofty minds.**

From the quote you mentioned:

>"in the age of perfect virtue, men lived in common with birds and beasts, and were on terms of equality with all creatures, as forming one family ..."

The Tao Te Ching, which Zhuangzhi's teachings are founded in, provide us with no historic account of any devolution from a pristine state of nature to the rise of civilization in the practical, linear sense. The original meaning of this quote's perspective implies that sages of high virtue abide in the state of "original nature" (primordial nature/pre-creation/pre-birth). This later on gets misinterpreted as the suggestion of an original state of "natural utopia" between all creatures which is highly idyllic and irrational given the food chain, natural aggression, etc.

Nevertheless, where the sentiments and guidance towards a utopia are genuine I would classify them as being either Exoteric Taoism or Exoteric-Esoteric Taoism, which is more world-tolerating than Esoteric-Esoteric Taoism, which is more natural-worldly-pessimistic. The Yin-Yang symbol, for example, in Esoteric-Esoteric Taoism signifies the pure primordial (non-being) principles of yin-yang caught in the cycles of impure worldly (being) yin-yang. Whereas, with Exoteric-Esoteric Taoism, and even more so with Exoteric Taoism, the Yin-Yang symbol

is used to imply internal harmonization with the natural environment and simplicity of society in the human kingdom.

Although, this "simplicity" is not to be mistaken with any of the villages/tribes we observe living in the natural state today. The Taoist Utopian sage society is characterized by men and women who "empty their minds, and fill their bellies" while "sitting in oblivion", act with sublime spontaneity, and keep sensual pursuits to a minimum, often "fasting the mind" and senses. These "virtuous" beings "sleep without dreaming" and "eat without savoring", they "breathe with their heels while the uncultivated breathe with their throats". This is the ideal Taoist 'stateless state'.

Meanwhile, Esoteric-Esoteric Taoism (the inner teachings) has a different view in mind:

>"Those who go against the way of heaven follow the course of nature, while **those who follow the way of heaven reverse the course of nature."** - Cultivating the Dao

>"**"Going along with the natural process gives birth to humans and other beings, the cycle of birth, aging, sickness, and death never ceasing.** Reversing the natural process produces enlightened adepts who are neither born nor perish."(reuniting with the birthless-deathless non-being) - The Inner Teachings of Taoism

And:

>"There once was an immortal being. One day a monster came along and formed holes into this immortal being for senses; **the once birthless-deathless being became a mortal being, subject to birth and death**" - Taoist myth

>"Colors blind the eye. Sounds deafen the ear. Flavors numb the taste. Thoughts weaken the mind. Desires wither the heart." - Tao Te Ching

The wu-wei (primordial, unified) consciousness falling into yu-wei (discriminating, sense perception) consciousness refers to the fall of non-being into being; primordial purity falling into the inferior natural world of impurity, plurality, and conflict; the "five elements overcoming each other", "producing and killing each other". Yet, in Exoteric Taoism this is naively interpreted as the once thoughtless and vague 'innocent' human falling into the thoughtful and calculating 'guilty' human of present. Similar to the nostalgic myth of a physical Garden of Eden, this is simply a mundane distortion and misunderstanding.

As far as human society:

>"Why is it necessary to support a household and be attached to spouse and children?...Family and wealth cast off, they are not your own possessions." - Understanding Reality

>"While your eyes are open, your family and goods are yours, but when your eyes close forever everything is one void." - Understanding Reality

>"Worldly people do not see through things of the world; accepting unreal nature and life, they are attached to their spouses and children and do not sever the bonds that entangle them." - Understanding Reality

"Unreal" in this instance refers to the things/beings of nature always being in flux; never *being* always becoming and un-becoming.

>"The sentiments of mundane ties are most injurious to the being. Cutting through with one stroke, there is nothing to bind you." - The Inner Teachings of Taoism

This is similar to Jesus' statement on relinquishing familial and worldly bonds in Matt 10:37 and Luke 14:26.

Again, on "going along with the natural process"; procreation/conception/birth:

>"When the time comes and the fetus is developed, heaven and earth overturn: the human being is startled, the amniotic sac breaks. **It is like losing one's footing while walking atop an enormous mountain: the baby is ejected head down and feet up, then gives a great cry.** Now the womb breathing is forgotten." - Vitality, Energy, Spirit: A Taoist Sourcebook

This insight stems from the sagely practices of "embryonic breathing" which is a virtual return to the mind of an embryo; 'conscious death/non-being', since this is closest to the primordial wu-wei state of 'un-consciousness'.

>"Non-being is the highest joy" - Tao Te Ching

This alchemical process can be likened, in terms of the Schopenhauerian system, to knowledge and the will/thing-in-itself reuniting; a nullification of subject-object, a "reversal of the will". Lao-Tzu, the father of Taoist thought and author of the Tao Te Ching, was essentially a thanatologist (a student/practitioner of death/non-being), in a manner not unlike Schopenhauer and Mainlander. He taught, as all the sages do, that non-being is higher than being. To that end is where the inner alchemical practices of Lao-Tzu and Taoism lead, resulting in a state of "sitting in oblivion". This is "the Way" of living the higher non-being while still simultaneously living as a being.

>"the calamities of viciousness and violence all arise from being-ego (body-self)"

>"the reason that I have trouble is that I have a body. If I had no body what trouble would I have?" - Tao Te Ching

>"All men desire solely to free themselves from death; they do not know how to free themselves from life." - Lao-Tzu

>"Survival may be the supreme goal in life, but to the man of gnosis who is able to identify with non-being, **life itself with its ever-present threat of trouble is not the supreme value.**" - The World of Thought in Ancient China

The Tao Te Ching even hints at the will-to-die, postulated by Mainlander:

>"All things are in process, rising and returning. Plants come to blossom, but only to return to the root. **Returning to the root is like seeking tranquility; it is moving towards its destiny. To move toward destiny is like eternity.** To know eternity is enlightenment, and not to recognize eternity brings disorder and evil." - Tao Te Ching

>"Immersed in the wonder of the Tao, you can deal with whatever life brings you, and when death comes, you are ready." - Tao Te Ching

>"If you stay in the center and **embrace death with your whole heart,** you will endure forever." (reuniting with the birthless-deathless non-being) - Tao Te Ching

>"He holds nothing back from life; therefore **he is ready for death,** as a man is ready for sleep after a good day's work." - Tao Te Ching

Death is considered "release from the carcass" and the "final liberation".

The concepts of world-denying vs world-harmonizing are found within every 'religion', it is the crucial difference between pessimism and optimism. Ultimately, I would suggest that with the presence of the human mind, any system is bound to become diluted and turn more and more of it's attention toward the world in spite of the esoteric and world relinquishing demands of it's founder. **The same can be said with Christianity, Buddhism, Hinduism, etc., and it is no different with Taoism.**

This was really fantastic to read, thanks.

>I would suggest that with the presence of the human mind, any system is bound to become diluted and turn more and more of it's attention toward the world in spite of the esoteric and world relinquishing demands of it's founder. The same can be said with Christianity, Buddhism, Hinduism, etc., and it is no different with Taoism.

Indeed. Religion brings the truth to the masses, but because, as TTC 41 expresses it:

>When a foolish man hears of the Tao,
he laughs out loud.
If he didn't laugh,
it wouldn't be the Tao.

it has to appear in a concealed manner. But since religion is possessed by the masses, the surrounding part will expand and become more and more important. People will mistake the by-products to be the essence of religion.

Metaphysics

<https://old.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/71x27c/metaphysics/>

--

>*I thank, ye Gods, that ye resolve*

>*Childless to root me hence. — Thee let me counsel*

>*To view too fondly neither sun nor stars.*

>*Come follow me to the gloomy realms below!*

— — — — — — — — — — —

>Childless *and guiltless come below with me!*

--

>(*Goethe*)

--

§ 1

The immanent philosophy, which has so far drawn from two sources only: nature in the widest sense and self-consciousness, does not enter her last section, metaphysics, releasing the brakes so that she can “go mad with reason”. – In the Metaphysics she simply places herself at the *highest immanent* standpoint. So far she has taken for every field the highest observation site, from where she could behold the whole defined area; however whenever she desired to extend her view beyond the borders, higher mountains obstructed the panorama. But now she is standing on the highest summit: she stands *above* all fields, i.e. she looks down *upon* the whole world and summarizes everything from *one* point of view.

Also in the Metaphysics the fairness of research will not abandon us.

Since the immanent philosophy has so far taken in all separated teachings always a correct, although one-sided standpoint, many results must be one-sided. Accordingly, in Metaphysics we do not only have to place the apex of the pyramid, but also have to supplement the halve results and smoothen the unpolished ones. Or more precisely: we have to examine the immanent domain again, from its origin until the present day, and coldly judge its future, from the highest immanent standpoint.

--

§ 2

Already in the Analytic, we found, following **a parte ante** the development rows of the things (with help of time), a basic pre-worldly unity, before which our cognition collapsed. We determined it, according to our mental faculties, negatively, as inactive: unextended, indistinguishable, unsplit, motionless, timeless. In Physics we placed ourselves before this unity again, hoping to get a glimpse of it in the mirror of the principles we had found in the meantime, will and mind, but here again our efforts were completely in vain: nothing was shown in our mirror. We had to determine it negatively again: as basic unity in rest and freedom, which was neither will nor mind, nor an intertwinement of will and mind.

On the other hand we obtained three exceedingly important **positive** results. We discovered that this basic unity, God, disintegrating itself into a world, perished and totally disappeared; furthermore, that the emerged world, precisely because of its origin in a basic unity, stands in a thorough dynamic interconnection, and related to this, that destiny is the out of the activity of all single beings, resulting continual motion; and finally, that the pre-worldly unity **existed**.

The existence is the small thread, which spans over the chasm between immanent and transcendent domain, and to this have to hold onto.

The basic unity existed: in no way we can identify more than this. What kind of existence this being was, is totally shrouded for us. If we nevertheless want to determine it in more detail, we have to seek refuge in negations again and proclaim, that it had no resemblance to somewhere a kind of being known to us: for all being known to us, is **moved** being, is **becoming**, whereas the basic unity was in absolute rest. Its being was **over-being**.

Thereby our positive knowledge remains completely untouched; for the negation does not refer to the existence itself, but only the kind of existence, which we cannot make comprehensible.

From this positive knowledge, that the basic unity existed, follows from itself the other positive, very important knowledge, that the basic unity must also have had a determined essence, for every **existentia** supposes an **essentia** and it is simply unthinkable, that a pre-worldly unity has existed, while being in itself without essence, i.e. nothing.

But from the essence, the **essentia** of God, we can have, like from his **existentia**, not the poorest of all representations. Everything, which we can grasp or perceive in the world as essence of single things, is inseparably connected with motion, and God rested. If we nevertheless want to determine his essence, then this can be done only in negations, and we must proclaim, that the being of God was a for us incomprehensible, but in itself determined, **over-essence**.

Also our positive knowledge, that the basic unity had a determined essence, remains totally untouched by this negation.

Thus far everything is clear. But it also seems, as if here human wisdom comes at its end and that the break-up of the unity into multiplicity is simply unfathomable.

Meanwhile we are not completely helpless. We precisely have a break-up of the unity into multiplicity, the transition of transcendent domain to the immanent one, the death of God and the birth of the world. We stand before a deed, the first and only deed of the basic unity. The

transcendent domain was followed by the immanent one, has become something, which it had not been before: is there perhaps not a possibility, to fathom the deed itself, without going mad in phantasms and succumbing to reverie? We will be very careful, with right.

--

§ 3

Certainly, we stand here before an event, which we can grasp as nothing else, but as a deed; we are also within our rights to do so, since we are still standing on immanent domain, which is nothing else but this deed. But if we would ask for the factors, which brought forth this deed, then we leave the immanent domain and find ourselves on the “shoreless ocean” of the transcendent, which is forbidden, forbidden because all our cognitive faculties collapse on it.

On the immanent domain, in the world, the factors (in themselves) of somewhere a deed are always known to us: always we have on one hand an individual will of a determined character and on the other hand a sufficient motive. If we were to use this irrefutable fact for the question lying before us, then we would have to identify the world as a deed which has flown out of a divine *Will* and divine *Intelligence*, i.e. we would put ourselves in total contradiction with the results of the immanent philosophy; because we have found, that basic unity was neither will, nor mind, nor an intertwinement of will and mind; or, with the words of Kant, we would make immanent principles, in the most arbitrary and sophistic manner, *constitutive* ones on the transcendent domain, which is *toto genere* different from the immanent domain.

But at once, here, a way out is opened, which we may enter without second thoughts.

--

§ 4

We stand, as we said, before a deed of the basic unity. If we would simply call this deed a motivated act of volition, like all deeds known to us in the world, then we would be unfaithful to our vocation, betray the truth and be foolish dreamers; for we may assign God neither will, nor mind. The immanent principles, will and mind, can simply not be transferred to the pre-worldly essence, we may not make them *constitutive* principles for the *deduction* of the deed.

In contrast we may make them *regulative* principles for “the mere *judgement*” of the deed, i.e. we may try to explain for ourselves the origin of the world by doing this, that we comprehend it, *as if* it was a motivated act of volition.

The difference immediately jumps out. ^1

In the latter case, we merely judge problematically, according to an analogy with deeds in this world, without giving, in mad arrogance any apodictic judgement. In the first case we readily assert, that the essence of God was, like that of man, an inseparable connection of will and mind. Whether one says the latter, or expresses it in a more concealed manner, and speaks about the will of God’s potentia-will, resting, inactive will, the mind of God’s potentia-mind, resting, inactive mind – always the results of fair research are hit in the face: for *will* supposes *motion* and mind is excreted will with a special motion. A will in rest is a *contradictio in adjecto* and bears the mark of logical contradiction.

^**1** Some elaboration, by Kant:

--

I think to myself merely the relation of a being, in itself completely unknown to me, to the greatest possible systematic unity of the universe, solely for the purpose of using it as a schema of the regulative principle of the greatest possible empirical employment of my reason.

(*Critique of Pure Reason*, A679, B707)

--

But we stop at this boundary if we limit our judgment merely to the relation which the world may have to a Being whose very concept lies beyond all the knowledge which we can attain within the world. For we then do not attribute to the Supreme Being any of the properties *in themselves*, by which we represent objects of experience.

If I say, we are compelled to consider the world *as if* it were the work of a Supreme Understanding and Will, I really say nothing more, than that a watch, a ship, a regiment, bears the same relation to the watchmaker, the shipbuilder, the commanding officer, as the world of sense does to the unknown, which I do not hereby cognize as it is in itself, but as it is for me or in relation to the world, of which I am a part.

Such a knowledge is *one of analogy*, and does not signify (as is commonly understood) an imperfect similarity of two things, but a perfect similarity of relations between two quite dissimilar things. By means of this analogy, however, there remains a concept of the Supreme Being sufficiently determined *for us*, though we have left out everything that could *determine* it absolutely and *in itself*; for we determine it as regards the world and as regards ourselves, and more do we not require.

(*Prolegomena*, §§ 57 - 58)

--

§ 5

We do therefore not proceed on a forbidden path, if we comprehend the deed of God, *as if* it was a motivated act of volition, and consequently *provisionally*, merely for the judgement of the deed, assign will and mind to the essence of God.

That we have to assign him will and mind, and not will alone, is clear, for God was in absolute solitude, and nothing existed beside him. He could not be motivated from outside, only by himself. In his self-consciousness his being alone was mirrored, nothing else.

From this follows with logical coercion, that the freedom of God (the **liberum arbitrium indifferentiæ**) could find application in one **single** choice: namely, either to **remain**, as he is, or **to not be**. He had indeed also the freedom, to **be different**, but for this being something else the freedom must remain latent in all directions, for we can image no more perfected and better being, than the basic unity.

Consequently only one deed was possible for God, and indeed a **free** deed, because he was under no coercion, because he could just as well have not executed it, as executing it, namely, going into **absolute nothingness**, in the **nihil negativum*²*, i.e. to completely annihilate himself, to stop existing.

Because this was his only possible deed and we stand before a totally different deed, the world, whose being is a continual becoming, we are confronted with the question: why did God, if he wanted non-existence, not immediately vanish into nothing? You have to assign God omnipotence, for his might was limited by nothing, consequently, if he wanted not to be, then he must also immediately be annihilated. Instead, a world of multiplicity was created, a world of struggle. This is a clear contradiction. How do you want to solve it?

The first reply should be: Certainly, on one hand it is logically fixed, that only one deed was possible for the basic unity: to annihilate itself, on the other hand, the world proves that this deed has not taken place. But this contradiction can only be an apparent one. Both deeds: the only logically possible one, and the real one, must be compatible on their ground. But how?

It is clear, that they are compatible only then, if we can verify, that somewhere an **obstacle** made the immediate annihilation of God impossible.

We thus have to search the obstacle.

In the case above it was said: “you have to assign God omnipotence, for his might was limited by nothing.” This sentence is however false in general. God existed alone, in absolute solitude, and it is consequently correct, that he was not limited by anything outside of him; his might was thus in that sense omnipotence, that it was not limited by anything lying **outside** of him. But he had no omnipotence towards his own might, or with other words, his might was not destructible by himself, the basic unity could not stop to exist through itself.

God had the freedom, to be how he wanted, but he was not free from his determined essence. God has the omnipotence, to execute his will, to be whatever he wants; but he had not the might, to immediately become nothing.

The basic unity had the might, to be in any way different, as it was, but it had not the might, to suddenly become simply nothing. In the first case it remains in existence, in the latter case it must be nothing: but then it itself obstructed the path; because even if we cannot fathom the essence of God, then we nevertheless know, that it was a determined over-essence, and this determined over-essence, resting in a determined over-being, could not through itself, not be. This was the obstacle.

The theologians of all times have without second thoughts assigned God the predicate of omnipotence, i.e. they gave him the might, to be able to do, everything, which he wanted. In doing so, not one of them had thought of possibility, that God could also want, to become nothing himself. This possibility, none of them had considered it. But if one considers it in all

seriousness, then one sees, that this is the only case where God's omnipotence, simply by itself, is limited, that it is no omnipotence towards itself.

The single deed of God, the disintegration into multiplicity, accordingly presents itself: as the *execution* of the logical deed, the *decision* to not be, or with other words: the world is the *method* for the *goal* of non-existence, and the world is indeed the *only possible* method for the goal. God recognized, that he could go from *over-being* to *non-existence* only by *becoming* a world of multiplicity, through the immanent domain, the world.

If it were not clear by the way, that the essence of God was the obstacle for him, to immediately dissolve into nothingness, then our ignorance of the obstacle could in no way trouble us. Then we would simply have to postulate the obstacle on the transcendent domain; because the fact, that the *universe* moves from being into non-being, will show itself clearly and completely convincingly for everyone. –

The questions, which can be raised here, namely, why God did not want non-existence *sooner*, and why he preferred non-existence over existence at all, are all without meaning, because regarding the first question, "sooner" is a time-concept, which is without any sense regarding eternity, and the second question is sufficiently answered by the *fact of the world*. Non-existence must very well have deserved the preference over over-being, because otherwise God, in all his perfected wisdom, would not have chosen it. And all this the more, if one contemplates all the torments known to us of the higher Ideas, the animals standing close to us and our fellow humans, the torments by which non-existence alone can be bought.

^^2^ *nihil negativum*: nothing in relation to everything in general.

--

§ 6

We have only *provisionally* assigned Will and Mind to the essence of God and comprehended the deed of God, *as if* it was a motivated act of volition, in order to gain a regulative principle for the mere judgement of the deed. On this path also, we have reached the goal, and the speculative reason may be satisfied.

We may nevertheless not leave our peculiar standpoint between immanent and transcendent domain (we are hanging on the small thread of existence above the bottomless pit, which separates both domains) in order to re-enter the solid world, the safe ground of experience, before having *loudly declared* one more time, that the being of God was neither a connection of Will and Mind, like that of humans, nor an intertwining of Will and Mind. The true origin of the world can therefore never be fathomed by a human mind. The only thing which we can and may do – a right which we have made use of – is to make the divine act accessible for us by analogy, but while always keeping the fact in mind, that

> now we see through a glass darkly (1. Corinthians 13)

and that we are dissecting according to our apprehension an act, which, as unitary act of a basic unity, can *never* be comprehended by the human mind.

The result of does nevertheless satisfy. Let us meanwhile not forget, that we could be equally satisfied, if it were barred to us, to darkly mirror the divine deed; for the transcendent domain has vanished without trace in our world, in which only individual wills exist and beside or behind which nothing else exists, just like how *before* the world *only* the basic unity existed. And this world is so rich, answers, if fairly questioned, so distinctly and clearly, that every considerate thinker lightheartedly turns away from the "shoreless ocean" and joyfully dedicates his whole mental power to the divine act, the book of nature, which lies at every moment open before him.

PHILOSOPHY OF SALVATION VOLUME 1, Critique

Preface

https://old.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/7dtzhx/preface_appendix/

The attentive reader who is familiar with the history of philosophy, will have found, that the by me presented teaching contains important truths that had been discovered by *Kant* and *Schopenhauer* without any change, as well as results, that can be led back to brilliant thoughts of these great men, although I have nowhere invoked *Kant* or *Schopenhauer*. I did it, because I wanted present my work as if it comes from a mold: pure and basic; and this goal prevented me also from using citations from other philosophers as support or decoration for my own thoughts, whereby I was also lead by the consideration, that my thoughts, that have not force to independently maintain themselves, or are not fiery enough to ignite, do not deserve to live: they may perish, the sooner the better.

But by mentioning no predecessors, I accepted the implicit obligation, to render account of what I owe to them, and I will fulfill this obligation on the following pages.

The holy fire of science, whereupon the salvation of humanity depends, is passed on from hand to hand. It does not fade. It can only become larger, its flame increasingly pure and smokeless. It follows however, that there can be no thoroughly original philosophical work. Everyone has somewhere a predecessor, everyone stands on the scientific labor accomplished by others.

And instead of openly confessing this, many try to shroud the relation, dress great, by others discovered truths in new robes and give them different names, yes, some go even as far, to totally ignore brilliant achievements of the mind or oust them with miserable sophisms, only in order to enjoy the sad fame, to have created an apparently brand new system.

But whoever downsizes the men, whose wisdom lives and works in him, is like the wretched who spits on the breast of his mother, who has fed him.

I therefore openly confess, that I stand on the shoulders of *Kant* and *Schopenhauer*, and that my philosophy is merely a continuation of the one and the other; for although *Schopenhauer* has submitted the main works of *Kant* to a thorough, very meritorious critique and has annihilated very essential mistakes in it, he has nevertheless not totally purified it from errors and furthermore also violently suppressed an exceedingly important truth that had been found by *Kant*. He unconditionally approves of the Transcendental Aesthetic, though it contains the poison of a great contradiction, and conducts a war of annihilation against the Transcendental Analytic, which is, in the main, unjustified and can be explained by *Schopenhauer* being provoked by the adulation of reason by his contemporaries, who consequently was no longer without prejudice when he judged the Analytic, which is no less than the Transcendental Aesthetic a testimony for *Kant*'s wonderful prudence and astonishing power of thought.

My present task consists merely of, first, exploring *Kant*'s Transcendental Aesthetic and Analytic and exposing the threads that will be relevant, and then, subjecting *Schopenhauer*'s complete brilliant system to a thorough criticism. I start this affair with the hope that I will make, by freeing the accomplishments of the two greatest German thinkers from all contradictions and side issues, that even shortsighted eyes can recognize their immeasurably high value. At the same time I will, under the stimulus of the uncovered contradictions, develop the main thoughts of my philosophy again and place them in a new light.

Analytic of the Cognition

Citations are from Kant's *Kritik der reinen Vernunft* unless stated otherwise. The page numbers are from the original version-A (the first edition) and version-B (the other editions).

For the B-version translations are from Norman Kemp Smith, 1929.

^^1^^

1. *a priori*: before (experience)
1. *a posteriori*: after (experience)
2. *subject*: perceiver
4. *ideal*: existing in our head only
5. *Synthesis*: conjoining (composition or connection)

I hope that this text can be readable for everyone, so if you have suggestions of concepts which should be added here, please let me know!

--

^^2^^ *Anschauung* knows no exact equivalent in English.

^^3^^ The *Transcendental Logic* consists of two parts: the Transcendental Analytic and the Transcendental Dialectic. Mainländer will only discuss the Transcendental Analytic.

^^4^ Understanding: translation of *Verstand*, the most basic faculty of our cognition. Understanding as noun is capitalized in order to distinguish it from the verb understanding.

^^5^ Nothing can be born of nothing, nothing can be resolved into nothing.

^^6^ “Wechselwirkung” , reciprocity: literally “reciprocal action”. Mainländer refers to Schopenhauer’s rejection of this concept in Fourfold Root § 20, where he comments that this concept is found in German language only (not a compliment!).

A few side-passages have not been translated. They don’t affect the criticism. Most of the time they are about Schopenhauer, and are just side-discussions in order to make his criticism Schopenhauer’s Analytic of the Cognition complete.

- * A small list mentioning Schopenhauer ‘s contradictory explanations of faculties of the mind.
- * His discussion of Schopenhauer’s On Vision and Colors.
- * A citation of Scotus Erigena’s De Divisione Naturae.

Mainländer says about reading *Kant*, that the first two times he read it "mechanically", he read only words and could not absorb it. In his Critique of Hartmann he also says: Everyone who starts to read *Kant* for the first time has immediately the feeling that a superior mind is talking. But this dark feeling gets eventually replaced by clarity.

(1) Summary of Kant's transcendental idealism

https://old.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/60uhme/1_summary_of_kants_transcendental_idealism/

Kant’s separation of time and space from the world has been the greatest achievement in the domain of critical philosophy and will never be outdone by any other. He moved the puzzling entities, real monstrosities, which stand in the way of every attempt of fathoming the being of the world, moved them from the world *into* our head, and made them forms of our sense perception, to principles of knowledge, that precede all experience, to prerequisites for the possibility of experience. He has laid down the justification for this treatment in his immortal Transcendental Aesthetic, and even if there will always be “savages”, who reject *Kant*’s transcendental idealism and make time and space again forms of the things-in-themselves, the great achievement will never seriously be threatened : it belongs to the few truths, that have become possession of human knowledge.

More than separating the monstrosities from the things-in-themselves and laying them in ourselves, the knowing subjects, *Kant* did not. Although he did not uncritically adopt them and simply granted them to the subject, as I will clearly show, (and was occupied by how they

actually came to their tormenting infiniteness, which no imagination can measure, how they could have emerged at all,) he nevertheless had no qualms to lay them, such as they are, in our sensibility, as forms. The Transcendental Aesthetic leaves no doubt about this. It determines:

>We can never represent to ourselves the absence of space, though we can quite well think it as empty of objects.

>Space is a pure form of perception. We can imagine one space only and if we speak of many spaces, we mean parts only of one and the same space. Nor can these parts be considered as antecedent to the one and all-embracing space and, as it were, its component parts out of which an aggregate is formed, but they can be thought of as existing within it only. Space is essentially one; its multiplicity, and therefore the general concept of spaces in general, arises entirely from limitations.

>Space is represented as an infinite given magnitude. ^{^(A24, B39)}

>With regard to appearances in general, we cannot think away time from them, and represent them to ourselves as out of and unconnected with time, but we can quite well represent to ourselves time void of appearances.

>Time is a pure form of sense perception. Different times are merely parts of one and the same time.

>To say that time is infinite means no more than that every definite quantity of time is possible only by limitations of one time which forms the foundation of all times. The original representation of time must therefore be given as unlimited. ^{^(A31, B46)}

So space and time lie as two *pure forms of sense perception, before all experience* in us, space as quantity, whose three dimensions are infinite, time as a from infinity coming and into infinity proceeding line.

All objects of possible experience must go through these two pure aprioric^{^1} forms and are determined by them, indeed as much by space as by time:

>since all representations, whether they have for their objects outer things or not, belong, in themselves, as determinations of the mind, to our *inner* state; and since this inner state stands under the formal condition of inner perception, and so belongs to time, time is an a priori condition of all appearance whatsoever. It is the immediate condition of inner appearances (of our souls), and thereby the mediate condition of outer appearances. Just as I can say a priori that all outer appearances are in space, and are determined a priori in conformity with the relations of space, I can also say, from the principle of inner sense, that all appearances whatsoever, that is, all objects of the senses, are in time, and necessarily stand in time-relations. ^{^(A34, B51)}

On all these passages I will come back later on and show, that in them lies the cause of a great contradiction, of which *Kant* was conscious, but which he intentionally hid. Because as certain it is, that time and space are not properties of the things-in-themselves, this certain

is it as well, that space and time, as they are characterized above by *Kant*, cannot be *pure forms a priori* and indeed are not.

It is good to first make clear what *Kant*, because of the discussed pure perceptions, understands under *empirical* perception.

Only those sense impressions, that lead to spatial limitations, so on the outlines of outer objects, provide objective perceptions. He therefore firmly rejects “that there is, outside space, also another subjective and on something else related representation, which can be called objective a priori” in order to prevent that *Locke’s secondary* qualities of the things, like color, smoothness, coarseness, taste, smell, coldness, warmth, etc. could be brought back to a common principle, a *third* form of sensibility. Without the limitation above, one could assume, that *Kant* understood under objective perception only the section, of the sum of our representations that rely on vision. It is however more and less: more, because touch also provides visualizable perceptions; less, because some impressions, like colors, mere sensations, do not provide objective perceptions. Smells, sensations of taste and tones are totally excluded. He says:

>The flavor of a wine does not belong to the objective properties of the wine, but rather to the specific nature of the senses of the subject, who enjoys the wine. Colors are not properties of the bodies, on whose representation they depend, but only modifications of the sense of viewing, which is affected by light in a certain way. ^(A28)

He wants to say: A certain book has for all humans the same extent; everyone identifies the same boundaries. But it can be blue for some, for others grey, for some it can be smooth, for others rough etc. Such representations:

>are, to be precise, not ideal, although like space, they are part of the subjective forms of the senses.

This is a very strange distinction. I will come back on this.

The results of the Transcendental Aesthetic are mainly two:

1. that we do not perceive the things-in-themselves as they *are*, but only how they *appear* to us, after going through the aprioric forms of our sensibility, space and time.
2. that these appearances and space itself only seemingly lie outside of us, in reality they are in our head. Or with the words of *Kant*:

> And as we have just shown that the senses never and in no manner enable us to know things in themselves, but only their appearances, which are mere representations of the sensibility, we conclude that all bodies, together with the space in which they are, must be considered nothing but mere representations in

us, and exist nowhere but in our thoughts. (Prolegomena, remark II)

The excellent *Locke* came, strictly sticking with experience, through research of the subjective share of the representation, to the result, that the things have also, independently from the subject, the so-called *primary* qualities:

>Solidity, extension, figure, motion and rest, would be really in the world, as they are, whether there were any sensible being to perceive them, or not. (On human understanding. L. II)

Kant went significantly further. Since he made space and time pure forms of perception a priori, he could deny the things their primary qualities.

>We can *only* talk from the human standpoint of space, of *extended* objects.

With the extension all properties of the things fall away; the things crimp together into a single thing-in-itself, the rows of *x* become a single *x* and this one *x* is equal to *zero*, a mathematical point, naturally without motion.

Kant shied away from this consequence, but his protests could not solve it. What does it help that he tirelessly emphasizes, that the transcendental idealism does not hit the existence and being of the things-in-themselves, only the way and manner they appear for a subject: he has destroyed that what appears, the cause of the representations, *at least for human knowledge*. We cannot say that Kant has found a better placement of the boundary between what is ideal and real, than Locke has, a for all times valid separation of the world in ideal and real; since a separation does not happen at all, when everything is moved to *one* side. With Kant there is only ideal to work with; what is real, as said, is not *x*, but *zero*.

I continue with the Trancendental Logic. ^3

As we have seen above, the sensibility, an activity (receptivity) of the mind, gives with help of its both forms, space and time, objective perceptions. These objective perceptions are completed with subjective *sensations* of one or more senses, in particular vision (colors) and finalized by and for it.

>The functions of thinking are in no way needed for perception. ^(A91, B123)

But they are not whole, but *partial*-representations, a distinction which is *very important* which we need to hold on to, because it is the only key, which opens the Trancendental Logic, this profound work, for understanding.

>Since every appearance contains a manifold, and different perceptions are found in the mind scattered and singly, a *conjoinment* of them is needed, which they can*not* have in the *senses themselves*. ^(A120)

>It was assumed, that the senses deliver not only impressions, but *also conjoin them* and provide *images* of objects. But for this to happen something else, besides the receptivity of impressions, is needed, namely a *function for the synthesis of these impressions*. ^(A120)

>For the unity of a manifold to become an objective perception (like something in the representation of space,) first the accession of the manifold and then the *unification* of this manifold are necessary, an act which I call the synthesis of apprehension. ^(A99)

> The combination (*conjunctio*) of a manifold can never come to us through the senses. ^(B129)

The similarly-manifold and what is homogeneous must therefore get composed into a complete object by a faculty, if we want not only isolated, strange, separated *partial*-representations, which are unworkable for cognition. To make the matter clear with an illustration, I say: the impressions, which the senses deliver us, are, according to *Kant*, like staves of a barrel; should these impressions become a finished object, then they need a composition, like the staves of a barrel require barrel hoops, in order to become a barrel. This faculty, whose function is this composition, *synthesis*, is, according to *Kant*, the *imagination*.

>The synthesis is a blind but indispensable function of the soul, without which we should have no cognition whatever, but of the working of which we are seldom even conscious. ^(A78, B103)

It is beyond doubt, that this manifold-synthesis of an objective perception is an *aprioric function* in us, like the ability of the hand to grab must precede an object. Whether it is a function of the imagination, as *Kant* says, or another faculty: I leave it open for now. If Kant had discussed this at the beginning of the Transcendental Logic and had introduced the Understanding⁴ with its 12 categories after it, then this treatise of the great thinker would have been less misunderstood and distorted, and it would not be up to me, to re-establish it, almost a hundred years after its first publication, in its true sense, that is, opposing that of *Schopenhauer*.

The manifold-composition of an objective perception by the imagination would be a useless play, i.e. the composed manifold would immediately fall apart in separated pieces and the cognition of an object would be virtually impossible, if I would not be *conscious* of the synthesis. The imagination cannot follow its synthesis with this absolutely necessary consciousness, since it is a blind function of the soul, and there must therefore be a new faculty, which gets connected with the sensibility through the imagination. It is *the Understanding*.

> The empirical consciousness, which accompanies different representations, is in itself diverse and without relation to the identity of the subject. That relation comes about, not simply through my accompanying each representation with consciousness, but only in so far as I conjoin one representation with another, and *am conscious of the synthesis of them*. ^(B133)

>Without consciousness, that that, which we think, is the same as, as what we thought a moment ago, all reproductions in the rows of representations would be in vain. Each representation would be a *new one*, and in no wise belonging to the act by which it was to

be produced by degrees, and the manifold in it would never form a whole, because deprived of that unity which consciousness alone can impart to it. ^{A103}

>To bring this synthesis *to concepts* is a function which belongs to the Understanding, and it is through this function of the *Understanding* that we first obtain knowledge properly so called. ^{A78, B103}

Kant has defined *the Understanding* in many ways: as capability to think, capability of concepts, of judgements, of rules, etc. and also as capability of *knowledge*, which is, for our current standpoint, the most suitable designation; he defines knowledge as follow:

>Knowledge consists in the determinate relation of given representations to an *object*. *Object* is that in the concept of which the manifold of a given perception is united. ^{B137}

We need to hold onto these definitions, because *Schopenhauer* has, concerning the *object*, totally misunderstood *Kant*.

Now, because we compose with consciousness, something which the senses and imagination are not capable of doing, all representations are *our* representations. The: “*I think*” accompanies all our representations, binds at every separate representation a thread, and the threads come together in a single point. This center of consciousness is the self-consciousness, which *Kant* calls the *pure*, original apperception, and also the original-synthetic unity of apperception. If this union of all representations would not take place in *one* self-consciousness

>then I would have an as many-coloured and diverse self as I have representations of which I am conscious myself. ^{B134}

Therefore the Understanding accompanies with consciousness the synthesis of the imagination, by which the partial-representations are composed into objects and does

> bring the manifold of given representations under the unity of apperception, which is the highest principle in the whole sphere of human knowledge. ^{B135}

The best way to recapitulate what we have read, is with *Kant*’s own words:

>There are three original sources (faculties or capabilities of the soul), which contain the prerequisites of all experience and cannot be brought back to other capabilities of the mind, namely:

- >1. the *synopsis* of the manifold a priori through the sense;
2. the *synthesis* of this manifold by the imagination; finally
3. the *unity of this synthesis* by the original apperception. ^{A94}

And now we will proceed to the *categories* or pure concepts of the Understanding.

The Understanding is understood here as the capability of *concepts*. The categories are now originally in the Understanding produced concepts, concepts *a priori*, which lie before all experience, as seeds, in our Understanding. They are on one side prerequisites for the possibility of *knowledge* and *experience* (like time and space are prerequisites for the possibility of *objective perception*), on the other side however they receive only meaning and content through the material, which the sensibility provides them.

Kant established 12 pure concepts of Understanding:

1. *Of Quantity*| 2. *Of Quality*|3. *Of Relation*|4. *Of Modality*

----|----|----|----

Unity|Reality|Inherence and Subsistence|Possibility – Impossibility

Plurality| Negation|Causality and Dependence|Existence – Non-existence

Totality| Limitation|Community|Necessity – Contingency

Which he has drawn from the table of all possible judgements. This one is composed as follow:

Quantity of the judgements|*Quality*| *Relation*|*Modality*

----|----|----|----

Universal|Affirmative|Categorical|Problematical

Particular|Negative|Hypothetical|Assertoric

Singular|Infinite|Disjunctive|Apodictic

He justifies this treatments with the words:

>The same function which gives unity to the various representations in a judgment also gives unity to the mere synthesis of various representations in an *objective perception*; and this unity, in its most general expression, we entitle the pure concept of the Understanding. ^ (A79, B105)

We have seen above that the Understanding accompanies the synthesis of imagination with consciousness and the into objects composed partial-representations and puts them in relation to the original apperception. As far as it exercises this activity it is called *judgement-power*. This judgement-power gives the pure concepts of Understanding its necessary content from the impressions of sensibility, while it *guides* the synthesis of imagination and subsumes that which is composed under the categories.

It is good to have a look at the covered way again, short as it may be, from this point out.

Initially we have a “chaos of appearances”, separated partial-representations, provided to us by the *sensibility*, with help from its form, *space*. Under guidance of the *Understanding*, called here *judgement-power*, the *imagination* comes into activity, whose function is the composition of the manifold. Without fixed rules however the imagination would compose, whatever is presented: what is similar and homogenous, as well what is heterogeneous. The

judgement-power has these rules with the categories, and this way complete representations emerge which stand under certain categories.

With this the business of the judgement-power is not done yet. The under certain categories brought objects are

>“a rhapsody of composed perceptions”

if they cannot be connected among themselves. Judgement-power does this; it places the objects in connection to each other and subsumes these connections again under certain categories (relation).

Now all our, by the sensibility for the Understanding supplied, objective perceptions are arranged, connected, and brought in relations to each other, they are put together under concepts, and for the Understanding only one step remains: it must bring the content of the categories to the highest point in our complete cognition, to the apperception, the self-consciousness.

Above we have stitched threads (so to speak) in our, into objects composed representations, and led them directly to our self-consciousness. Due to the meanwhile inserted categories, this direct course of the threads has been interrupted. Now they are *first* unified in the categories and brought in relationship to each other and *then* connected into the self-consciousness. And now we have an intimate cohesion of all representations, have through connecting (following general and necessary laws) knowledge and experience, connected representations, with one word: the unity of the self-consciousness stands in opposition to *nature*, which is in every aspect the *work of our Understanding*.

And now we want to have short look at the *application* of the categories on the appearances. By doing this we have to deal first with the schematism of the pure concepts of Understanding. *Schopenhauer* calls the treatise on this: “wondrous and known as exceedingly obscure, since no man has ever been able to make anything out of it”, and gives it diverse interpretations. *Kant* says:

>But pure concepts of Understanding being quite heterogeneous from empirical perceptions (and indeed from all sense perceptions), can never be met with in any visualizable perception. ^ (A137, B176)

Since all in subsumptions of an object under a concept all representations of the former must be homogeneous with the latter, so must there be

> some third thing, which is homogeneous on the one hand with the category, and on the other hand with the appearance, and which thus makes the application of the former to the latter possible. ^ (A138, B177)

Kant calls this mediating third the transcendental schema and finds that, what he seeks, in *time*, so that every schema of a concept of Understanding is a determination of time a priori resting upon rules.

> Now a transcendental determination of time is so far homogeneous with the category, which constitutes its unity, in that it is universal and rests upon an a priori rule. But, on the other hand, it is so far homogeneous with appearance, in that time is contained in every empirical representation of the manifold. \wedge (A138, B177)

Now the schemata end up, ordered by the categories, in *time-series*, *time-content*, *time-order*, and lastly, the *scope of time*.

I can find in the “wondrous” chapter nothing else, than that the manifold-*synthesis* of perception would be impossible without succession, i.e. without time, which, a bit modified, is very true, which I will show. But what great obscurity and unclarity did Kant have to lay upon this simple relationship, since his categories are concepts, which precede all experience. An empirical concept naturally has a homogeneity with the by it represented objects, since it is only its image. But a concept a priori is obviously not homogeneous with empirical perception, which can of course satisfy no one.

We will assume however with *Kant*, that it does satisfy, and go on to the use of the categories.

The rules for the objective use of the categories are the *principles* of pure Understanding. They fall apart in

1. Axioms of objective perception,
2. Anticipations of subjective perception,
3. Analogies of experience,
4. Postulates of empirical thought in general.

Kant divides the principles into mathematical and dynamical ones, and considers that 1 and 2 to belong to the former, 3 and 4 to the latter, after having made the same section in the categories. His line of thought is remarkable:

>All combination (*conjunctio*) is either composition (*compositio*) or connection (*nexus*). The former is the synthesis of the manifold where its constituents do not necessarily belong to one another. ... Such also is the synthesis of the *homogeneous* in everything which can be mathematically treated. ... The second mode of combination (*nexus*) is the synthesis of the manifold so far as its constituents necessarily belong to one another, as, for example, the accident to some substance, or the effect to the cause. It is therefore synthesis of that which, though *heterogeneous*, is yet represented as combined a priori. This combination, as not being arbitrary and as concerning the connection of the *existence* of the manifold, I entitle dynamical. \wedge (B201)

>In the application of pure concepts of Understanding to possible experience, the employment of their synthesis is either mathematical or dynamical; for it is concerned partly with the mere objective perception of an appearance in general, partly with its existence. The a priori conditions of objective perception are absolutely *necessary* conditions of any possible experience; those of the existence of the objects of a possible empirical perception are in themselves only *accidental*. The principles of mathematical employment will therefore be unconditionally necessary, that is, apodictic. Those of dynamical employment will also indeed possess the character of a priori necessity, but only under the condition of *empirical thought* in some experience, therefore only mediately and indirectly. ^{A160, B199}

The principle of the *Axioms* of objective perception is:

>*All objective perceptions are extensive magnitudes.*

Here we encounter *partial*-representations again, which we discussed at the beginning of my analysis of the Transcendental Analytic. What this is about is the composition of the homogeneous partial-representations and the consciousness of the synthetic unity of this homogeneous manifold.

> Consciousness of the synthetic unity of the homogeneous manifold in perception in general, in so far as the representation of an object first becomes possible by means of it, is, however, the concept of a magnitude (*quanti*). Thus even the perception of an object, as appearance, is only possible through the same synthetic unity of the manifold of the given sense perception as that whereby the unity of the combination of the homogeneous manifold is thought in the concept of a magnitude. In other words, appearances are all without exception magnitudes, indeed *extensive* magnitudes. ^{B203}

The principle of the *Anticipations* of subjective perception is:

> In all appearances, the real that is an object of sensation has *intensive* magnitude, that is, a *degree*.

As we have seen in the Transcendental Aesthetic, *Kant* makes a strict distinction between objective perceptions and mere *sensations*. The former are limitations of the before all experience in us lying pure perceptions (space and time), so that we can, without having seen an object, state a priori with full certainty, that it has a shape and stands in a necessary relation to time. The mere sensations however, like color, temperature, smell, etc. lack a similar transcendental principle; since I cannot determine *before* all experience the activity of an object. Moreover experience learns us that what one calls warm, another calls cold, this one considers light what another considers heavy, and especially tastes and color! *Des goûts et des couleurs il ne faut jamais disputer.* (About taste and color we must never dispute)

Thus all these mere sensations wander *homelessly* around the Transcendental Aesthetic, as bastards, begotten in the impure marriage bed of the sensibility, since *Kant* could not find a

form of sensibility, under which they should fall, like the infinite space for all imaginable spaces, the infinite time all imaginable times.

But all these sensations, as manifold as they may appear in different subjects, are inseparably with the appearances connected and will not allow to be disavowed away. Yes, they are *main issue*, since the *activity* that evokes them, fills up space and time as such; since it is clear, that an object is not further extended, than where it is active. In the Transcendental Aesthetic *Kant* may deal with the mere sensations this way, but not anymore in the Transcendental Analytic, which is about the connection of appearances, (where all its peculiarities are considered,) and where they are subsumed according to rules under the diverse concepts of Understanding. *Kant* united them under the category of *quality* and called the rule according to which this happens, Anticipation of subjective perception.

You would image that nothing is harder to anticipate (to know and determine a priori) than what is *only* empirically perceptible, and that the *axioms* of objective perception alone can with right be called *anticipations* of perception. Or with *Kant*'s words:

> But as there is an element in the appearances (namely, *sensation*, the matter of subjective perception) which can never be known a priori, and which therefore constitutes the distinctive difference between empirical and a priori knowledge, it follows that sensation is just that element which cannot be anticipated. On the other hand, we might very well entitle the pure determinations in space and time, in respect of shape as well as of magnitude, anticipations of appearances, since they represent a priori that which may always be given a posteriori in experience.^(A167, B208)

But *Kant* is not shy. Since he cannot solve the difficulty with reasons, he skips over them. He says:

> Apprehension by means merely of sensation occupies only an instant, if, that is, I do not take into account the succession of different sensations. As sensation is that element in the [field of] appearance the apprehension of which does not involve a successive synthesis proceeding from parts to the whole representation, it has no *extensive* magnitude. The absence of sensation at that instant would involve the representation of the instant as empty, therefore as = 0. Now what corresponds in empirical perception to sensation is reality (*realitas phaenomenon*); what corresponds to its absence is negation = 0. Every sensation, however, is capable of diminution, so that it can decrease and gradually vanish. Between reality in the [field of] appearance and negation there is therefore a continuity of many possible intermediate sensations, the difference between any two of which is always smaller than the difference between the given sensation and zero or complete negation. In other words, the real in the [field of] appearance has always a magnitude. ^(A167, B209)

>A magnitude which is apprehended only as unity, and

in which multiplicity can be represented only through approximation to negation = 0, I entitle an *intensive magnitude*.

^(A168, B210)

According to this *Kant* desires, that I start with every empirical sensation from its negation, from zero, and produce them by intensification. Hereby a process in time and a synthesis of single moments into the total subjective perception takes place, which has only now an *intensive* magnitude, i.e. only now I am conscious that it has a certain degree.

This is meanwhile only an *empirical* process; he does not explain, how an *anticipation* is possible. Here is now the explanation.

>The quality of sensation, as for instance in colors, taste, etc. , is always merely empirical, and cannot be represented a priori. But the real, which corresponds to sensations in general, as opposed to negation = 0, represents only that something the very concept of which includes being, and signifies nothing but the synthesis in an empirical consciousness in general. ... Consequently, though all sensations as such are given only a posteriori, their property of possessing a *degree* can be *known a priori*. ^(A175, B217)

-

>*Then the philosopher steps in: he'll show*

>*That it certainly* had *to be so.*

>^(Goethe, Faust, The Study)^

Let us wait for a moment and orientate us.

We have, in accordance with the Axioms of objective perception and Anticipations of subjective perception, *extensive* and *intensive* magnitudes, i.e. completed objects which we follow with consciousness, we *think* these objects as such. We see houses, trees, fields, humans, animals etc. Nevertheless two things have to be mentioned. First, these objects are pure creations of the Understanding. He alone has combined the data of sensibility and the resulting objects are his work. The synthesis is only in the Understanding, *by* the Understanding, *for* the Understanding and nothing in *that what appears forces* the Understanding, to combine it in a certain way.

> We cannot represent to ourselves anything as combined in the object which we have not ourselves previously combined, and that of all representations combination is the only one which cannot be given through objects. Being an act of the self-activity of the subject, it cannot be executed save by the subject itself. ^(B130)

> For where the Understanding has not previously combined, it cannot dissolve, since only as having been combined by the Understanding can anything that allows of analysis be given to the faculty of representation. ^(B130)

Second, these objects stand to each other in an isolated, separated way. If experience occurs in the senses, then these objects must be *connected* under each other. The categories of relation accomplish this, according to rules, which *Kant* calls *Analogies* of experience.

The general principle of the Analogies of experience is (TN; there are 3 Analogies):

>Experience is possible only through the representation of a necessary connection of perceptions.

The principle of the *first* analogy is:

>In all change of appearances substance is permanent; its quantum in nature is neither increased nor diminished.

I will not stop at this principle now, since I will discuss it on another occasion. I want mention only, that it makes the substance to a communal substrate *before* all appearances, in which they are connected together. All changes, all emerging and dissolving, does not affect the substance, but only its accidents, i.e. its being of existence, its specific way to exist. The corollaries of this principle are the well-known, that the substance has not emerged, nor can it dissolve, or as the ancients said: *Gigno de nihilo nihil, in nihilum nil posse reverti*. ^5

The principle of the *second* analogy is:

> All alterations take place in conformity with the law of the connection of cause and effect.

In the first Analogy we have seen the regulation of the *existence* of the objects by the Understanding, here we have to consider the law, according to which the Understanding orders its *changes*. I can be brief, since I will investigate all causality-relations in the criticism of the *Schopenhauer*ian philosophy. I restrict myself to the presentation of the *Kant*ian proof of the apriority of the concept of causality.

>I perceive that appearances follow one another, that is, that there is a state of things at one time the opposite of which was in the preceding time. Thus I am really connecting two perceptions in time. Now connection is not the work of mere sense and viewing, but is here the product of a synthetic faculty of imagination, which determines inner sense in respect of the time-relation.

But imagination can connect these two states in two ways, so that either the *one* or the *other precedes* in time. For time cannot be perceived in itself, and what precedes and what follows cannot, therefore, by relation to it, be empirically determined in the object. I am conscious only that

my *imagination* sets the one state before and the other after, not that the one state precedes the other in the *object*. In other words, the objective relation of appearances that follow upon one another is not to be determined through mere perception.

In order that this relation be known as determined, the relation between the two states must be so thought that it is thereby determined as *necessary* which of them must be placed before, and which of them after, and that they cannot be placed in the reverse relation. But the concept which carries with it a necessity of synthetic unity can only be a pure

concept that lies in the Understanding, not in perception;
and in this case it is the concept of the relation of *cause*
and *effect*, the former of which determines the latter in time,
as its consequence, not as in a sequence that may occur solely in the imagination. ^{B233}

Therefore in that what appears does not lie the *coercion* for the Understanding, to set one as the cause of the effect of the other, but the Understanding brings both appearances in relation to causality and determines, unconcernedly, which of both precedes the other in time, that is, which one is the cause of the other. –

The principle of the *third* analogy is:

>All substances, in so far as they can be perceived to *coexist* in space, are in thoroughgoing reciprocity.

This principle achieves the expansion of the causality on all appearances in that way, that every appearance impacts all others in the world directly and indirectly, like all appearances for their part work upon every single one, and indeed always *simultaneously*.

In this sense, community or reciprocity has its full legitimacy, and if the concept reciprocity is found in no language but German⁶, then it only proves, that the Germans are the most profound thinkers. *Schopenhauer*'s position towards this category will be touched upon by me at a suitable moment. That *Kant* had his eyes set on connecting the appearances into a world-entirety, in which nothing can lead a completely independent life, is clear for all open-minded. That, which the category of community identifies, is best expressed by the poet's exclamation of admiration:

>How each to the Whole its selfhood gives,

>One in another works and lives!

>^{(Goethe, Faust, Night)^}

The categories of Modality do not help to complete the experience.

>The categories of modality have the peculiarity that, in determining an object, they do not in the least enlarge the concept to which they are attached as predicates. They only express the relation of the concept to the faculty of knowledge. ^{A219, B266}

I cite the *postulates* of empirical thought only for the completeness.

- >1. That which agrees with the formal conditions of experience, that is, with the conditions of objective perception and of concepts, is *possible*.
2. That which is bound up with the material conditions of experience, that is, with sensation, is actual.
3. That which in its connection with the actual is determined in accordance with universal conditions of experience, is (that is, exists as) *necessary*.

If we go back to the Analogies of experience, the question arises: what do they teach us? They teach us, that, like the composition of partial-representations into objects is the work of the Understanding, also connecting these objects amongst each other is achieved by the Understanding. The three dynamical relations, inherence, consequence and composition have only meaning for and thanks to the human Understanding.

The consequences which follow from this leave *Kant* cold and unmoved.

>All appearances stand in a permanent connection according to necessary laws and therefore in a transcendental affinity, *of which the empirical is the mere consequence*. ^(A114)

>The arrangement and the regularity of the appearances, which we call *nature*, *we bring them ourselves* in it, and we could not find them, if we, or the nature of our mind, had not *initially placed them there*. ^(A125)

>As exaggerated, as nonsensical as it sounds, to say: the Understanding itself is the source of the laws of nature, this right is such an assertion. ^(A128)

>The Understanding does not derive its laws from nature, *but prescribes them to it*.
(Prolegomena, last sentence of § 36)

And so we stand, at the end of the Transcendental Analytic, even more depressed, than at the end of the Transcendental Aesthetic. It delivered the Understanding partial-representations of an appearing = 0, which got worked into *deception*-objects, in a *deceptive* nexus. In the *deception* of sensibility the Understanding produces, by composing, *new deceptions*. The ghostliness of the outside world is inexpressibly grim. The freely thinking subject, who should be the creator of the whole phantasmagoria resists with full force against the accusation, but already the siren calls of the “all-crusher” anaesthetize, and he clamps himself at his last resort, his self-consciousness. Or is it mere *deception* and illusion too?

The Transcendental Analytic should have as motto the line above the gate of hell:

> ***Abandon all hope, you who enter here.***

But no! *Schopenhauer* says: “*Kant* is perhaps the most original mind, which nature has ever produced”; and I cross out with full conviction “perhaps” and many would do the same. What such a man has written, with such great effort of astuteness, cannot be through and through false, up to its root. And it indeed is not. One can open a side of the Transcendental Analytic, and one will always find the *synthesis* of a manifold and *time*: they are the indestructible crown on the corpse of the categories, which I will show.

Now it is my most urgent affair, to prove from passages of the Transcendental *Analytic*, which I have until now left untouched, that *infinite* space and *infinite* time cannot be *forms* of our sensibility.

(2) Visualizations

https://old.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/60ugu4/2_visualizations/

We have to remind ourselves again, that the composition of a manifold can never come to us through the *senses*, that it is, however

> an affair of the Understanding alone, which itself is nothing but the faculty of combining a priori, and of bringing the manifold of given representations under the unity of apperception. ^{^(B135)}

If I can now give evidence with sentences of *Kant*, that the infinite space and infinite time do not *originally* lie in the sensibility as essential, all-embracing, pure perceptions, but that they are the product of an in infinity advancing *synthesis* of the *Understanding*, then we do not assail that space and time are not properties of the things-in-themselves —this most lustrous philosophical acquisition!— but instead that *Kant*'s space and Kant's time are, as pure *perceptions a priori*, completely untenable, and the sooner they are removed as our *aprioric* forms, the better it is.

It is not hard for me, to give the proof. I cite the most concise passages, and I do not want it to be left unsaid, that Kant removed the first two from his second edition of the Critique: for good reasons and with purpose.

* ***Passages from the First edition of the Critique:***

>The *synthesis* of apprehension must now also be exercised a priori, that is, on representations *that are not empirical*. For *without this synthesis* we could not have a representation of *space*, nor of *time* a priori, because these could *only* be generated through the *synthesis* of the manifold, which sensibility offers in its original receptivity. ^{^(A99)}

>It is clear that, when I draw a line in thought, or think the time of an afternoon to another, or just want to imagine a certain number, that I will necessarily first have to connect one of these manifolds to the other. However if I would *lose* that what precedes (the first part of the line, the preceding part of time, or the after another imagined units), if I would *always lose them in my thoughts*, and not reproduce them, when I continue to the proceeding part, then I could never have a complete representation and the above mentioned thoughts, *nay, not even the purest and first principle-representations of space and time could arise.* ^{^(A102)}

* ***Passages from the Second edition of the Critique:***

>Appearances as objective perceptions in space and time must be represented by *the same synthesis, whereby space or time* can be determined at all. ^{^(B203)}

>I think to myself with all times, *however small*, only that successive advance from one moment to another, whereby through the parts of time and their *addition* a determinate time-magnitude is generated. ^{^(A163, B203)}

The most important passage is this:

>Space, represented as *object* (as we are required to do in geometry), contains *more* than mere *form* of perception; it also contains the *combination* of the manifold, given according to the form of sensibility, in an *objective* representation, so that the *form* of sensibility gives *only a manifold*, the *formal perception* gives unity of representation. ^{^(B160)}

It is as if we are dreaming! I ask everyone to put these passages next to the sentences cited from the Transcendental Aesthetic, especially those which are represented with great certitude:

> Space is a pure form of perception. We can imagine one space only and if we speak of many spaces, we mean parts only of one and the same space. Nor can these parts be considered as antecedent to the one and all-embracing space and, as it were, its component parts out of which an aggregate is formed, but they can be thought of as existing within it only. ^{^(A24, B39)}

Certainly it is impossible to imagine a more pure, complete contradiction. In the Transcendental Aesthetic, *form* of perception is always identical with *pure perception*; however here they are separated in the strictest manner, and *Kant* emphasizes, that space as pure perception is *more* than space as *mere form*, that is, a *composition* of a manifold, through the *synthesis* of the Understanding, which is nothing more, than the capability to compose a priori.

From this it becomes irrefutably clear, that the infinite time and infinite space, as such, are not *forms* of the sensibility, but *compositions* of a manifold, which, like all compositions, are the work of the Understanding, therefore belong to the Transcendental *Analytic* and indeed under the category of *quantity*. *Kant* implicitly says this as well in the Axioms of objective perception.

> The mathematics of space (geometry) with its axioms is based upon this successive synthesis of the productive imagination in the generation of figures. ^{^(A163, B204)}

which he connects to pure mathematics in its complete precision on the objects of experience.

Meanwhile we want to put all of this aside and investigate, how space and time, as pure perceptions, are created. *Kant* says in the mentioned passages of the first edition of the Critique:

>Space and time can *only* be generated through the *synthesis* of the manifold, which the *sensibility* offers in its *original receptivity*.

What is this manifold of the *original receptivity* of the sensibility? That we have to deal with a composition *before* all experience is clear; since it would be the shaking of the Kantian philosophy in its foundations, if space, which we want to consider first, would be the composition of an *a posteriori* given manifold. But how can it be possible, that it is the composition of a manifold a priori? What spatiality, as *unit*, does the sensibility offer a priori to the imagination, by which infinite space is generated through continual composition? Is this

unit a cubic inch? a cubic foot, a cubic rod, cubic mile, cubic sun-width, cubic Sirius-width? Or is it no unit at all but instead the most diverse spatialities which the imagination puts together?

Kant remains silent about this!

A posteriori the composition is not difficult. In that case, I have a monstrous sea of air which offers itself to the imagination. Who thinks about the fact that a force manifests itself in it? A clumsy objection! Air and space are exchangeable concepts. The greatest mind, as well as the most narrow-minded peasant talks about space, which contains a house, a room; *Kant* says at the top of his "Metaphysical Foundations of Natural Science": "Matter is the movable in space"; the poet lets the eagle fly "drunk of space" his circle, yet only the imagination should be questionable? No! To the space, which is offered by the *air*, the spatialities are added of houses, trees, humans, the whole earth, the sun, the moon and all stars, which the thinking subject had cleansed it from all the it fulfilling activity. Now it continues from the gained monstrous spatiality to infinity in a similar manner, a standstill is impossible, since there are no boundaries in the continuation.

Hereby an infinite space be constructed a posteriori, with open or closed eyes, i.e. we do not have a single entity, but only the assurance, that in this progress of the synthesis we will never find an obstacle.

But are we allowed to make this composition? Not even the purest spatiality of a cubic line can be provided to us a posteriori, i.e. through experience. The smallest spatiality, as well as the largest, results only because, that I think away the it fulfilling *force*. There where a body is inactive, starts the activity of another. My head is not in *space*, as *Schopenhauer* once remarks, but in the *air*, which certainly is not identical with space. Likewise, matter is not the movable in space, but substances move *in* substances and motion in general is only possible due to the different bodies's so-called states of matter, not because an infinite space encompasses the world.

If the world would be composed of solid substances only, then motion would only be possible through the simultaneous shifting of all bodies, and the representation of a space would not arise in a human's head. Really, a movement in liquid elements is considered by no one as a motion in *space*. We do not say: the fish swim in *space*, but: they swim in *water*. The unlimited view into distance and the reason which has gone astray (*perversa ratio*) are the authors of infinite space. In the world there are *only* forces, *no* spatialities, and infinite space exists as little, as the smallest spatiality.

It is very remarkable, that in the pre-Kantian time, where things were granted space just like that, that this state of affairs was correctly recognized by *Scotus Erigena*. Although his world does lie in the infinite space, which contains everything, which itself does not move, however inside the boundaries of the world there is no space: there, there are only bodies *in* bodies. This does not get changed by the fact that *Scotus* sometimes brings back space *in* the world; he did not have the critical mind of *Kant*, and no one, even today, will misjudge the difficulty of the investigation. (By the way, one time *Scotus* makes the remark, that space exists only in the human mind.) He says in his *De Divisione Naturæ*:

>(…)

The free unbounded view through the absolutely transparent element is also the reason, why everyone, the greatest as well as the most limited human,

>can never represent to himself the absence of space, though we can quite well think it as empty of objects.

Meanwhile, we should not jump to conclusions. Are air and the perverse reason really enough, in order to generate the infinite space? Certainly not! Only due to an aprioric form they can. Which form is it however? We will find it immediately.

First we have to come back to our question, whether space can be the composition of a manifold *a priori*? We have seen already, that *Kant* leaves us completely in the dark about it, which parts of space should be composed a priori. So we ask: Is it possible at all to have the representation of a certain spatiality in us *before* all experience, or with other words, can we come to a visualization of a spatiality, before having seen or felt an *object*? The answer to this is: no! that is impossible. Space either lies in us as pure infinite perception, before all experience, in me, or it is found a posteriori, through empirical ways: for it is as hard to let the *smallest* spatiality lie, as pure perception a priori, in our sensibility, as the *infinite* space. But if this is the case, then it would be the most foolish torture, to attain through synthesis homogenous parts, what I can immediately have as a whole.

Here does also lie the cause, why *Kant* makes with no further ado of space a pure perception and does not let it be generated by a composition of spaces first, by which also the *synthesis* would enter in *sensibility*, while it should be *only* a function of the Understanding, resp. the blind imagination.

If space can on one hand *only* be generated by an a priori given manifold; and if, on the other hand, it is as impossible to discover in us a partial-space before all experience, as the complete space, then it follows, that infinite space cannot be generated a priori at all, that there is given no space, as pure perception, a priori.

I summarize: There is, according to our investigations, no infinite space outside my head, in which the things are contained, nor is there an infinite space inside my head, as a *pure perception* a priori. Likewise, there are no limitations of space, spatialities, outside my head. However there is an infinite space *in* my head (attained through the synthesis of an *a posteriori* given manifold), which is moved *outwards*. I also have in an *empirical* manner from the *perverse* reason obtained, infinite *fantasy-space*. Hereby I also have its limitations, so spatialities of arbitrary size, fantasy-spaces.

Consequently, as I remarked on the first page of this critique, *Kant* has done nothing more, than definitively moving the *external* fantasy-space, which is normally seen as an independent from subject existing *objective* space, into our head. Hereby he has freed the things-in-themselves from space, which is precisely his immortal merit. His fault was, that he attacked, that infinite space is of *empirical* origin, and he put it, as pure perception, before all experience, in our sensibility. A second merit is that in the Transcendental Analytic he separated space as *form* from space as *object* (pure perception). Although he came hereby to an irresolvable contradiction with the teachings of the Transcendental Aesthetic, he nevertheless demonstrated, that he had completely fathomed the problem of space and gave possible successors an invaluable indication to the right path. We will follow this indication.

What is *space* as form of objective perception, which (we will follow *Kant*'s line of thought for now) lies *a priori* in our *sensibility*.

In negating manner the question has already been answered: space, as form of perception is *not* infinite space. What is it then? It is, generally expressed, the form through which the objects's boundaries of activity are set. Thereby it is a prerequisite for the possibility of objective perception and its apriority determined above all doubt. Where a body is inactive, there space sets the boundary for it. Even though the special activity of a body (its color) can set its boundaries (I do not consider touch), this can only happen into height and width, and all bodies would be perceived as planes, even if all in my vision lying planes could would move in parallel and their distance from me = 0. They lie so to speak on my eyes. With help of space's dimension of depth, the Understanding determines (according to *Schopenhauer*'s masterful exposition [TN; in Fourfold Root § 21]), on basis of the most miniscule data, the depth of the object, their distance to each other etc.

This form is only imaginable as the image of a *point*, which has the ability, to extend itself in three dimensions of *undetermined* wideness (*in indefinitum*). It is the same, if the sensibility lies it at a grain of sand or at an elephant, if its third dimension is used for the determination of distance a 10 feet from me standing object or the moon. *It itself is no perception, mediates however all perception*, like the eye itself does not see itself, the hand cannot grab itself.

Hereby it becomes clear, how we come to a fantasy-space. Through experience we learn to use the point-space – otherwise it would lie dead in us – and the subject may extend it to its liking, into three dimensions, without giving it an object, as wide as he wants. By this way we soar through the “infinite space of heaven” without content, and proceed always further without any obstacle. Without this always ready in us lying form the perverse reason would be unable to generate infinite space, with only the unlimited view into the wide. However the possibility of the unlimited view relies already on the aprioric form space (point-space). – I still want to remark, that the right use of space demands a long first stadium. Little children try to grab everything, the moon, as well as images on walls. Everything floats before their eyes: they have not learned how to use the third dimension. The same has been observed, as is known, with operated blind-born.

The consequences of the point-space are extremely important. If infinite space is a pure perception a priori, then it is without doubt that the thing-in-itself possesses *no extension*. To see this, only short reflections is needed; since it is clear, that in this case every thing has its extension only *provided* by the general infinite space. However, if space is not a pure perception, but only a form *for* perception, then *extension* does not rely on space, but only its *perceptibility*, the *knowledge* of extension depends on the subjective form. If there is somewhere a path to the things-in-themselves (which we still have to investigate), then they are certainly also extended, i.e. they have a *sphere of activity*, although space a priori, as subjective form, lies in us.

Concerning time the questions are the same.

1) Is time generated through the synthesis of a manifold, which the sensibility offers in its original receptivity? Or

2) does it result through the synthesis of a manifold, which the sensibility offers a posteriori?

Kant says:

>Time determines the relation of representations in our inner state. \wedge (A33, B50)

So the inner state is what we have to take as foothold. If we take a look inside of us, under the condition that the outside world is still completely unknown to us and has made no impression on us, and also, that our inside offers no changes, then we would be practically dead, or inside the deepest dreamless sleep, and a representation of time would *not* appear in us. The original receptivity therefore cannot give us the most insignificant datum [TN; singular form of data] for the generation of time, whereby the first question is answered in the negative.

If we think of a change of sensation in us, or, merely the experience of our breath, the regular ejection of air after inhaling, then we have a set of *fulfilled* moments, which we can connect to each other. Thus only a *fulfilled* time is perceivable, and the fulfillment of moments is only possible through the data of *experience*. It would come up in no one's mind, to say, that our inner state does not belong to experience and cannot be given a posteriori.

But how is the infinite time generated, which is after all imagined as *empty*? In a similar way as the infinite space. The thinking subject abstracts the *content* of every moment. The from its content deprived transition from present to present is the unit, which the imagination will hand over to the synthesis. Since, however, an empty moment is in no way an object of perception, we borrow from space

>and represent the time-sequence by a line progressing to infinity, in which the manifold constitutes a series of one dimension only; and we reason from the properties of this line to all the properties of time, with this one exception, that while the parts of the line are simultaneous the parts of time are always successive. \wedge (A33, B50)

Thus the infinite time lets itself be constructed a posteriori, i.e. we do not have a specific perception of it, but only the certitude, that the progress of the synthesis will nowhere be restrained. But we ask here, just like with space, are we allowed to such a synthesis? Not the smallest imaginable time can be delivered *unfulfilled* to us through experience. Let us nevertheless try one time, to provide ourselves an empty moment. Throw away everything from the rapid transition between two presents, then we have at least fulfilled the smallest time-magnitude *in our thoughts*.

We conclude now as we did with space. If the infinite time is *only* generable through the synthesis of an a priori given manifold; if in our original sensibility no smallest unfulfilled time is to be found, then the infinite time a priori cannot be generated a priori, it can then also not, lie as pure perception a priori in our sensibility.

According to this there is no infinite space in outside head, which devours the things, nor is there an infinite time in my head, which should be a pure perception a priori. However there lies an infinite space (consciousness of an unconstrained synthesis) in my head, obtained through the connection of a posteriori given fulfilled moments, whose content is violently robbed.

Thus we have an *empirical* obtained, surreptitious infinite fantasy-time, whose being is through and through succession, which transports everything, the objects as well as our consciousness, in restless progress with itself.

Kant banned the infinite space from our head, i.e. he took the things-in-themselves away from it, freed them from time. To this great merit he stands on the other side the fault, that he placed time, as pure perception a priori, in our sensibility. A second merit was that he discerned time as *form* from time as object (infinite line).

And now we stand before the important question: What is time, as *form* of perception, which lies a priori in our sensibility? In negating manner it has already been answered. Time, as *form* of perception, is *not* the infinite time. What is it then? As *form* of *sensibility* it can only be the *present*, a *point*, just like with space, a point that is always becoming but never is, *always moving*, a floating point.

As present, time has really no influence on objective perception or, as *Kant* says it:

> Time cannot be a determination of outer appearances; it has to do neither with shape nor position.

I will say it openly: *time is no form of sensibility*.

Like we remember us, *Kant* brought them there via a detour, as he explains:

> All representations, whether they have or have not external things for their objects, still in themselves, as determinations of the mind, belong to our internal state,

which falls under the formal prerequisite of time. The inner state is however never an *objective perception*, but *feeling*, and where this one, the inner *motion*, affects the mind, there lies the point of present.

Hereby a peculiar light falls upon the complete Transcendental *Analytic*. Its topic was not the sensibility, that was the topic of the Aesthetic. Only the manifold of the sensibility, the *material* for the categories, wanders above the Analytic, in order to be *composed* and *connected*. The Analytic itself solely deals with the Understanding, the categories, the synthesis, the imagination, the consciousness, the apperception, and always and always again, time. The transcendental schematics are *time*-determinations, the generation of extensive and intensive magnitudes takes place in the progress of *time*, the Analogies of experience sort similar appearances according to their relation in *time*. This is why I said, that we can open one page of the Analytic and we will always encounter the synthesis of a manifold and *time*, and called both of them the immortal crowns on the corpse of the categories. How is it possible, that Kant could not bring about the *Analytic* without a form of *sensibility*, without *time*? Precisely because time is not a form of sensibility, no *aprioric* original form at all, but only and solely a *composition* of reason. About this I will talk in extensive detail later; but the passage where we are now, is the most suitable to introduce *Schopenhauer*, the only intellectual heir of *Kant*.

Schopenhauer's position to the Transcendental Aesthetic and Analytic is: unconditional acceptance of one, unconditional rejection of the other. Both are unacceptable.

He readily accepted, without any criticism, infinite space and infinite time, the *pure perceptions* a priori, as *forms* of perception, and he completely ignored the strict investigation of *Kant* on the *forms* of the perceptions in the Analytic. It was for him a clear matter, that space and time lie, *before* all experience, as forms of perception, in our cognition. He denied, therefore, with *Kant*, the cognizability of the thing-in-itself. These forms, according to which sense impressions are processed, stand always between the perceiving subject and thing-in-itself.

Nevertheless he has, with most high human prudence, improved a part of *Kant*'s epistemology and irrefutably proven his improvements. The first question, which he asked himself, was: "How can we come to a perception of outward objects at all? how arises this complete, for us so real and important world in us?" With right he was not satisfied with the meaningless expression of *Kant*: "the empirical content of perception is *given* to us from without". The question itself is extremely meritorious; since nothing seems more self-evident than the emergence of objects. They are here at the same time of a simple glance with the eyelids; what complex process should happen in us, to generate them?

Schopenhauer did not let himself be misled by this "at the same time"-ness. Like *Kant*, he started with the sense impression, which is the first point of reference on subjective ground for the development of objective perceptions. He examined it precisely and found, that it's certainly given, but not that the *objective perception* can come from the *senses*, like Kant wants; because

>for sensation is and remains a process within the organism and is limited, as such, to the region within the skin ; it cannot therefore contain any thing which lies beyond that region, or, in other words, anything that is outside us. (Fourfold Root § 21)

Should the sensation become perception, then the *Understanding* must become active and exercise its one and only *function*, the *causal law*:

>for, in virtue of its own peculiar form, therefore a priori, i.e. *before* all experience (since there could have been none till then), the Understanding conceives the given corporeal sensation as an *effect* (a word which the Understanding alone comprehends), which effect, as such, necessarily implies a *cause*.

The causal law, the aprioric function of the intellect, which he first needs to learn as little, as the stomach digesting, is therefore *nothing more*, than the transition of the effect in the sense organ to cause. I request to remember this well, because *Schopenhauer* will, as we will see later on, bow it into different directions and openly violate it just in order to be able to reject *Kant*'s complete Transcendental Analytic.

Schopenhauer continues:

>Simultaneously it summons to its assistance *Space*, the form of the outer sense, lying likewise ready in the Understanding (i.e. the brain), in order to remove that cause beyond the organism ; for it is *by this* that the *external world first arises*.

>This intellectual operation does not however take place discursively or reflectively, in abstracto, by means of conceptions and words ; it is, on the contrary, an intuitive and quite direct process. For by it alone, therefore exclusively in the Understanding and for the Understanding, does the real, objective, corporeal world, filling Space in its three dimensions, present itself and further proceed, according to the same causal law, to change in Time, and to move in Space.

Thus the Understanding has to deliver the objective world, and our empirical perception is an *intellectual* one, not a merely *sensuous* one.

Next *Schopenhauer* proves with success the intellectuality of the objective perception (turning the in the retina wrongly standing image upright; single view of the doubled visual sensations, double view by squinting; double feeling of one object with crossed fingers) and masterfully shows, how the Understanding makes from the merely planimetric sensation, with use of the third dimension of space, a stereometric perception, while constructing with the different gradations of light and dark the individual bodies and then their location, i.e. their distance from each other, with use of visual angle, linear perspective and air-perspective.

According to *Schopenhauer* the Kantian pure perceptions, space and time, are no forms of our *sensibility*, but forms of the *Understanding*, whose only function is *the causal law*. To this improvement of *Kant*'s epistemology the second one is added, namely, he separated intuitive knowledge from abstract knowledge, the Understanding from reason; since hereby our knowledge gets freed from the *pure* concepts a priori, an extremely harmful and confusing, without justification entered wedge.

According to *Kant* the *sensibility* perceives, the *Understanding* (faculty of concepts and judgements) thinks, the reason (faculty of conclusions and ideas) concludes; according to *Schopenhauer* the senses only provide the material for perception (although he grants them also capability of perception, more on this later), the Understanding perceives, the reason (faculty of concepts, judgements, conclusions) thinks. Reason, whose only function is the construction of concepts, according to *Schopenhauer*, does not help in any way the production of the phenomenal world. It only repeats it, mirrors it, and besides the intuitive knowledge, it adds the distinctly different reflective knowledge.

> The intuitive and, so far as material content is concerned, empirical knowledge, which Reason — *real* Reason works up into conceptions, which it fixes sensuously by means of words ; these conceptions then supply the materials for its endless combinations through judgments and conclusions, which constitute the weft of our thought-world. Reason therefore has absolutely no *material*, but merely a *formal*, content,

> In reflecting, Reason is absolutely forced to take its material contents from outside, i.e., from the visualizable representations which the Understanding has created. Its functions are exercised on them, first of all, in forming conceptions, by dropping some of the various qualities of things while retaining others, which are then connected together to a conception. Representations, however, forfeit their capacity for being visually perceived by this process, while they become easier to deal with, as has already been shown. — It is therefore in this, and in this alone, that the efficiency of Reason consists ; whereas it can never supply material content from its own resources. (Fourfold Root § 34)

(3) The only intellectual heir of Kant: Schopenhauer

https://old.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/60uggy/3_the_only_intellectual_heir_of_kant_schopenhauer/

Before we continue, I have to make one remark. *Schopenhauer* is, aside from *Kant*, in my conviction, the greatest philosopher of all times. He has brought philosophy in a completely new orbit, and has powerfully led it further, animated by the upright desire to bring humanity closer to the truth. But in his system lie the most incompatible contradictions in such amount, that it is already a huge task, to discuss them just briefly. This task is fundamentally made harder, because he himself does not strictly respect his own definitions and designates one and the same issue first right, then wrong. (...)

Thus the Understanding brings about, through its function (causal law) and its forms (space and time), due to the changes in the sense organ, the visualizable world, and the reason extracts from these empirical perceptions its concepts. *Schopenhauer* had to reject the complete Analytic of *Kant*. From the standpoint of the Understanding he could not accept the synthesis of the manifold, since the Understanding, without help of the reason, brings about objective perception; from the standpoint of reason he had to assail the categories, since concepts rely only on empirical perceptions and therefore a concept a priori is a contradiction *in adjecto*. However, the synthesis and the categories form the content of the Analytic.

I absolutely agree with the rejection of the categories, as pure concepts a priori: a concept a priori is impossible; however it is false, that the Understanding, without help of the reason, can construct the visualizable world.

Before I can justify this view, which has the irrefutable right part of the Transcendental Analytic on its side, the synthesis of the manifold of perceptions, I have to clarify the reason and in general the complete cognition.

The *reason* has one function and one form. *Schopenhauer* gives it no form and a function, which does not include its full being. He places its function in the building of concepts; I however say: the *function* of the *reason* is simply *synthesis*, its form the *present*.

It has three helping faculties. The first one is the *memory*. Its function is: preservation of the impression in the mind, as long as possible. The second helping faculty is the *judgement-power*. Its function is: assembling what is homogenous. It thus has 1) assembling of homogenous *partial*-representations of the Understanding, 2) assembling similar objects, 3) assembling concepts, according to the laws of thought. The third helping faculty is the *imagination*. Its function is merely, to hold the composed *perception* together as *image*.

The completed cognition, so sense, the Understanding, judgement-power, imagination, memory and reason come together in a center: the mind (called by *Kant* pure original

apperception and by *Schopenhauer* subject of perception) whose function is the self-consciousness. Everything comes together in the center of the self-consciousness, and conversely, it crosses through all its faculties with its function and gives consciousness to their actions. The table of the mind is according to this as follows:

[Picture](https://imgur.com/a/UTYoP6h)

From the different nuances of the mind follows, that the placement of *single* cognitive faculties is not an idle affair. There, where is sensibility, there is also mind. But how could the difference between an animal and a human be better indicated than by this, that certain activities of the mind are denied to the animal? Without disassembling the mind in its single capabilities (faculties) we would be limited to completely meaningless general expressions, such as, the intelligence of this animal is *less* than that one. If we disassemble, we can indicate much better what is lacking, and so to say, lie the finger on the source point of the distinction.

Kant was therefore right to disassemble the mind; also, the disassembling is virtually necessary for the *critical* philosophy.

The reason proceeds now on the domain of the Understanding in two distinct types of compositions, which *Schopenhauer* completely overlooked. He recognizes only one type: the building of concepts; he does not recognize the other one: composition of partial-representations into objects and connection of objects under each other.

The second type is more original than the others, we will first observe the building of concepts.

That the building of concepts rests upon the synthesis *only*, will accept everyone after a short moment of thought. The judgement-power provides the reason a similar manifold, which assembles it and designates it with one single word. The judgement-power assembles only the homogenous: in this act immediately lies the *separation*. The reason unifies the homogeneity, as well as its *remainder*. For example, all horses are unified in the concept horse un that which is separated (oxen, donkeys, insects, snakes, humans, houses etc.) in the concept *not-horse*. Always it appears synthetically.

Its act is also always the same, if it has innumerable, or only a few objects, or properties, activities, relationships etc. to bring under a concept. Only the spheres of concepts are different. Further: the less specific a concept is, the more it contains, and the more specific a concept is, the emptier it is.

Through this way the complete experience of humans, inner and outer, is reflected in concepts. The reason then works them further in composition of concepts to judgements and in the connection of judgements (premises), to find from it a divided lying judgement, which Logic and Syllogism are about.

If we follow the reason on its other path, we enter a domain, where the Understanding is excluded from, and which we, after *Kant*, will call the domain of the inner sense, until we

have we know it more precisely. We have touched upon it in the preliminary discussion of time. There we found, that fulfilled moments get connected. But what is the role of reason in this operation? Its own form, the present, becomes a problem for it. It is conscious of its own changes in the inner sense, through the memory, but has nevertheless only the present, which is constant and yet always is. Now it guides with increasing attention the *always continuing* point of present and lets the imagination hold on the vanished points: this way it preserves the first fulfilled transition from present to present, i.e. the first fulfilled moment, then the second, the third etc. and through that the consciousness of *succession* or the concept of *time*. The always continuing point of present describes in the imagination so to speak a line. The reason connects moment with moment, and the imagination always hold that which is connected. The imagination itself does not connect, like *Kant* wants.

The reason, which is conscious of the unconstrained continuation of its synthesis and the incessantly the present affecting inner state, connects also the lost moment with the upcoming moment. This way the original image of time emerges: a point between two moments, two connected wings.

The by the reason constructed *time* should not be confused with the *aprioric* form present. It is a composition *a posteriori*. The underlying unity is the fulfilled moment.

The synthesis of the reason does not depend on the time. The reason connects in the continuation of the present and lets the imagination of the connected take over in every new moment fully and completely. Therefore time is also not the prerequisite of the perception of objects, who are always fully and completely in the present. But time is a prerequisite for the perception of *motion*.

Like the world is, without the space, always only an on our eyes lying colored plane, likewise our knowledge would, without time, be deprived of all development; since, with the words of *Kant*, without time

>a composition of contradictorily opposed determinations in one and the same object would be impossible to grasp.

But it would a great error, to assume, that *development itself* depends on the prerequisites of time: only the *knowledge* of the development, not this itself, depends on time.

Kant and *Schopenhauer* are in regard to time, because they first make it to an *apriopric form*, then since they let the real motion depend on it, trapped in the rarest deception.

Furthermore *Kant* first lets time float, then lets it stand still:

>Coexistence is not a mode of time itself; for none of the parts of time coexist; they are all in *succession to one another*. ^(A183, B226)

>Time, the continuity of which we are wont to express by the name of flowing, or passing away. ^(A170, B211)

On the other hand:

> Time, in which all change of appearances has to be thought, remains and does not change.
^(B224)

At this last sentence *Schopenhauer* takes great umbrage; but does he put the *restless* time in a better light by taking away its ground, the real succession, with which it stands or falls? He says, in reaction to the last sentence:

>That this is fundamentally false, is proven by the in us all existing firm certitude, that, if all things in heaven and on earth would suddenly stand still, time would continue its course unaffected. (Perarga)

And why would in this case time continue its course? Only because, one thing on earth, which has this firm certitude, does *not* stand still.

To use an image to make the state of affairs more clear, the point of present can be compared to a cork ball, which moves upon a steady moving flow. The wave, which carries the ball, is the inner state, a wave among countless others, which all have the same course. If we give the ball consciousness disappear under water, then it does not remain at the same place, but floats further. With humans it is the same. If we faint, or in sleep our consciousness is completely defunct and the time rests; but our inside does not rest, but unstopably moves itself further. Upon awakening, through our state amid the general development of the world we remark at first, that a certain time has passed and subsequently construct it. If we consider, an individual who has slept uninterruptedly for 50 years and meanwhile has naturally been changed; nevertheless he does not feel the ailments of old age, and his chamber has not changed since the moment he fell asleep, then he would, upon awakening, first believe, that he has slept only *one* night. A look through the window, a look at the mirror immediately changes his view. Due to his grey hairs and facial features he will be able to “approximately” measure the time, which has since then passed by; better methods would tell him the minutes, i.e. the covered way of the *complete world-wave* determines the time, which has since then passed by.

Time certainly stands *Still*. It is an *imagined fixed* line, whose positions are immovable. The past year 1789 and the future year 3000 take a fully determined place on it. What however *floats*, always floats, floats restlessly, is the *present*, carried by the point of motion.

Before everything we must research whether the Understanding can construct, with its function (causal law) and its forms (space and time), the whole real world that lies before our eyes, alone; reason does really not provide anything for perception: according to the *Schopenhauer*ian theory.

First and foremost we encounter *Schopenhauer*'s inexcusable misuse of the causal law. For him it is “a girl for everything”, a magic horse, on whose back he swings into the drunkenness, when the obstacles seem too difficult for thought.

We remember, that the causal law does not mean anything else but the transition of the *sensuous sensation* to its cause. It consequently expresses only the causal relation between outside world and *subject*, or better: the *Schopenhauer*ian “immediate object”, the body,

and this constraint becomes even more limited because it is **always** the transition of the **effect** to the cause, never vice versa. When the Understanding has found the cause for the change in the sense organ, and has as well brought it into a relation to time (I follow **Schopenhauer**'s line of thought), then its job is done.

The **knowledge** of the operation itself is not a work of the Understanding. That relies on **thinking** and is therefore a late ripe fruit of the reason.

This clear state of affairs first gets darkened by Schopenhauer, when he grants the Understanding the transition of **cause** to effect. Because he says:

>The Understanding has everywhere the same simple form: **knowledge** of causality, transition from **effect** to cause, **and** from **cause** to effect. (**WWR** V1, § 6)

This is false in two directions. First, the Understanding does not **know**, as I have said above, the transition of effect to cause, since it is exclusively the affair of the thinking (the Understanding knows as little its function, as the stomach knows that it digests); secondly, its function is exclusively the transition of **effect** to cause, never vice versa. Here **Schopenhauer** assigns the Understanding an impossibility, i.e. **thinking** and earns the criticism he accused **Kant** of, namely to bring **thinking** in **objective perception**.

Meanwhile with this darkening he is not finished yet, the darkness is not intensive enough, full darkness must occur:

> But in every case the business of the Understanding is invariably to apprehend directly causal relations: **first**, as we have seen, those between our own body and other bodies; **then** those between these objectively perceived bodies **among themselves**. (4fold R, § 21)

This is fundamentally false, and the simple aprioric causal law is strongly violated, in order to serve the goals of **Schopenhauer**. It does not require special sharpness, to see what motives led him; for it is clear, that the objective world relies on the Understanding **alone** and support of the **reason** is not needed, only if the Understanding "immediately grasps" the **whole** causal net that encompasses the world. If the latter not possible, then the reason must be called upon. Through this however came (as **Schopenhauer** assumed without any reason), the thinking in objective perception and also causality would not be through and through aprioric, but only the causal relation between my own body and the other bodies would be aprioric, which would wipe out the baselines of the **Schopenhauer**ian system.

Everyone will see, that **Schopenhauer** has also here effectively brought the thinking in perception. The Understanding goes only from the effect **in the sense organ** to the cause. It executes this transition without support of the reason, since it is its function. But this transition gets **known** only due to thinking, i.e. because of reason. The same knows furthermore the transition of the **cause** to effect in the sense organ and eventually it knows the body as object among objects and gains by this the knowledge of causal relations between bodies **among themselves**.

From this becomes clear, that causality, which expresses the causal relation between object and object, is **not** identical with the **causal law**. The first one is a more broad concept, which contains the law as a more narrow concept. So the causality in **Kant**ian sense, which I have called **general causality**, should not be confused with the **Schopenhauer**ian causal

law. The latter only expresses the connection of a certain object (my body) to other bodies, which cause changes in me, and indeed, and like I have to repeatedly emphasize: *the one-sided* relation of *effect* on cause.

The proof for the apriority of causality, in which *Kant* was totally unsuccessful, like *Schopenhauer* brilliantly showed, is therefore also not finished by *Schopenhauer*, since the causal law lies indeed in us *before* all experience, but it does not cover causality. Meanwhile *Schopenhauer* acts as if he has really proven the apriority of causality; furthermore, as if the Understanding grasps all causal relations immediately. The latter is, as we have seen, a subreption (obtaining by false pretenses), since these relations can only be known by thinking and the Understanding cannot think.

When we hear *Schopenhauer* talk about causality, which I will touch upon again below, then we know from now on, first that it is *not* identical with the causal law, secondly, that the law's apriority cannot give it the same nature. It is a *connection a posteriori*.

After this preview I go back to our actual research, if the forms space and time are really enough, to generate the *visualizable* world.

We can put time aside; since it is, as I have shown, not a form of perception, but a composition a posteriori of the reason. Suppose by the way, that it is a form of perception, then it is obvious, that it can only bring the finished objects in a relation, by giving its states of being duration. Superfluously, I want to remind us of *Kant*'s striking remark:

> Time cannot be a determination of outer appearances; it has to do neither with shape nor position.

Therefore only *space* remains and it indeed gives the object shape and position, by precisely bounding the sphere of force and determining its place. However is the object *finished*, when I have its mere outline, when I know, that it is extended this and that long in length, width, depth? Certainly not! The *main issue*: its colors, hardness, smoothness or roughness etc. brief, the *sum* of its activities, which space can only place to its boundaries, cannot be determined by space alone.

Let us remind ourselves, how *Kant* dealt with these ways of activity of bodies. In the Transcendental Aesthetic he disdainfully made them mere sense sensations, which could rely on no transcendental principle in the sensibility, and in the Transcendental Analytic he brought them by the skin of his teeth under the category of quality, according to the rules of Anticipation of subjective perception, for which he gave a wondrous proof.

Schopenhauer dealt with them with even greater harshness. In his first works he calls them specific sense impression, the specifically determined way of activity of the bodies too, from which he immediately jumps off, to arrive at the mere abstract activity in general. Only in his later works he comes closer to the matter. He says:

>The nerves of the organs of sense impart to the phenomenal objects color, sound, taste, smell, temperature, so the brain imparts to them extension, form, impenetrability, the power of

movement, in short all that can only be presented in perception by means of time, space.
(*WWR* V2, § 2)

Furthermore in Parerga:

>I have expressed, that those forms (space, time and causality) are the *brain*'s share in perception, just as specific sense impressions are the share of the respective *sense organs*.

>Just as our eye produces green, red and blue; so does our *brain* produce time, space and causality (whose objectified abstractum is matter). My *perception* of a body is the product of my sense-function and brain-function with x.

This last sentence will fulfill every friend of the *Schopenhauer*ian philosophy with displeasure; for the *intellectuality* of the *perception* gets a mortal wound. As we know, he originally let the only function of the senses be, delivering the raw material for perception; the senses are “the under-workmen of the Understanding” and in that, which they deliver it, does not lie “anything objective”. And therefore our perception is through and through intellectual, not *sensible*. How does this suddenly change, if I look back at the passages above! Now the Understanding partially perceives, partially the sense organs perceive: perception is thus partially sensible, partially intellectual, and the pure intellectuality of perception is irretrievably lost. (In order to prevent misconceptions, I remark, that according to my epistemology, perception is not intellectual but rather *spiritual*: a work of the *complete mind*. The merit of *Schopenhauer* lies in the fact, that he denied the senses the ability to perceive in Fourfold Root.)

Why did *Schopenhauer* fall in this unfortunate contradiction with himself? Clearly because he could as little as *Kant*, find a *form of Understanding*, on which the manners of activity in question can be brought back as a whole. Here, he and *Kant* have left a big gap in epistemology, and to fill it has been a task granted to me. Namely, the form which the Understanding uses as support, is *matter*.

We must also imagine *matter* to ourselves as a point with the ability of *objectifying* the specific way of activity of a body (the sum of its activities). Without this aprioric form of the Understanding, perception would be impossible. Even space would lie uselessly in us, since it can only place the boundaries of a specific activity. As little as the upside down turned image of a house for example on our retina, can become, without the causal law and space, an upright standing object, so little can the in the sense organ generated blue color for example be transferred to an object, without the Understanding and its second form *matter*. Matter is therefore a prerequisite for experiencing objects and is as such aprioric.

(...) [Link to the side-discussion about Schopenhauer's contradictory explanations of matter.](https://old.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/6eol11/3a_schopenhauer_and_kant_on_matter/)

Despite this firm statement, that matter lies *inside* of us, *Kant* could not make it a form of sensibility, like space and time. The reason is clear. First, the forms of sensibility had to be pure perceptions. This characteristic can simply not be given to matter. Second, the “mere sensation” would hereby obtain a transcendental ground, i.e.

>they would become necessary requirements, through which alone the representations can become objects of the senses for us. They are however merely connected with appearances as *accidentally* added effects of the specific subject. ^ (A29)

This is nevertheless false. It is as if I would say: because there are deformed persons and maniacs, the Idea of man cannot be determined. Let us consider colors to start with. All humans with a normal organization of the eye will designate a red, green, blue object as red, green, blue. That there are some people, who cannot differentiate between certain colors, nay, that their retina has not the capability at all, to qualitatively split their eye, is of no importance; because in some way the surface of a body must always bring forth an impression.

Let us stay with a man, who really sees everything *without color*, then his retina has at least the capability, to split *intensively*, i.e. he will distinguish between light and dark and the nuances between the two extremes. An object that appears to normally organized people as *yellow*, will appear for him as *bright*, a *blue* object *dimmer* than yellow etc. but he will always have impressions, according to which he assigns objects certain properties, and this object will *necessarily* appear with the same surface if the lighting is the same. It is not that *everyone* should have of a colored object the same representation, but that they can perceive the surface at all, that it becomes visible for them, brief, that the object becomes *materialized* for them. However, this can only take place, if the Understanding has besides space – the latter only gives outlines – a second form, matter, which it can use as support. Now the object is ready, i.e. its complete activity, as far as it makes impressions on vision, it is objectified.

When we continue with touch, here again the issue is only that I receive a certain impression from the object. Someone will call perhaps *hard*, what I call *soft*; but *that* I call the object hard at all, what another considers to be soft, that depends on the form of Understanding matter, without which the certain impression in the senses could never be carried onto the object.

The same is the case with hearing, smell, taste. When these senses receive a certain impression, then the subject can only impart them through matter (resp. substance, which I will talk about later) onto an object. It is hereby totally unimportant, whether I like for example a wine that disgusts a wine expert.

Generally expressed, matter is that form of Understanding, which *objectifies* the certain and specially determined way of activity of a body. Without it the outside world, despite senses, causal law and space, would be closed for us. All activities, all forces must first become materialized (substantive), before it becomes something for us. *Schopenhauer* is right that matter is the carrier of forces and for our knowledge the vehicle of qualities and forces of nature, but well-understood: it is *in our* head, the force remains *outside* and independent of the head. Every force is for our knowledge *material*, in the object they are inseparable. However force is, independently from the subject, *not* material: it is *only* force, or according to the brilliant teaching of *Schopenhauer*, only *will*.

Here I remark, that the marvelous *Locke* found himself on the right path to the truth, but, looking ahead in the distance, was deceived. Namely, instead of summarizing the by him so astutely detached *secondary* qualities under the concept *matter* and determining the thing-

in-itself as *pure force*, he let them wander as mere sense sensations and made *matter* to *thing-in-itself*. He turned the affair on its head.

This is the right place, to highlight a merit of *Schopenhauer*, which I much prefer to do, since it is the best way to wipe out the painful impression which his fruitless struggle with matter has to make on us: that is, delivering the *true theory on colors*. He did so in his marvelous work: "On vision and colors", which I consider to be among the most important ones, to have ever been written.

(...)

After these necessary side-discussions we return to the *synthesis* of the reason. We remember the great *composition*, time, which it, on the domain of the inner sense, accomplished by the itself moving point of present.

As object of research we take a blooming apple tree at such a distance of us, that it fully emerges on our retina. According to *Schopenhauer* it stands as exclusive work of the Understanding completely finished before us, according to *Kant* we have without *reason* (with him Understanding) only a "rhapsody of perceptions", "a bustle of single appearances", which do *not* constitute a *whole*. I will prove, that *Kant* was right.

Schopenhauer takes an aristocratic glance at and coldly rejects the profound teaching of *Kant* of a composition of a manifold of perceptions and complains, that *Kant* did not properly explain, nor demonstrated, what then this manifold of perceptions, should be *before* the composition by the reason. The complaint is however justified by nothing and it seems, as if he intentionally ignores the clearest passages of the Transcendental Analytic. I remind of the passage cited above, namely this one:

>It was assumed, that the senses deliver not only impressions, but *also put them together* and provide *images* of objects. But for this to happen, is, without doubt, besides the receptivity of impressions something more needed, namely a *function for the synthesis of these impressions*. ^{^(A120)}

If only *Kant* had always written this clearly: a lot of wondrous and lunatic stuff would not have come on the market!

Discussing the synthesis in more detail, *Schopenhauer* deems that: all things are in space and time, their parts are originally unseparated, instead they are united. Therefore everything already originally appears as *continuum*. If however one wants to lay the synthesis in it

>the different sense-impressions of one object to this one only ... is rather a consequence of the knowledge a priori of the causal nexus ... , by virtue of which all those different effects upon my different organs of sense yet lead me only to one common cause of them. (*WWR* V1, Appendix)

Both are false. We have already seen, that time is originally not a continuum, but must be composed into one by reason; *mathematical space*, which we will get to know soon, is likewise composed. Furthermore the Understanding can, by virtue of its function, only search the cause to a change in the sense organ; it can however not know, that diverse activities originate from *one* object, since it is not a composing or thinking faculty. Besides that, this is about different composition.

The great considerateness which *Schopenhauer* manifested, by asking: how do I come to it at all, that I search the cause of a sense impression not *in* myself, but instead, outside of me and effectively moving it outwards – this question which made him find the aprioric causal law –, he left it completely as he went to the construction of the outer world. Here he took the objects as they appear for *adults* and did not ask: must this perception not likewise at first *be learned* as child, like the perception of the right place of an object. But now let us come to business!

We contemplate our blooming apple tree while paying full attention to our eyes, then we will find, that they are in constant movement. We move them from downside to upside, from upside to downside, from right to left and vice versa, brief, we *palpate* the whole tree with our eyes, which use the lighting rays as long feelers, as Schopenhauer strikingly says.

> In examining (*perlustrare*) an object, we let our eyes glide backwards and forwards over it, in order to bring each point of it successively into contact with the center of the retina, which sees most distinctly: we feel it all over with our eyes. (4fold Root, § 21)

Before we do this at all, we already have the tree completely before us, it is already a united object, and we palpate it merely, because those parts, which lie on the sides of the center point of the retina, are not clearly seen by us. This happens at lightning speed, so that we can be conscious of the unquestionable synthesis of the obtained clear representation only with the greatest attentiveness. Our imagination holds upon the clear parts, which if they belong to an object, reason tirelessly conjoins, and by this we obtain a clear image of the full tree.

This synthesis always takes place, although we might have seen this tree a thousand times. It is however essentially made easier by the fact, that we, as adults, presume the concept of *whole* concepts and grasp a new object immediately, in a very short moment, as whole, to precisely observe its parts is our only task.

I started with the hardest example, in order to obtain a sketch of the process. Now we want to let a part of the tree meet the retina and for this goal we place ourselves close to it. If we focus our eyes straight forwards we see a piece of the trunk. We immediately know, that we have a tree before us, but we do not know its figure. Now we start from downside and go up to the top, contemplate it from right to left too and always we lose the contemplated parts from our eyes. In spite of this, we have the complete tree in the imagination. Why? Because our reason composes the parts and the imagination always holds on to what is composed. Here the synthesis manifests itself already very clearly.

Most clearly it becomes, when we leave the eyes and limit ourselves to *touch*; since the eye is the most perfected sense organ and functions with incomparable speed, so that we can capture its procedure only with great effort. Touch is completely different; here our wings are cut off. Let us imagine, that our eyes are closed and we are given an empty frame of a picture. We find an edge, then move our hand until we find another edge, under it another one, until

we come to our starting point. What has actually happened? The Understanding has applied the first impression of my fingertip's nerves to a cause, has placed the boundaries of this cause with help of space, and has given the extended cause, with help of matter, a determined manner of activity (like complete smoothness, certain temperate and density). It cannot do anything else. This procedure is repeated with the second impression, with the third on etc.; always it starts again: connection of the effect to a cause and the structure according to its forms, space and matter. By this manner it produces *partial*-representations, which are, *without reason*, even if the imagination holds onto them, nothing more than a "rhapsody of perceptions", which cannot become an object. But the reason is meanwhile not inactive. Exercising its function, it composes the *partial*-representations and the imagination follows, as loyal follower, always holds the *partial*-representations together. Finally we lift the frame and the Understanding gives it a certain weight and the object is *finished*.

Reason cannot process the impressions of the senses, the Understanding cannot conjoin the sense impressions: only *together* they can generate objects and *Kant* is right, when he says:

> Understanding and sensibility, with us, can determine objects only when they are employed in conjunction, [^](A258, B314)

but, I add, *without categories*, which have become completely superfluous.

Reason composes the partial-representations, which are by space determined according to depth (elevation, deepening, size), length and width, into a figure of space and the special activity of the partial-representations, which matter objectifies, into quality of space, and the object is finished, without help of the Categories of Quantity and Quality. This manner of synthesis has nothing to do with *concepts*.

While *Schopenhauer* recorded only on side of the function of the reason: creation of concepts, he overlooked the other side: synthesis of a manifold of perceptions into objects, and moreover very rightly judged, that thinking can contribute to perception really nothing (or as also *Kant* very fittingly says: perception does not require the functions of thinking in any way), believed to bring the *reason* however *only* thinking in perception, he rejected the profound teaching of the synthesis of a manifold by the Understanding (reason), i.e. he cut off the *best* part of *Kant*'s epistemology. *Thinking* does however not come in any way in perception through the composition of a manifold by reason.

Let us turn back to our apple tree. The composition of single perceptions happens successively. The reason composed and the imagination held upon what was composed at all times. All this found place on the always continuing point of present and the succession in the composition was in no way considered. This is meanwhile accidental, since reason is already in possession of time and, while the synthesis had to link its attentiveness fully on the succession. By this it has given the tree, as long as the contemplation lasted, brought the contemplation itself in a time-relation and has given it duration.

Likewise locomotion (like for example the motion of a branch of our tree) are cognized upon the point of motion, when they are such that they can be perceived as moving compared to resting objects. On the other hand, locomotion, where this is not the case, can only be known

with help of time. The same happens with development, which completes together with the concept change of places, the sphere of the concept of motion (motion covers both concepts). We imagine us that we stand again before our apple tree in autumn. Right now it bears fruit. We have the same tree and nevertheless not the same. A composition of the opposing predicates (blooming and bearing fruit) in the same objects is only possible due to time, i.e. it is very well possible, to perceive the blooming tree to one time and the fruit bearing tree to another time.

Thus we owe time, as we can see very well from this point, an extraordinary great *extension* of our knowledge. Without it we would always be limited to the present.

This is also the right place, to say something about the cognition of the higher animals. *Schopenhauer* assigned them only *Understanding* and denied them *reason*. He had to do this, since he lets the reason only think, not compose, and it is certain that animals know no concepts. My explanation of reason as an ability, of achieving two very different ways of compositions, which relies on a *single* function (in essence I merely free the gold of a brilliant thought of *Kant* from an on it poured heap of worthless soil), proves itself here to be very fertile. Every day, animals give proofs, that they are not completely limited to the present, and people break their head about it, how they come to their actions. Sometimes they are assigned only reason, i.e. the capability of thinking in *concepts*, or everything is put under instinct. Both are false. They merely have a one-sided reason. They compose; compose therefore images on the always continuing point of present, brief, they can think in *images*.

Let us look back! The visualizable world is ready. Object stands next to object, they rest or move themselves, they all develop themselves and they stand in a relation to time, which is not an infinite pure perception a priori, but instead a composition *a posteriori* grounded upon the floating aprioric point of present.

The next thing which we have to discuss is mathematical space.

As I have shown above, space is, as form of Understanding, a point with the ability, to place the boundaries of the spheres of activity of the objects into three directions. As it is and for itself space has no extension, although all extension can only objectify itself by it. It is the reprehensible game of the frivolous reason, to take the space away from the hands of the Understanding (which uses it only for the determination of *objects*), to extend it, in unhindered continuation of its synthesis, to unify empty spatialities (which can only exist in our fantasy) in an empty *objective* space, whose dimensions extend into infinity.

On the other hand it is nevertheless correct, that every object is active towards three directions. Not the size of this activity depends on the point-space – it is present independently from our head – but never we would be able, to *perceive* it, without the point-space, which lies in us for this goal and therefore it is a prerequisite a priori for the possibility of experience.

Since this conformity exists, I can say of every body, before I know it, so a priori, that it is active towards three directions. The from its content separated pure form is suited, to essentially extend human knowledge. So the reason is justified, to synthetically shape it.

This is the case with mathematical space; since no one will question its utility. The reason composes, like partial-representations into objects, fantasized spatialities into mathematical space.

That it is a composition is clear. As little as I have with an object immediately as a whole, so little is the mathematical space given me as prepared, as pure perception. Or with the words of *Kant*:

>Appearances are all without exception magnitudes, and indeed extensive magnitudes, because as perceptions in space or time, they must be represented by the same synthesis whereby space and time can be determined at all. ^{B203}

It is hardly necessary, to mention, that mathematical space has *only* scientific and indirectly practical worth and that the perception of objects is fully and completely independent from it. They only come about with support of the form of Understanding space, the point-space. By this time essentially distinguishes itself from mathematical space; since knowledge of many locomotions and all developments are impossible without time.

(3a) Schopenhauer and Kant on matter

https://old.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/6eol11/3a_schopenhauer_and_kant_on_matter/

And now I have to present a web of contradictions, in which *Schopenhauer* enrolled himself regarding matter. Matter has been the heavy philosopher's cross he had to carry during his long life, and it pulverized his so important thinking power during some moments so much, that word combinations emerged, which we can imagine nothing about. We have already met one above. There, matter was:

>"the most objective abstractum of space, time and causality"

which vividly reminds of the *Hegel*ian "Idea in its other-being."

Following *Schopenhauer* on the error in which he often indulged, we initially find many explanations of matter on subjective ground. The main passages are the following ones:

1. Space and time are not only, each for itself, presupposed by matter; but a *union* of the two constitutes its *essence*. (*WWR* V1, § 4)
2. Time and Space are only perceptible when filled. Their *perceptibility* is Matter. (Fourfold Root, § 18)
3. Matter shows that it springs from *time* by *quality* (accidents), without which it never exists, and which is plainly always *causality*, action upon other matter, and therefore change (a *time concept*). (*WWR* V1, § 4)
4. The form is conditioned by *space*, and quality or activity, by *causality*. (*WWR* V2, On matter)
5. What we think under the conception matter, is the residue which remains over after bodies have been divested of their *form* and of all their specific qualities : a residue, which precisely

on that account must be identical in all bodies. Now these shapes and qualities which have been abstracted by us, are nothing but the peculiar, specially defined way in which these bodies act, which constitutes precisely their difference. If therefore we leave these shapes and qualities out of consideration, there remains nothing but mere activity in general, pure action as such, *Causality* (!) itself, objectively thought— that is, the reflection of our own Understanding, the externalised image of its sole function (!) ; and Matter is *throughout* pure *Causality*, its essence is Action in general. This is why pure Matter cannot be perceived, but can only be *thought* : it is a something we *add* to every reality, as its basis, in thinking it. (Fourfold Root, § 21)

6. In reality we think under *pure matter* only action, in the abstract, quite independent of the kind of action, thus pure causality itself; and as such it is not an *object* but a *condition* of experience, just like space and time. This is the reason why in the accompanying table of our pure a priori knowledge matter is able to take the place of causality, and therefore appears along with space and time as the third *pure form*, and therefore as dependent on our intellect. (*WWR* V2, On knowledge a priori)

I will not discuss again, the misuse which *Schopenhauer* commits again with *causality* in one passage, which is certainly not the *function* of the Understanding; but I must protest against the new proposition, that causality is identical with *activity*. As little as a general law of nature is identical with *force*, which works according to the law, this little causality and activity are one and the same. Causality says only: every change in nature must have a cause. What has this *formal* law to do with activity on its own and in itself? The activity of a body is its force and this has been brought back by *Schopenhauer* to will, which is identical with it. He wishes to merge two totally different concepts, mix the formal with the material, so that he can fish in murky waters, a proceeding which cannot be tolerated. But this is noted incidentally.

Matter is first a *union* of space and time. What should that mean? Space and time are, according to *Schopenhauer*, basic forms of our cognition, which should be given content, if they want to be something at all. Very inaptly *Schopenhauer* expresses the latter in the second passage with the words: matter *is* the perceptibility of space and time; since he clearly had wanted to say: *through* matter space and time become perceptible. Both sentences are however very different; for in the former something is said about the *essence* of matter, while in the latter space and time are made dependent on matter, of which the essence remains thereby untouched.

The mere union of two pure, empty perceptions should now be matter! How is it possible, that an eminent mind could write such a thing. Even the extravagant fantasy of the ancient Egyptian priests and those of Zarathustra did not assign space and time such *procreative power*.

In the 3th and 4th passage it is determined, that matter does *not* appear without *quality* and that space conditions its form. But in the 5th passage we should think under the concept the opposite, that is, that which remains from bodies, when we have divested them their *form* and *quality*! Furthermore matter is without more ado separated from space and time, in whose union it should nevertheless have its essence.

Then suddenly we should no longer seek its essence in space, time and causality, rather in reason. Matter becomes a *Kant*ian Category, a pure concept a priori, which we should think as basis to every reality.

Finally in the 6th passage *Schopenhauer* places it with *one* foot in *reason*, with the other in *Understanding*, to figurate, next to space and time, as third formal, the dependency of our intellect. The intellect is certainly its only rightful location, but not because it is identical with causality, rather because without it an *activity* could not be objectified.

Also *Schopenhauer* did not earnestly assign it that location, as we will immediately come to see. He casts it out again, not to give it somewhere a permanent location, rather to make it a second “eternal Jew”. One time only, he has the mood to bring it under the intellect. He calls it:

>the *visibility* of the will,

which is identical with the *Kant*ian thing-in-itself. Meanwhile he jumps off of this explanation too, which is equally an incorrect one, already therefore incorrect, since accordingly a *blind person* could not come to the representation of material things.

In the *subject* – this we have seen – there is no place for matter anymore. Maybe it can find accommodation in the *object*.

This is nevertheless, if one watches more closely, impossible; for *Schopenhauer* says:

> when an Object is assumed as being determined in any particular way, we also assume that the Subject knows precisely in that particular way. So far therefore it is immaterial whether we say that: Objects have such and such peculiar inherent determinations, or: the Subject knows in such and such ways. (Fourfold Root, § 41)

Accordingly, if matter is not a *form of perception*, then it cannot show itself in the object. Nevertheless *Schopenhauer* makes the impossible, with a violent trick, possible. Matter, which he cannot lose sight of, which incessantly tortures him and thereby impresses him, has to, since it can find no accommodation in the intellect and *Schopenhauer* for now does not dare to place it on the throne of the thing-in-itself, find some way to locate it. He therefore splits the world as representation and gives it two *poles*, namely:

> the simple knowing subject without the forms of its knowledge, and crude matter without form and quality. (*WWR* 2, The standpoint of Idealism)

Hereby he enters the fairway of materialism and the goal which it heads toward is, seen from here, recognizable. One can read the first chapter of this volume, which also contains the dubious passage:

> *It is just as true* that the knower is a product of *matter* as that matter is merely the representation of the knower ; but it is also just as one-sided.

and one can suspect what comes.

And indeed, it rapidly goes downhill. Also on the pole of the world as representation it does not fit for a long time. He shoves it away from this place and places it *between* the world of

representation, whose pole it once was, and will, i.e. between the appearance and that what appears, the thing-in-itself, which is separated by “a deep gulf, a radical difference”. It becomes the *bond* between the world as will and the world as representation. (*WWR* 2, On matter)

Now only two steps are possible, and *Schopenhauer* makes both of them. He first declares matter to be *quasi-identical* with the will, then he fully replaces the will by matter.

> That matter for itself, thus separated from form, cannot be visualized or presented in imagination depends upon the fact that in itself, and as the pure substantiality of bodies, it is *actually the will itself*. (On matter)

and:

> If an *absolute* must absolutely be had, then I will give one which is far better fitted to meet all the demands which are made on such a thing than these visionary phantoms ; it is *matter*. It has no beginning, and it is imperishable ; thus it is really *independent*, and *quod per se est et per se concipitur* ^1; from its womb all proceeds, and to it all returns ; what more can be desired of an absolute ? (*WWR* V1, Appendix)

I am finished. If there is in philosophy something else besides subject, object, thing-in-itself, then *Schopenhauer* would have brought in matter. He starts in the *subject* with *space* and *time*; then he places matter in *time* and *causality*; then in space and causality; then in *causality alone*; then he places it *half* in the *intellect, half* in the *reason*, ; then *completely* in the *reason*; then *completely* in the *intellect*, then as correlate of the intellect, on this opposing *pole* of the world as representation, then between world as *representation* and world as *will*; then he makes it *quasi-identical* with the *will*, finally he raises *it alone* on the throne of the thing-in-itself.

No view has lasted with *Schopenhauer*; he changes often and accepts sometimes multiple views in one chapter. This is why matter is an unsteadily roaming ghost in his works, which always vanishes, when one believes to have grasped it, and re-appears in a new form. In his last years *Schopenhauer* seems to have stayed with the explanation: *matter is the visibility of the will*. I have already shown how inadmissible this limitation of matter is, which relies on vision. Extremely unsound however is, how he introduces the visibility. One would assume, that matter, as visibility of the will, must completely fall in the subject. But no! It is:

> the visibility of the will, or the bond between the world as will and the world as representation. (On matter)

Thus it either does not fall in the subject, or it stands with one foot in the subject and with other in the thing-in-itself. He could, as much warm-up as he used, *not* decide, to place matter fully and completely, as a *form* of Understanding, in the subject. Because he could not separate matter from will, but rather made *both* (in the essence of his thought) *independent* from the knowing subject, they darken and distort each other simultaneously. Let one read the 24th chapter of the second volume of *WWR* (TN; “On matter”) and one will agree with me. I know no more contradictory work. Most of the mentioned explanations are reflected in it and the confusion is indescribable. He expresses there openly:

> that it does not belong so entirely and in every regard to the *formal* part of our knowledge as space and time, but contains *simultaneously* an a posteriori given element.

In this chapter he also says, that matter is *actually* (!) the will itself. How clear would his philosophy have become, if he had done the single right thing, namely totally separating matter and will from each other, the former *in* our head, the latter *outside* our head.

Kant is regarding matter free from inconsequences. Though matter is with him not a form of sensibility, like space and time, it nevertheless lies completely in the subject. A few beautiful passages from the first edition of the Critique I want to cite:

>Matter is not a thing by itself, but only a class of representations within us. ^{A360}

>Matter is nothing but a mere form, or a certain mode of representing an unknown object by that intuitive perception, which we call the external sense. ^{A385}

>There may therefore well be something outside us, to which the appearance which we call matter corresponds; though in its quality of appearance it cannot be outside us, but merely a thought within us, although that thought represents itself through the external sense as existing outside of us. ^{A385}

>All difficulties with regard to a possible connection between a thinking nature and matter arise, without exception, from that subrepted dualistic representation, namely, that matter, as such, is not appearance, that is, a mere representation of the mind to which an unknown object corresponds, but the object itself, such as it exists outside us, and independent of all sensibility. ^{A391}

^**1** Comes from Spinoza: *Per substantiam intelligo id, quod in se est, et per se concipitur: hoc est id, cujus conceptus non indiget conceptu alterius rei, a quo formari debet.* / By substance I understand what is in itself and is conceived through itself, i.e., that whose concept does not require the concept of another thing, from which it must be formed.

(4) Conclusions

https://old.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/60ug6i/4_conclusions/

We will now examine causal relations.

For everyone it is as certain as an irrefutable fact, that nothing in the world happens without cause. Nevertheless there has been no lack of those, who have called into doubt, the necessity of this highest law of nature, causality.

It is clear, that the general validity of the law is only then protected from all doubt, if it can be shown, that it lies *before* all experience in us, i.e. that, without it, it would be impossible, to perceive an object at all, or to generate an *objectively* valid connection of the appearances.

Kant tried to prove the apriority of causality from the latter (lower) standpoint, in which he was completely unsuccessful. *Schopenhauer* has thoroughly disproven the “second Analogy of Experience” in § 23 of Fourfold Root (particularly using that all following from is following after, but not all following after is following from), which I refer to.

Even if *Kant*'s proof for the apriority of causality would not contain a contradiction, it would nevertheless be false, because it rests upon a pure concept of Understanding and, as we know, pure concepts a priori are impossible. It was therefore *Schopenhauer*'s task, to prove the apriority of causality in a different way. He positioned himself at the higher standpoint, i.e. he showed, that we, without causal law, would never be able, to perceive the world, that it therefore *must* be given to us *before* all experience. He made the transition of effect (change in the sense organ) to cause the sole function of the Understanding.

Meanwhile I have already refuted above that, that the simple and completely determined function of the Understanding does experience an extension by the Understanding itself. The causal relations, which as a whole fall under the concept of causality, are *not covered* by the *Schopenhauer*ian causal law. They can be established by the *reason*, as I will immediately show.

Initially, reason knows the causal interconnection between representations and the immediate object (my body). They are only my representations, since they are the causes in my senses. The *transition* from their effects to them is the affair of the Understanding, the *connection* of the effects with the causes *and* vice versa is the work of reason. Both relations are connected to knowledge by it.

This aprioric causal interconnection between me and perceived objects determines nothing more, than that the objects affect *me*. Whether they affect other objects too, is still a question. An unconditional direct certainty about that cannot be given, since we are not able, to leave our skin. On the other hand it is just as clear, that only a lost reason can desperately hold onto this critical reservation.

First and foremost reason recognizes, that my body is not a *privileged subject*, but instead an object among objects, and transfers, based on this knowledge, the relation of cause and effect to objects among each other. Thus it subjects, by this *extension*, all appearances of possible experience, to causality (the *general causality*), whose law from now on contains the general formulation: wherever in nature a change takes place, it is the effect of a cause, which preceded it in time.

By subjecting the changes of all objects to causality, grounded on the causal law, reason connects the activity of appearances. Like it did before with those appearances themselves, by composing the partial-representations into objects. And by this it essentially extends our knowledge. Hereby however it has not come to an end.

From the knowledge, that all bodies, without exception, are incessantly active (otherwise they could not even be objects of experience) it gains the other knowledge, that they are active in all directions, that there are therefore no separated, parallel to each other running rows of causality, but instead that every body, directly and indirectly, affects all others and *simultaneously* experiences the activity of all others bodies on itself. By this new connection (community) reason gains the knowledge of an interconnected nature.

Kant treats the community in the third Analogy of Experience and has his eyes fixed on nothing else, than the dynamic interconnection of the objects. *Schopenhauer* however did not want to concede reciprocity in this sense and opens a polemic against it, which reminds us of Don Quixote's struggle with the windmills and is really petty. Reciprocity is not a concept a priori; the *Kant*ian proof also does not suffice; but the issue, which it is about, has full validity. *Schopenhauer* stays at the word reciprocity, which should say, that two states of two bodies are *simultaneously* cause and effect of each other. In no syllable *Kant* has argued such a thing. He merely says:

> Each substance must contain in itself the causality of certain determinations in the other substance, and at the same time the effects of the causality of that other; ^{A212, B259}

as with two wrestlers, both press and get pressed, without the pressure of one being the cause of the pressure of the other and vice versa.

We stand before the most important question of epistemology. It is: Is the object of my perception the thing-in-itself, gone through the forms of the subject, or does the object give me no justification, to assume a thing-in-itself as its ground?

The question is answered by the pre-question: Is the cause of a change in my sense organ *independent* from the subject, or is the cause itself from subjective origin?

Kant made causality into a pure form of thinking a priori, which had only the goal, to place appearances in a necessary relation among each other. The empirical content of perception is, according to him, simply given and independent from causality. Causality, which therefore can only find application on the appearances, has only validity on the domain of appearances, and would be completely abused, if I transgress this domain, to record something behind the world as representation with help of causality. Though all *Kant*'s researches have the clearly expressed goal, to define the limits of human knowledge, where on the other side the "shoreless ocean" begins with its "deceptive prospects". He does not get tired of warning us for sailing this ocean, and asserting in many ways, that:

> the *pure forms of Understanding* can never be used for transcendental applications, but at all times empirical applications.

Nevertheless he has violently made use of causality, in order to obtain the thing-in-itself, when he, according to this law, concludes a ground, from the appearance on what appears, an intelligible cause. He did it, because he feared nothing more than the allegation, that his philosophy is pure idealism, which makes the whole objective world into illusion and takes away *All* reality from it. The three

[remarks](https://www.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/60ug6i/4_conclusions/dizplb3/) (TN; at the end) of the first part of the Prolegomena, with this in mind, are very much worth reading. I cannot condemn this great inconsequence. It was the smaller one of two evils, and *Kant* bravely embraced it. Meanwhile *Kant* gained nothing by this subreption; because, as I have mentioned above, a thing-in-itself without extension and motion, in short a mathematical point, is for human thought *nothing*.

Let us assume that *Kant* obtained the thing-in-itself by a justified method and we know only, *that* it is, not how it is, thus the object would be nothing else, but the thing-in-itself, as it *appears* according to the forms our knowledge. Or as Kant says:

> In fact, when we (rightly) regard the objects of the senses as mere appearances, we thereby admit that they have a thing in itself as their ground—namely, the thing of which they are appearances. We do not know what this thing is like in itself; all we know is its appearance, viz. how this unknown something affects our senses. (Prolegomena, § 32)

This is the right foundation of the transcendental or critical idealism; however *Kant* has obtained it *by fraud*.

The intended inconsequence was very soon discovered *(G. E. Schulze)*. *Schopenhauer* discusses it several times, particularly in *Parerga*. He accuses *Kant*, that he did not say, as the truth demands:

> simply and absolutely that the object is conditioned by the subject, and conversely ; but only that the manner of the appearance of the object is conditioned by the forms of knowledge of the subject, which, therefore, also come a priori to consciousness, (*WWR* V1, appendix)

and explains, that on the way of *representation* one *cannot* transgress the representation. How is it explicable that he stands on the viewpoint of the *Fichte*an idealism, although he could not find enough words, to condemn it? He has found the thing-in-itself on a different way, as will, and therefore did not have to fear being called an empirical idealist.

Is it then really impossible, to come to the thing-in-itself on the way of representation? I say: *certainly it is possible*, and indeed with use of the *Schopenhauer*ian causal law. The *Kant*ian causality cannot lead us to it, but this law can.

The Understanding becomes active, as soon as in some sense organ a change takes place; since its sole function is the transition of the change to its cause. Now can this cause, like the change, lie *in* the subject? No! it must lie outside of it. Only through a *miracle* could it be in the subject; since without doubt a *notification* takes place for example to see an object. I may *want* a thousand times to see another object than this determined one, I would *not* succeed. The cause is therefore fully and completely independent from the subject. If it would nevertheless lie *in* the subject, then the only option is assuming an intelligible cause, which brings forth with invisible hand changes in my sense organs, i.e. we have the *Berkeley*an idealism: *the grave of all philosophy*. Then we act very wise, when we, as soon as possible, reject all research with the words of *Socrates*: I know one thing only, that I know nothing.

We will not do this however, rather we keep standing there, that every change in the sense organ directs to an outside of me lying activity (subjective: cause). *Space* is not there, to first generate this “outside of me” (we belong to nature and nature does not play hide-and-seek with itself), but instead, as we know, to give the sphere of activity but to place – as we now openly dare to say – the *thing-in-itself* boundaries and determine its placement among the other things-in-themselves.

If *Schopenhauer* would have entered this way, which he had opened in such considerate manner, then his brilliant system would not have become a fragmented, necessarily glued, by incurable contradictions ill system, which one can explore only with great indignation and

admiration. If he did not enter it, he has downrightly disavowed the truth, and indeed with full consciousness. Certainly, he was not allowed to enter it, since he, like *Kant*, believed, that space is a pure perception a priori; however it would have been more honorable for him to, like *Kant* with causality, to leave the suggestion of an inconsequence, than proclaiming that the causes of an appearance lie, like the sensation of the sense organ, *in* the subject.

I say: *Schopenhauer* has consciously denied the truth. Let everyone judge for himself. In Fourfold Root § 21:

> *Locke* has completely and exhaustively proved, that the feelings of our senses, even admitting them to be roused by external causes, cannot have any resemblance whatever to the qualities of those causes. Sugar, for instance, bears no resemblance at all to sweetness, nor a rose to redness. *But that they should need an external cause at all*, is based upon a law whose origin lies demonstrably within us, in our brain ; therefore this necessity is not less subjective than the sensations themselves.

What an open sophistry and intentional mix-up! On the causal law relies merely the *perception* of the active thing-in-itself, not its *activity itself*, which would be present too without a subject. The causal law is the formal expression for the necessary, exceptionalness, always the same staying operation of the Understanding: to seek that, what changes a sense organ. First the reflecting reason connects *based on general causality* the change in the sense organ as *action* with that, which evoked it, as cause; i.e. it brings the from subject totally independent real effect of a thing-in-itself in a causal relation. The formal causal interconnection is therefore indeed always *purely subjective* (without subject no relation of cause and effect), but not its real dynamic ground.

As certain as it is, that I, without the causal law, would *not* come to objective perception – from which *Schopenhauer* very properly deduces its apriority – this certain it is, that the Understanding can*not* exert its function without an impact from *outside*, from which I deduce with the same good right, that the activity of the things, thus its force, is *independent* from the subject.

We consider the last composition, which reason brings about. It is the *substance*.

Matter, a form of Understanding, we have to imagine us, like space and present, as the image of a point. It is only the capacity, to precisely and truthfully objectify the specific activity of a thing-in-itself, to make it perceivable. Now, since the diverse activities of the things, as far as they must become objects of perception, must enter in this *single* form of Understanding *without exception*, matter becomes the *ideal subtract* of all things. By this, reason is given a diverse homogeneity, which it connects into a single *substance*, from which forms of activity are merely *accidental changes*.

Reason connects so rigorously and without exception in this direction, that even the things-in-themselves, (who so to speak can only be forced by surprise, to make a weak impression on our senses,) immediately become substantive for us, like for example pure nitrogen, whose presence can be concluded merely because it makes breathing and burning impossible.

Based on this ideal composition we attain the representation of a *completed* world; because with it we objectify also all those sense impressions, which the Understanding cannot mold in its forms, space and matter, like tones, smells, colorless gasses.

This composition contains no danger, as long as I am conscious, that it is an *ideal* composition. Is it recognized as *real*, then the clumsy and thereby *transcendental* materialism arises, whose practical usefulness I have recognized in my work, but which must be unconditionally shown the door on *theoretical* domain. *Schopenhauer* sometimes pulls his hand away from it, then stretches his hand out to it, depending on whether he places matter in the subject, or in the object, or in the thing-in-itself, or between one and the other, during his regrettable odyssey. We will not make ourselves guilty of this unfortunate halfness.

How is now the *unity* concluded of this substance?, this ideal composition, based on matter, a form of Understanding. Only because the themselves objectifying forces, in a certain sense, are *essentially similar* and form together a collective-unity. From the nature of this substance, which is only unitary, can only be extracted what is in accordance with this nature, as determination of the, it juxtaposing diverse ways of activity of the bodies, like the essence of time is succession, since in the real development of things is succession, and space has to have three dimensions, since every force is extended in three directions. What has now as inseparable, with the substance been connected? The *persistence*, i.e. something, which does not lie in it, a property, which is not extracted from it, but from the *activity of some* things in *empirical* way.

Thus we see that *Kant* deduces the persistence of the substance not from it, but from the aprioric time, and *Schopenhauer* calls upon space for its support:

>The firm immovability of *space*, which presents itself, as the persistence of the substance.

But actually he deduces it from the *causality*, which he makes for this goal, on the most arbitrary way, identical with matter and in turn makes its essence (but only as long as he wants to prove the persistence of the substance a priori) stand in the intimate union of space and time.

> Intimate union of space and time causality, matter, actuality are thus one, and the subjective correlative of this one is the Understanding. (*WWR* V1, appendix)

How the most diverse concepts are blurred here into one pot! As *Hamlet* said: Words, words, words!

In the course of our critique everything revealed, that our cognition has aprioric forms and functions solely for the goal, of *recognizing* the from subject independent real. Nature, which we are part of, does not play an unworthy game with us. It does not deceive us, does not hide itself; it merely wants to be questioned honestly. It always gives the upright researcher, as far as it can, a satisfying answer.

One thing we have not examined yet, that is, by what is the synthesis of a manifold juxtaposed on the real side?

Kant denies a from the *object* coming *coercion* to a determined synthesis. Immediately the question arises: by what should the synthetic subject know, that the from the sensibility to the Understanding delivered *partial*-representations belong to *one* object? How come, that I always compose exactly the same part into one object and *never* doubt what does belongs together, and what does not? *Kant* does not explain this operation and we have to assume, that the judgement-power, as it were instinctively, correctly chooses the into one object belonging parts and composes them into extensive magnitudes.

We stand on better ground than *Kant*. As I have shown above, space is the form of Understanding, by virtue of which the subject can perceive the boundaries of the activity of a thing-in-itself, thus it does not lend him the extension first. Every thing-in-itself is an in itself closed force of a determined intensity, i.e. every thing-in-itself has individuality and is essentially a unity. Reason can therefore only compose into one magnitude that, which it encounters as an individual whole; i.e. it can only know through synthesis, that which, independent from it, as unity, as individuality, is present. It thus always knows due to the available continuity of the individual force to distinguish, what belongs to it, and what does not.

We draw near the end. I summarize. As we have seen, is the world with *Kant* through and through illusion, a perfected work of art of the Understanding, from his own means, *by* himself, *in* himself, *for* himself, with one word: a miracle! This is would be the case even, if he would have succeeded, in finding a real basis for the thing-in-itself. He would have obtain it through trickery however, since his philosophy opens no way to the thing-in-itself.

The world as representation with *Schopenhauer* is likewise through and through a product of the subject, nothing but deception. Against his better knowledge and judgement, with harsh sophisms, he made it to it with violent methods, partially out of real need, since his philosophy rests upon breakable pillars (on space and time as pure perceptions a priori), partially out of carelessness, since he was in the position to juxtapose against the ideal world as representation a real world as Will.

One would deceive oneself however, if one were to believe, that *Schopenhauer* has maintained until the end, that the world as representation is nothing else, but a pure web and tissue of the perceiving subject. He was a genius, a great philosopher, but not a consequent thinker. One and the same philosophical matter has presented itself before his restless mind countless times, and always he found new perspectives, but he did not knew, with rare exceptions, to unify them in a whole. For his philosophy the remark of the *Goethe*'an Theory of Colors fully applies:

> It is a continuous stating and revoking, an unconditionally declaring and instantly limiting, so that at the same time everything and nothing is true.

He has on one side greatly perfected the *Kant*ian epistemology, on the other hand essentially corrupted, and was trapped in self-deception, when he awarded himself the merit, of

> having *completed* the from the most decided materialism starting, but into idealism leading row of philosophers. (Paralipomena, § 61)

Initially he said in Parerga:

> The thing-in-itself *actually* cannot be ascribed extension, nor duration.

Here we encounter for the second time the very characteristic “actually”. Already above it was: matter is *actually* the will. We will still often encounter this “actually”, and at the conclusion of this critique I will compile a few “actualities” into a small bouquet.

Then he says:

> The organism itself is nothing but the will which has entered the region of representation, the will itself, perceived in the cognitive form of Space. (Will in Nature, comparative anatomy)

The will is *Schopenhauer*'s thing-in-itself; it is thus openly admitted, that the thing-in-itself has directly gone through the form of perception space of the subject. Everyone can see here, that this is only about the way and manner how the thing-in-itself appears to the subject, although *Schopenhauer* reproaches *Kant*, as we know, that he has not, as the truth demands, simply declared that the object implies the subject and vice versa, instead of the way and manner the object appears etc. But where in this passage is the object, which should completely shroud the thing-in-itself?

Also other kind of questions can arise at this passage. Is the body really only the in the cognitive form space perceived will? But where is time? Where is the special activity of the Idea human. And does this conclusion, that the body is the will gone through the subjective cognitive form, not get drawn because of the causal law? whilst we can read in *WWR* V1, § 5:

>It is needful to guard against the grave error of supposing that because perception arises through the knowledge of causality, the relation of subject and object is that of cause and effect. For this relation subsists between objects alone.

The most important passage is however the following one:

>Generally speaking, however, it may be said that in the objective world, so in the visualizable representation, nothing can manifest itself at all which does not have in the essence of things-in-themselves and thus in the *will* that underlies the *appearance*, a tendency that is precisely modified to suit. *For the world as representation can furnish nothing from its own resources,* but for this very reason it cannot serve up any fanciful or frivolously invented fairy-tale. The infinite variety of the forms and even colourings of plants and their blossoms must yet be everywhere the *expression* of a subjective essence that is just as modified; *i.e. the will as thing-in-itself, which manifests itself in them,* must be exactly reflected through them. (Paralipomena, § 102b)

What an internal struggle *Schopenhauer* must have had, before he had written this passage. Its consequence is that the object is nothing else, but thing-in-itself gone through the forms of the subject, something which he most strongly denied in his world as representation. On the other hand it is highly painful to see how this great man, struggles with truth, whose loyal and noble disciple he incessantly was.

Kant's section through what is real and what is ideal was no section at all. He misjudged the truth so completely, that even that which is the most real of all, *force*, was pulled to the subjective side and was not even worthy of a category: he made it belong to the predicables of the pure Understanding. He simply made the real ideal and thus ended with only ideal in his hand. *Schopenhauer*'s division of the world in a world as representation and a world as will is likewise a flawed one, since what is real can and must be separated in the world as representation from what is ideal.

I believe, that I have succeeded, to put the knife at the *right* place. The center of gravity of the transcendental philosophy, which my philosophy relies on, does not lie in the subjective forms space and time. Not in the width of a hair a thing-in-itself is active beyond where space has indicated its extension; not in the width of a hair is the real motion of a thing-in-itself beyond my present: my subjective cork ball stands always exactly at the point of the *world*-development. The center of gravity lies in the subjective form *matter*. Not that matter does not faithfully reflect the essence of a thing-in-itself up to details – no! it does reflect it faithfully, for this goal it is precisely a form of Understanding; the difference lies more fundamentally, in the *essence* of both. The essence of matter is absolutely something different, than that of the force. The force is everything, is the only thing which is real in the world, is completely independent and autonomous; matter however is ideal, is nothing without the force.

Kant says:

> If I take away the thinking subject, the whole material world must vanish, for it is nothing but an appearance in the sensibility of our subject, and a class of its representations.

And *Schopenhauer* says:

>No object without subject.

Both statements rest upon pure perceptions a priori, space and time, and *correct* conclusions from *wrong* premises. If I take away the thinking subject, then I certainly know, that individual forces, in real development, remain, but that they have lost *materiality*: “the material world must vanish”, “no object anymore”.

We thus have:

a. aprioric forms and functions

on the subjective side|*on the real side*

---|---

Causal law|Activity in general

Point-space|Sphere of activity

Matter|Force

Synthesis|Individuality
Present|Point of motion

b. ideal compositions

on the subjective side|*on the real side*

---|---

General causality|One thing-in-itself affecting another

Community|Dynamic interconnection of the complete world

Substance|Collective-Unity of the world

Time|Real succession

Mathematical space|Absolute nothingness

We will now quickly produce the *visualizable* world according to *my* epistemology (continuation of the *Kant-Schopenhauer*ian epistemology).

1. In the *senses* a change takes place.

2. The *Understanding*, whose *function*

>is the causal law and its forms *space* and *matter*, searches the cause of the change, constructs it spatially (puts boundaries of the activity in length, width, depth) and makes it material (objectification of the specific nature of the force)

3. The thus constructed representations are *partial*-representations. The Understanding offers them to the

> *Reason*, whose *function* is *synthesis* and its *form* the *present*. Reason composes them into complete objects with support of

>

> *Judgement-power*, whose *function* is: judge what is homogenous, and

>

> *Imagination*, whose *function* is: hold on to that which is composed.

Thus far we have single, completed objects, next above and behind each other, without dynamic interconnection and standing in the point of present. All mentioned forms and functions are aprioric, i.e. they are inborn, lie *before* all experience in us.

Reason now comes based on these aprioric functions and forms to the production of compositions and connections. It composes:

>a. the always continuing points of present traversed and to be traversed positions into *time*, which must be imagined as the image of a line of indefinite length. With help of time we know:

1. Locomotions that are not perceivable;

2. The development (inner motion) of the things.

Reason composes:

>b. based on the point-space arbitrary large empty space-particles into *mathematical space*. On it relies mathematics, which essentially extends our knowledge.

It connects:

>c. based on the causal law

1. the change in the *subject* with a thing-in-itself, which caused it;
2. every change in any Thing in the world with the thing-in-itself which caused it: *general causality*;
3. all things among each other, while it recognizes, that every Thing affects all other things and all things affect every single thing: *community*.

Finally reason connects:

>d. all different, by the matter objectified types of working of the things into one *substance*, with which the subject objectifies all such sense impressions, which reason cannot shape.

All these compositions are brought about *a posteriori*. They are the formal net, in which the subject hangs, and with it we spell out: the activity, the real interconnection and the real development of all individual forces. Therefore the empirical *affinity* of all things is not, as *Kant* wants, a *result* of the transcendental affinity, instead they both run parallel.

From this point of view the Transcendental Aesthetics and the Transcendental Analytic of *Kant* manifest their complete magnificent importance. In them he has, with exceptional sharpness, recorded,

> the *inventory* of all our possessions through *pure reason*, $\wedge(AXX)$

with the exception of the causal law. He erred only in the determination of the true nature of space, time and the Categories and, by not juxtaposing something *real* against the single subjective pieces.

If we arrange the *ideal* compositions according to the table of Categories, then in the remainder belong

1. *Of Quantity*| 2. *Of Quality*|3. *Of Relation*|

----|----|----

Time|Substance|General causality

Mathematical space| |Community

I have, while still standing on the domain of world as representation, found the *forms* of the thing-in-itself: individuality and real development, and have as well strictly separated force from matter and have the truth on my side. It is as unfounded as it is a common opinion in philosophy since *Kant*, that development is a *time-concept*, and is therefore only possible due to time (it is the same, if I were to say: the horseman carries the horse, the ship carries

the current); similarly, that extension is a *space-concept*, therefore only possible due to space. All upright empiricists must form a closed front against these doctrines, since only nutcases can deny the real development of the things and their strict "I-ness", and natural sciences based on empirical idealism are completely impossible. On the other hand it is impossible for the thinker who has absorbed *Kant*'s teachings, to believe in a completely from subject independent world. To escape from this dilemma *Schelling* invented the identity of the Ideal and Real, which *Schopenhauer* fittingly disavows with the words:

>Schelling hurried to proclaim, his own invention, the absolute identity of the subjective and the objective, or the ideal and the real, what implies, that everything, which rare minds like Locke and Kant separated with an incredible effort of sharpness and reflection, is to be poured in the porridge of an absolute identity.

The only path, on which that which is real can be separated from what is ideal, is the one proceeded by me. What obstructed its entrance, was the false assumption, that space and time are pure perceptions a priori, whose invalidity I had to prove first.

My theory is nothing less than a philosophy of identity. The separation of matter from force proves this sufficiently. But furthermore there exists a more fundamental difference between the causal law and the activity of the things; between space, this faculty, to extend in *indefinite* length into three dimensions, and a certain determined individuality. Is time, this measure of all developments, identical with the development itself of a force? etc.

Time and space are, in accordance with *Kant*'s great teaching, *ideal*; individuality and motion however (without this assumption no natural science, nor a philosophy free from contradictions is possible) are *real*. Both have only the goal, to *cognize* them. Without subjective forms no perception of the outer world, yes however striving, living, willing individual forces.

It is about time, that the battle between realism and idealism is brought to an end. *Kant*'s assurance, that his transcendental idealism does not nullify the empirical reality of the things, originates from a complete self-deception. A thing-in-itself, which, as appearance, has borrowed its extension and motion from the pure perceptions time and space, has no reality. That is rock-solid. The by me in its fundamentals modified *Kant-Schopenhauer*ian critical idealism leaves however the extension and motion of the things intact and claims only, that the object distinguishes itself through *matter* from the thing-in-itself, since certainly the manner and way of the appearance of a force require the subjective form matter.

Schopenhauer translated the second remark at the end of Chapter of 1 of Kant's Prolegomena. I found the translation on [this site of *Der Spiegel*](<http://gutenberg.spiegel.de/buch/anmerkungen-zu-locke-und-kant-sowie-zu-nachkantischen-philosophen-6459/8>).

The second remark

>Whatever is to be manifested to us as an object, must be manifested to our perception. But all our perceptions are effected by the means of our senses: for the understanding does

not perceive intuitively, it only reflects. Now as by what has been hitherto proved, the senses never nor even in any respect whatever, manifest to our cognizance the things as they are in themselves, but merely their appearances, which are no more than the ideas of our sensitive faculty, it follows »that we must deem all the bodies, along with the space wherein they subsist, to be nothing more than mere ideas in our minds and that consequently they exist nowhere else but only in our thoughts«. Now is not this clear idealism?

>Idealism consists in maintaining that there exist no other but thinking beings and that all things besides, which we deem to perceive are merely the ideas of those thinking beings without any really outward object corresponding to them. Now on the contrary what I say is this: things subsisting extrinsically of us are manifested to us as objects of our senses; but nothing do we know of what they may be in themselves, our knowledge of them extending no further than to their appearances i. e. to the ideas, which they produce in us by affecting our senses. Accordingly I certainly allow bodies extrinsical of us to exist i. e. things which, though entirely unknown to us as to what they may be in themselves, yet come into our notice by means of the ideas, which we acquire from their influence on our sensitive faculty: to these things we apply the name of bodies, meaning by this term merely the appearance of an object unknown to us indeed, but not the less real. May this be called Idealism? Why, it is the very reverse of it.

That we may, without detracting from the real existence of outward things, assert that a good many of their qualities do not belong to those things in themselves, but only to their appearance and accordingly have no existence of their own and independent of our ideas of them, this is a truth that has been generally received an allowed long before Locke's time; but more especially since it. Of this kind are warmth, colour, taste &c. Now not the slightest argument can be alleged to shew it as inadmissible, that I, upon weighty reasons, reckon to the mere appearance besides the above mentioned also all the remaining qualities of bodies, those, I say, which are called primary ones, as extension, place and space in general with all its dependencies, such as impenetrability or materiality, form and the like. As little, therefore, as he may be styled an Idealist, who maintains the colours to be no qualities adhering to the objects themselves, but only to our organ of sight as modifications thereof; as little is my doctrine liable to be called idealistical, merely because I find, that still more, nay all the qualities constituting the perception of a body appertain merely to its appearance. For by this I do not, as real Idealism does, evert the existence of the appearing things, but only shew that we can never through the medium of senses know them so, as they are in themselves.

>I should be glad to know, how my positions ought to be constituted in order to contain no Idealism. No doubt I ought to say that the idea of space is not only perfectly congruous to the relation in which our senses stand to the objects (for that is what I have said) but also that it is perfectly resembling those objects; a position to which I cannot attach any sense, no more than to this that the sensation of red in my eye bears a resemblance to the quality of the Cinnober that occasions it.

Schopenhauer also writes:

>“My English accent is such as to my having been frequently mistaken by Englishmen for their countryman at first acquaintance, though I confess that usually in the course of half an hour they would be undeceived. (...)

>I would accordingly venture to say, that my deficiency seems very inconsiderable if compared to that of an English translator who without having previously penetrated Kant's

opinions in general, now sits staring at a passage he does not know what to make of, till he gets rid of it by putting in its stead some commonplace-thought of his own store, though expressed in very choice English. On the whole therefore I believe that the way I propose is the only one to bring forth to light a creditable English translation of Kant: nay I might even presume to say that the possibility of it is a rare chance not to be foregone, as, for all I know, a century may pass ere than shall again meet in the same head so much Kantian philosophy with so much English as happen to dwell together in this grey one of mine.”

(5) Final remarks

https://old.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/8nuikv/5_final_remarks/

Nothing can be born of nothing, nothing can be resolved into nothing.

As the thing-in-itself was for *Kant* a totally unknown=*x*, with which he did not occupy himself, the consequences of the pure perceptions time and space, such as:

>We can talk only from the human standpoint of *extended* objects,

and

>This acting subject would not, in its intelligible character, stand under any conditions of time; for time is only a condition of appearances, not of things in themselves. In this subject no action would begin or cease, and it would not, therefore, have to conform to the law of the determination of all that is alterable in time. ^{A539, B567}

are less eye-catching. But with *Schopenhauer*, who had to occupy himself constantly with the thing-in-itself (will), they celebrate on every page their Saturnalia. The denied individuality and the denied real development of the thing-in-itself wrestled most terribly; they shattered his intellectual work and threw it scornfully before his feet. A philosophical building must be such that every floor rests upon solid pillars, otherwise it cannot survive one strong gust of wind, and it collapses. The strictly separated forms of the subject and the thing-in-itself are, however, the fundament of all philosophy. If an error occurs here, then the most beautiful construction is worth nothing. This is also why every honest system has to start with the sharp, although very painstaking, research of the cognition.

In this section of my critique I will not yet discuss the contradictions in which *Schopenhauer* had to ensnare himself by the mentioned denial. This will happen later on, and we will then also come to see how he often threw away the difficult chains of the pure perceptions, space and time, and placed himself on the real soil. Right now, I want to show briefly, how *Schopenhauer* makes from the extensionless and motionless point of the one thing-in-itself (will) the objective, real world of bodies that fills up space in three dimensions, by virtue of the subjective forms.

Before this, I need to mention, that he even makes the *existence* of the world dependent on the subject. He says:

>Among the many things that make the world so obscure and doubtful the first and chiefest is this, that however immeasurable and massive it may be, its *existence* yet hangs by a single thread ; and this is the actual consciousness in which it exists. (*WWR* 2, The Standpoint of Idealism)

Instead of existence, he should have written *appearance*. He had totally forgotten, that he had said in Fourfold Root § 24:

>The application of the causal law to anything but changes in the material, empirically given world, is an abuse of it. For instance, it is a misapplication to make use of it with reference to physical forces, without which no changes could take place ; or to Matter, on which they take place ; or to the world, to which we must in that case attribute an *absolutely objective existence independently of our intellect.*

>Where the object begins the subject ends. The universality of this limitation is shown by the fact that the essential and hence *universal forms of all objects, space, time*, and *causality*, may, without knowledge of the object, be discovered and fully known from a consideration of the *subject*. (*WWR* V1, § 2)

On the other hand, the older philosopher teaches in the same section of Volume 2:

>The objective is conditioned by the subject and also by its forms, the forms of the idea, which depend upon the subject and *not on the object*. (*WWR* V2, The Standpoint of Idealism)

What should be said here?!

And now, let us come to business.

> The body lies, like all objects of perception, within the universal forms of knowledge, time and space, by which multiplicity exists. (*WWR* V1, § 2)

>Time is that disposition of our intellect by virtue whereof the thing we apprehend as the future does not seem to exist at all. (Paralipomena, § 29)

>In truth, the constant arising of new beings and perishing of existing beings must be seen as an illusion, brought forth by the apparatus of *two polished lenses* (brain functions), through which alone we are able to see something: they are called space and *time* and, in their mutual interpenetration (!) *causality*. (Paralipomena, § 136)

>It is through our optical lens of time that something that is already present at this moment, presents itself as something that will merely come in the future. (Parerga, Essay on Spirit Seeing)

> Our life is of a microscopical nature; it is an indivisible point that we see drawn apart by the two powerful lenses of space and time, and thus very considerably magnified. (Paralipomena, § 147a)

>If we could withdraw those forms of knowledge like the glass from the kaleidoscope, we should have to our astonishment that *single* and *enduring* thing-in-itself before us as something imperishable, unchangeable, and identical, in spite of all

apparent change, perhaps even down to quite individual determinations. (Parerga, Fragments for the History of Philosophy)

>Another conclusion which might be drawn from the proposition that time does not belong to the essence-in-itself of things, is that, in some sense, the past is not past, but that everything, which has ever really and truly existed, must at bottom still exist, since time indeed is only like a stage waterfall

that appears to flow downwards, whereas, being a mere wheel, it does not move from its place; long ago in my chief work, I compared space analogously to a glass *cut with many facets*. (ib.)

It was bound to happen! What was only mutedly sketched by *Kant had* to be executed by his greatest successor in a forthright painting, whereby even dumb people can immediately recognize the monstrosity of the matter. Let us visualize the process. The one thing-in-itself, foreign to all multiplicity, exists in the *nunc stans* (permanent now) of the scholastics. Juxtaposed to it, the subject opens its eyes, while by the way also belonging to the one thing-in-itself. Now, in the intellect first space takes effect (not the causal law, but causality, which is the interpenetration of space and time), which can be compared to a glass cut with many facets. This glass distorts the one indivisible point of the thing-in-itself, not into a million forms of similar shape and size – no! into mountains, floods, humans, oxen, donkeys, sheep, camels etc. All of this is accomplished by its own means, for in the one point there is no place for distinction. Then, the lens time takes effect. This glass distorts the one deed of the eternal, in absolute rest residing thing-in-itself, namely, to exist, into countless successive acts of volition and movements, but – well-understood – out of its own means, it makes it such that one part is already of the past, while hiding the other part for the subject. The miraculous-magical lens moves these hidden acts of volition always in the present, from where they are carried away into the past.

How much nature is made here into a lost church by the same man, who does not get tired of declaring that:

>Nature never lies; indeed with her truth is always plain truth. (Parelipomena, § 34)

But what does nature show? *Only individuals and real becoming.* No one may ask here by the way: how is it possible, that an outstanding mind could have written such things? for the whole absurdity is merely a natural consequence of the *Kant*ian pure perceptions, which are also the fundament of the philosophy of *Schopenhauer*.

Thus, out of its own means the subject issues the multifarious world. Meanwhile, as I cited above, the older idealist saw the issue in a different light. He had to admit: “the world as representation cannot serve up any fanciful or frivolously invented fairy-tale.” But the revocation of the greatest significance was regarding the so persistently denied individuality. For, many passages such as:

>*The illusion of multiplicity* proceeds from the forms of external, objective comprehension. (*WWR* V2, Transcendent considerations concerning the will as thing in itself.)

>The *multiplicity* of things has its root in the nature of the knowledge of the subject. (ib.)

representation ; (2.) the object of the representation ; (3.) the thing in itself. The first belongs to the sensibility, which in its case, as in that of sensation, includes the pure forms of perception, space and time. The second belongs to the Understanding, which *thinks* it through its twelve categories. The third lies beyond the possibility of all knowledge. (*WWR* V1, appendix)

Of all this *nothing* can be found in *Kant*'s Analytic and *Schopenhauer* has simply fantasized. He even goes as far, to accuse the deep thinker, the greatest thinker of all times, of an incredible want of reflection, because he has brought conjunction in perception through the Understanding (reason), which is in fact his immortal merit. One hears:

>*Kant* carries that incredible want of reflection as to the nature of the idea of perception and the abstract idea, so far as to make the monstrous assertion that *without thought*, that is, without abstract conceptions, there is no knowledge of an object. (ib.)

As we know, reason adds not *thought*, but rather, *conjunction* in perception. We obviously also think while we are perceiving, reflect the perception in concepts and raise ourselves to the knowledge of a complete world, its dynamic interconnection, its development etc., but that is something totally different. The mere perception, the perception of objects, arises without concepts and nevertheless with support of reason. Because *Schopenhauer* assigned reason as only task to form concepts, *Kant had* to be wrong. It is, however, the most beautiful obligation of posterity, to revoke the unjustified judgement and bring light on this forgotten merit. In the case at hand, I felt called to fulfill this duty.

#If the link on the very first page of this document is still available, the table of contents from that post has entries for "**Physics**" and "**Aesthetics**" under "Philosophy of Salvation Volume 1, Critique" but they are unlinked as of 6/25/2019. This paragraph is just a note that.

Ethics

https://old.reddit.com/r/Efilism/comments/4yzwmn/mainl%C3%A4nders_criticism_of_schopenhauers_ethics/

Mainländer's criticism of Schopenhauer's Ethics

This translation is far from perfect, because of both my English and German. My motivation for translating this small part of Mainländer's work is best expressed by his own words:

>Because many adherents of the Schopenhauerian philosophy discern no signs and miracles in it, they continue to suffer and believe that they are not called. This is a very serious practical consequence of a theoretical flaw. The rapture is not the distinction mark of the salvation. The distinction mark, as well as the requirement, is freely chosen virginity without any outside pressure.

I chose this part because it advocates antinatalism. While Schopenhauer is considered to be a founding father of antinatalism his philosophy is anti-sexuality *and only thereby* antinatalistic. Mainländer's criticism purifies his philosophy from this flaw, like Schopenhauer tried to purify Kant's philosophy. No greater deed of gratitude can be shown than making the truth shine even more clearly.

Mainländer works as follow. He gathers the passages of Schopenhauer as neutral observer of nature and shows how his philosophy is consistent and immanent. This is part one. Then Mainländer gathers the passages where Schopenhauer leaves the boundaries of immanence, where he contradicts his own passages of part one. Therefore the prefix is a quote of Goethe:

>The thinking man has the wondrous trait that at the point, where the unsolved problem lies, he connects it with a fantasy picture, which he can't set loose, when the problem is already solved and the truth has been revealed.

All text is Mainländer's and all quotes are Schopenhauer's:

Part One

As we know Schopenhauer assigned to every human a unique Idea and let exist, in good moments, the will inseparably in the individual. This must be our starting point.

Every human is a closed whole, strict self-existence of a specific character. He is will to live, like everything in nature, his maxim is:

Pereat mundus, dum ego salvus sim! (The world may perish, as long as I will be saved)

And his individuality is in essence egoism.

>Now this egoism is, both in animals and men, connected in the closest way with their very essence and being ; indeed, it is one and the same thing.

>Egoism is, from its nature, limitless. The individual is filled with the unqualified desire of preserving his life, and of keeping it free from all pain, under which is included all want and deprivation.

We continue holding on to this, that no matter what, human wants his existence to be maintained.

How has he obtained his existence? From his parents, through the begetting.

>They feel the longing for an actual union and fusing together into a single being, in order to live on only as this ; and this longing receives its fulfilment in the child which is produced by them, as that in which the qualities transmitted by them both, fused and united in one being, live on.

> That this particular child shall be begotten is, although unknown to the parties concerned, the true purpose of the whole love story.

>The ultimate purpose of all love affairs is nothing less than the composition of the next generation.

>The **dramatis personæ** who shall appear when we are withdrawn are here determined, both as regards their existence and their nature, by these frivolous love affairs.

>

>Why does the lover hang with complete abandonment on the eyes of his chosen one, and is ready to make every sacrifice for her ? Because it is his immortal part that longs after her.

The last sentence must be read and understood more accurately: because he wants to maintain his existence, because he wants to be immortal.

These passages are clear and pure and every one of them possesses the mark of truth. Every human has the *existentia* and *essentia* from his parents. They maintain themselves through their children in existence, who will continue to maintain their existence the same way.

> These lovers are the traitors who seek to perpetuate the whole want and drudgery, which would otherwise speedily reach an end ; this they wish to prevent, as others like them have prevented it before.

(...)

In the lower realms of the animal kingdom death very often immediately follows the begetting, which beautifully reveals the true relationship between parents and offspring.

(...)

Thanks to procreation we exist, by procreation we will exist. Now let us take a look at death. Death is the complete annihilation. The by the type subjected chemical forces are liberated: he is extinguished like a light which no longer has oil.

>The end of the individual by death in truth, really requires no proof, but is recognized by the healthy understanding as a fact, and confirmed by the confidence that nature never lies any more than she errs, but openly exhibits and naively expresses her action and her nature, while only we ourselves obscure it by our folly, *in order to establish what is agreeable to our limited point of view.*

> Opinions change with time and place ; but the voice of nature remains always and everywhere the same, and is therefore to be heeded before everything else. Now here it seems distinctly to say that death is a great evil. In the language of nature death means annihilation.

I summarize:

1. The human being is the rejuvenation of his parents;
2. The human can only maintain its existence through procreation;
3. Death is complete annihilation;
4. The individual will, which has not rejuvenated itself through children, which has not through them ensured his existence, is irredeemably lost in death;
5. The center of gravity of life lies in sex drive and consequently only the moment of begetting bears importance;
6. The hour of death is without any importance.

When we call this desire of humans to maintain their existence with Schopenhauer: the affirmation of the will to live; the desire to free one from oneself, the denial of the will to live, then affirms:

1. The human most clearly and without doubt his will in the act of procreation;
2. Can only assuredly be freed from life, from himself, redeem oneself, when he does not obey his sex drive. Virginity is the *conditio sine que non* of the salvation and the denial of the will to live is fruitless when he seizes the human after he has already affirmed his life with the creation of children.

>With that assertion beyond our own body and extending to the production of a new body, suffering and death, as belonging to the phenomenon of life, have also been asserted anew, and the possibility of salvation, introduced by the completest capability of knowledge, has for this time been shown to be fruitless. Here lies the profound reason of the shame connected with the process of procreation.

Schopenhauer wrote those passages as a clear, sober, and impartial observer of nature, in other passages, which I will now quote, as a transcendent philosopher, who presents himself with clenched hands before the truth and then trespasses the sublime Goddess. (...) His genius displays itself in those

moments only by an admirable, dexterous concatenation of what is heterogenic and in the careful concealment of all leaps and disruptions. Before showing a few of them, I want to let himself be the one who condemns the following. He says:

>There is nothing more unphilosophical imaginable, than constantly talking about something, of existence of which we can have no knowledge and have of its being no concept.

Part Two

At the peak of his fundamental flaws are the occasional causes. In ethics they become the most blatant occasionalism, which Kant brands with the words:

>We can presume, that no one would accept this system, since it has nothing to do with philosophy.

Schopenhauer however ignores this warning and writes:

> Generation is, with reference to the begetter, only the expression, the symptom, of his decided assertion of the will to live : with reference to the begotten, it is not the cause of the will which appears in him, for the will in itself knows neither cause nor effect, but, like all causes, it is merely the occasional cause of the phenomenal appearance of this will at this time in this place.

>Death overtly presents itself as the end of the individual, but in this individual lies *the seed for a new being.*

>The dying goes down: but a *seed* remains, auf which a *new being* can emerge, which appears in existence *now*, without knowing, where he comes from.

This means in dry words: the death of an organism doesn't affect his being. He sinks back to a single will which becomes, as a working force, a new seed or an egg. What is human, can become an oak, a worm, a tiger etc, or a dying beggar becomes the son of a king. It is almost impossible to grasp that a man which wrote the shining "On hereditary" could have had such thoughts. It is as if a Brahmin or a Buddhist priests holds a lecture about reincarnation. But no! Reincarnation is a profound, for the support of morality founded religious dogma. Schopenhauer however knows no retribution after death, and life in this world can be the only possible punishment for the will. Certainly it is true that all *future* oaks stem from *present* oaks, and all *future* humans stem from *present* humans, in completely *natural* way. I have all reason to assume that Schopenhauer leaned his absurd occasionalism from the exceptionally important Karma-doctrine.

On another occasion Schopenhauer also talks boldly and confidently about an existence, which has nothing to with the existence of one will. He says:

> The horrors upon the stage hold up to him the bitterness and worthlessness of life, thus the vanity of all its struggle. The effect of this impression must be that he becomes conscious, if only in obscure feeling, that it is better to tear his heart free from life, to turn his will from it, to love not the world nor life ; whereby then in his deepest soul, the consciousness is aroused that for another kind of willing there must also be another existence.

> Behind our existence lies something else, which is only accessible to us if we have shaken off this world.

> I believe that at the moment of death we become conscious that it is a mere illusion that has limited our existence to our person.

> Death and birth are the constant renewal of the consciousness of the will, in itself without end and without beginning, which alone is, as it were, the substance of existence (but each such renewal brings a new possibility of the denial of the will to live).

This fluctuating between immanent domain and an *at the same time* existing transcendent domain (this oscillating which until now no philosopher could escape from, and which my philosophy has finally brought to an end) and his vain struggle to bring both domains in harmony, are in no passage as clear as this one:

>One can also say: the will to live represents itself in only manifestations, which *totally* become *nothing*. This nothing *stays* however, together with the manifestations, within the will to live and rests on its basis.

He is at least so honest to add :

>*This is admittedly obscure!*

Of course for the transcendent Schopenhauer not the moment of procreation, but the moment of death is the most important of life. About death he speaks with a highly solemn, anointing tone like Kant does with conscience.

> Death is the great opportunity no longer to be I ; blessed him who uses it.

>

>In the hour of death it is decided whether the man returns into the womb of nature or belongs no more to nature at all, but : *for this opposite we lack image, conception, and word.*

>

>The death of the individual is in each case the unweariedly repeated question of nature to the will to live: Hast thou enough? Wilt thou escape from me?

>

>In this spirit are the Christian provisions for the suitable employment of the hour of death by means of exhortation, confession, communion, and the last unction: hence also the Christian prayers for deliverance from sudden death.

>

> Dying is certainly to be regarded as the real aim of life : in the moment of death all that is decided for which the whole course of life was only the preparation and introduction.

Schopenhauer, *as a human*, stands before suicide without prejudice, which I greatly appreciate. Only cold, mindless, or in dogmata trapped people can condemn a self-murderer. Blessed are we all, that by a mild hand a door has been opened, through which we, when the heat in the sultry saloon of life becomes unbearable, can enter the quiet night of death.

The *philosopher* Schopenhauer, without any sound foundation, brands suicide as a useless act. He believes:

>The suicidal should not hope for liberation from death and can't save himself with suicide; only with false pretense the cold Orcus lures him as a port of rest.

>The self-murderer denies only the individual, not the species.

> Suicide is the random annihilation of a single manifestation, which undisturbed continues to exist as thing-in-itself.

This is false. Like Schopenhauer *ex tripode* (from the pulpit) explains: the will is metaphysical, the intellect physical, while every body clearly shows us, that the whole Idea is annihilated, this way he handles suicide. He acts as if he knows exactly, from surest possible source, has experienced, what happens with a self-murderer after death. The truth is that the self-murderer, as thing-in-itself, is

annihilated in death, like every organism. Does he not live forth in other bodies, then the death is *absolute* annihilation; in other cases he lives forth.

Read in *WWR* V1, how suicide by a through asceticism chosen hunger death should have a different result than normal suicide, and one will be astonished about the errors of a great genius. The best way to finish this part is with another great thought of Schopenhauer:

>Philosophy must be *communicable* knowledge, hence be rationalism.

Comment to “Mainländer's criticism of Schopenhauer”

User Egool:

Isn't Mainländer misunderstanding schopenhauers Idealism here ? According to schopenhauer the world always needs a subject in wich the world around us can manifest.
This is from The Standpoint of Idealism from WaWuV

***The true idealism, on the contrary, is not the empirical but the transcendental. This leaves the empirical reality of the world untouched, but holds fast to the fact that every object, thus the empirically real in general, is conditioned in a twofold manner by the subject; in the first place materially or as object generally, because an objective existence is only conceivable as opposed to a subject, and as its idea; in the second place formally, because the mode of existence of an object, i.e., its being perceived (space, time, causality), proceeds from the subject, is pre-arranged in the subject. Therefore with the simple or Berkeleian idealism, which concerns the object in general, there stands in immediate connection the Kantian idealism, which concerns the specially given mode or manner of objective existence. This proves that the whole material world, with its bodies, which are extended in space and, by means of time, have causal relations to each other, and everything that depends upon this—that all this is not something which is there independently of our head, but essentially presupposes the functions of our brain by means of which and in which alone such an objective arrangement of things is possible. For time, space, and causality, upon which all those real and objective events rest, are themselves nothing more than functions of the brain; so that thus the unchangeable order of things which affords the criterion and clue to their empirical reality itself proceeds only from the brain, and has its credentials from this alone. All this Kant has expounded fully and thoroughly; only he does not speak of the brain, but calls it “the faculty of knowledge.” Indeed he has attempted to prove that when that objective order in time, space, causality, matter, &c., upon which all the events of the real world ultimately rest, is properly considered, it cannot even be conceived as a self-existing order, i.e., an order of the thing in itself, [pg 171] or as something absolutely objective and unconditionally given, for if one tries to think this out it leads to contradictions. To accomplish this was the object of the antinomies, but in the appendix to my work I have proved the failure of the attempt. On the other hand, the Kantian doctrine, even without the antinomies, leads to the insight that things and the whole mode of their existence are inseparably bound up with our consciousness of them. Therefore whoever has distinctly grasped this soon attains to the conviction that the assumption that things also exist as such, apart from and independently of our consciousness, is really absurd. That we are so deeply involved in time, space, causality, and the whole regular process of experience which rests upon them, that we (and indeed the brutes) are so perfectly at home, and know how to find our way from the first—this would not be possible if our intellect were one thing and things another, but can only be explained from the fact that both constitute one whole, the intellect itself creates that order, and exists only for things, while they, on the other hand, exist only for it.”*

How can *"the absolute annihilation of the individual"* lead to some sort of release from life ?

>How can "the absolute annihilation of the individual" lead to some sort of release from life ?

This what Schopenhauer himself claims to be the case for those who no longer affirm the will to live:

> From this we can understand how blessed the life of a man must be whose will is silenced, not merely for a moment, as in the enjoyment of the beautiful, but forever, indeed altogether extinguished, except as regards the last glimmering spark that retains the body in life, and will be *extinguished with its death*.

(WaWuV 1, book 4, Affirmation or Denial of the Will to Live)

Being released from life and death is what his 4th book in both volumes is about. Without doubt you know this so further quotes are unnecessary I think.

So I don't fully understand what exactly you're arguing: is it perhaps due this strange paradox which stays in contrast with his 4th book, his claim in WaWuV V1 B2:

>We may therefore say that if, per impossibile, a single real existence, even the most insignificant, were to be entirely annihilated, the whole world would necessarily perish with it. The great mystic Angelus Silesius feels this when he says — "I know God cannot live an instant without me, He must give up the ghost if I should cease to be."

Quantity is a not a property of the thing-in-itself but of the phenomena. So what difference does it make if one manifestation of the Will no longer wills?

Thanks for the answer.

But isn't Mainländer stating that the destruction of the individual who abstains from sexual intercourse will be freed from life ? It just seems to me that Mainländer thinks that the will to live will perish with the individual. Didn't schopenhauer point out that the will to live as thing it itself is unaffected by the birth and death of individuals (phenomena).

>Didn't schopenhauer point out that the will to live as thing it itself is unaffected by the birth and death of individuals (phenomena).

Yes, Schopenhauer wrote that death doesn't affect the thing-in-itself, *but only thanks to sexual impulse!*. I will let Schopenhauer speak himself:

>>If the will to live exhibited itself merely as an impulse to self-preservation, this would only be an assertion of the individual phenomenon for the span of time of its natural duration. Since, on the contrary, the will wills life absolutely and for all time, it exhibits itself also as sexual impulse, which has in view an endless series of generations.

But if one abstains from sexual intercourse then "the will does not then transcend the individual, but is abolished in it." (Both quotes from the beginning of WaWuV 2, book 4, Affirmation of the Will to Live)

>But isn't Mainländer stating that the destruction of the individual who abstains from sexual intercourse will be freed from life ?

Indeed. Schopenhauer says exactly the same. Celibacy is the **only step** needed for salvation after death:

>>When the coitus is no longer wanted solely because of the coitus, then the denial of the will to live has already materialized and the procreation of the human race is unnecessary and *unneeded because its goal has already been achieved.*

>>Just on this account Buddhism is free from all strict and excessive asceticism, which plays a large part in Brahmanism, thus from intentional self-mortification. It rests satisfied with the celibacy, voluntary poverty, humility, and obedience of the monks, with abstention from animal food, as also from all worldliness.

I want to add that in Mainländer's idealism, individuality is *real*. The world is not a single thing-in-itself without number as in Schopenhauer's philosophy (one metaphysical will), but a collection of many things-in-themselves (*individual* wills). M had written about his own distinction already so that's why he is so short about suicide here.

For more on this: [Analytic of the Cognition](https://www.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/60uhme/1_summary_of_kants_transcendental_idealism/)

Politics

<https://old.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/85c66k/politics/>

>Everyone, even the greatest genius, is in some sphere of knowledge decidedly limited.

>(Schopenhauer)

It must be called a fortune, that there is not one problem in philosophy which Schopenhauer has tried to solve *only* from the standpoint of empirical idealism, but instead, being tired from the heavy chains, threw them away, and reflected upon the things as a realist. He did it, just like *Kant*, who, in fact, should have stopped at the thing-in-itself, as an X. Even if thereby *Schopenhauer*'s system has become a by contradictions eroded system, it offers on the other hand a wealth of sane, genuine and true judgements of the greatest significance. Also in the domain of politics, we will find, besides the most absurd notions, also good and excellent ones, though unfortunately the latter in a frighteningly smaller amount. The reason for this lies in the fact, that on this domain, the judgmental, well-off citizen *Schopenhauer* could have a voice. The sufferings of the people are indeed brilliantly depicted, but only in order to give the pessimism a frame. Otherwise, *Schopenhauer* had only words of mockery and disdain for the people and its endeavors, and one turns in disgust before the perversity of this attitude of the great man.

Starting from the pure perception a priori, time, first, *Schopenhauer* denies the real development of the human race.

>For all such historical philosophy, whatever airs it may give itself, regards time, just as if Kant had never lived, as a quality of the thing-in-itself. (*WWR* V1, § 53)

>History is like the kaleidoscope, which at every turn shows a new figure, while we actually (!) always have the same thing before our eyes. (*WWR* V2, On the Indestructibility of Our Essential Being by Death)

>All those who set up such constructions of the course of the world, or, as they call it, of history, have failed to grasp the principal truth of all philosophy, that what is is at all times the same, all becoming and arising are only seeming ; the Ideas alone are permanent ; time ideal. (*WWR* V2, On History)

>The said philosophers and glorifiers of history are accordingly simple realists, and also optimists and eudemonists, consequently dull fellows and incarnate Philistines ; and besides are actually bad Christians. (ib.)

This generous outpouring of acid of the enraged idealist has always greatly amused me; because why would he be enraged? Merely because he has failed to grasp the principal truth of all philosophy, that time is indeed *ideal*, but the motion of the will *real*, and that the former is dependent on the latter, whereas the latter is not dependent on the former.

As little as we will care for these vituperations, this calmly we will put aside his well-intended advice:

>The true philosophy of history ought to recognise the identical in all events, of ancient as of modern times, of the east as of the west ; and, in spite of all difference of the special circumstances, of the costume and the customs, to see everywhere the same humanity. This identical element which is

permanent through all change consists in the fundamental qualities of the human heart and head many bad, few good. (ib.)

About history itself he has the most wondrous view:

>History lacks the fundamental characteristic of science, the subordination of what is known, instead of which it can only present its co-ordination. Therefore there is no system of history, as there is of every other science. It is therefore certainly rational knowledge, but it is not a *science* ; for it never knows the particular by means of the general.

>Even the most general in history is in itself only a particular and individual, a long *period* of time, or an important event ; therefore the special is related to this as the part to the whole, but not as the case to the rule ; which, on the contrary, takes place in all the sciences proper because they afford conceptions and not mere facts. (ib.)

A more erroneous standpoint is barely imaginable. *Every science* is *mere knowledge* until the particular, the countless cases, that stand in long rows next to each other, are summarized and brought under rules, and every science becomes more scientific, as far the unity is placed at a higher point, in which all threads come together. To examine the enormous material from experience, to connect it, and to continuously attach it to a higher point, is even the endeavor of philosophers. Let us presume, that history was at the time of *Schopenhauer* a mere *knowledge*, then therein should have lied the most urgent invitation, to bring the countless battles, invasions and defensive wars, religious wars, discoveries and inventions, political, social and intellectual revolutions, brief, the succession of history under a general viewpoint, and this one again under a more general one, until he would have come to a final principle and had made history into the science *par excellence*. He could have done this regardless of his *idealism*, because what else are the other, by him accepted sciences, than classifications of the *things in themselves* and their activities? Or are they not rather classifications of *appearances*, without value and reality, appearances of eternally lasting and totally hidden Ideas?

Was history, however, in *Schopenhauer*'s time a mere knowledge? In no way! Already before *Kant* history was seen as a history of culture, i.e. it was recognized, that the wars of Alexander in Asia were more than just the satisfaction of the thirst for glory and fame of a valiant youngster, that the protest of Luther was something more than the detachment of a honest individual from Rome, that the invention of gunpowder was a bit more than an accidental appearance in the laboratory of an alchemist etc. *Kant* has tried, in his small but brilliant work : "Idea for a Universal History with a Cosmopolitan Purpose", to give the human race, from its first beginnings, a goal: the ideal state, which will encompass all of humanity, and *Fichte*, *Schelling*, *Hegel*, have, with veritable enthusiasm, seized *Kant*'s thoughts in order to expand them and spread them everywhere. Especially *Fichte* needs a honorable mention, who has, in his immortal works: "Characteristics of the Present Age" and "Addresses to the German Nation" – though they also contain untenable viewpoints and many palpable errors – set out for all the life of our race on this earth as goal:

>that the Human Race orders with *freedom* all its relations according to Reason.

It was thus the duty of the philosopher *Schopenhauer*, to not ignore *Kant*, but connecting himself to his history-philosophical treatises, supported by his spirit, to shape history even more scientifically, than *Kant* had done. He chose, however, to deny the truth, in order to not pull the same cart as the three "after-Kantian sophists."

I have shown in my Politics, that the ideal state of *Kant* and *Fichte* cannot be the last goal in the movement of humanity. It is only the last *transit point* of the movement. Moreover, the expositions of *Kant* as well as *Fichte* are also lacking on another point, namely, that there is too much discussion of final causes and a world plan and too little of efficient causes. There can be no talk of a world plan, intended by a divine Intelligence, at all, and of a final cause only insofar we are justified to conclude,

based on the direction of development rows, between the point where they clearly emerge out of the mist of the most ancient history, and our present age, that they will all come together in one ideal point. Finally, there is also a shortage in the fact, that although the movement can be fixed, the *factors*, from which it arises, cannot be brought to a higher point.

I am convinced that I have given history, as well as aesthetics and ethics, the character of a true science and refer to my work.

In whatever form the life of the human race may develop, *one thing is certain*, that the final generations will live in one and the same form of state: *in the ideal state*: the dream of all good and righteous. But it will be but the preliminary step of the “*final émacipation*.”

Although *Schopenhauer* assured us, that all development is in essence only a joke and illusion, he does not forgo of speaking about a state of nature and a state that follows it, as well as taking a peak at a possible goal of humanity. We will follow the realist now. It is impossible to construct the state of nature in any other way, than abstracting all arrangements of the state and comprehending man solely as animal. One must pass over the most loose society and may only hold onto the animality. There, there is no right or wrong, but only violence. One cannot even speak of the right of the strongest. Every human acts in the state of nature according to his character and all means are allowed. Humans can have property like an animal has its nest, stocks etc. : it is uncertain, floating, not legal property, and the stronger is free to take it, without doing any wrong, at any moment. I stand here at the standpoint of *Hobbes*, man of “completed empirical method of thought” [*WWR* V1, § 62], who declared right and wrong to be conventional, arbitrarily assumed and therefore outside positive law not existing definitions.

Schopenhauer denies this and says:

>The concepts wrong and right, as *synonymous* (!!) with injury and non-injury, the latter also including the prevention of injury, are *obviously* independent of all positive law-giving and prior to it: so there is a purely ethical right, or natural right, and a pure doctrine of right, i.e. one independent of all positive institution. (*On the Basis of Morality*, §17 The virtue of justice)

He has been so stubborn in his false viewpoint, that he did cast the most unjustified judgement imaginable on *Spinoza*. He says:

>The obligatory optimism forces Spinoza to many other false conclusions, the most conspicuous being the absurd and often revolting sentences of his moral philosophy, which in the sixteenth chapter of his *tractatus theologico-politicus* rise to real *infamies*. (*Parerga*, Fragments for the History of Philosophy)

What sentences is he referring to? Sentences such as the following:

>For it is certain that nature, considered absolutely, has unlimited rights within the bounds of possibility; in other words, the right of nature is as extensive as its power.

>But as the power of nature at large is nothing more than the aggregate power of every individual thing in nature, it follows that each individual thing has the highest right to all it can compass or attain, and that the rights of individuals are coextensive with their power.

>The natural right of every man therefore is determined by appetite and power, not by sound reason.

i.e. sentences, which (if one correctly understands the word “right”,) belong, just as the whole 16th chapter, to the best, that ever have been written. They express high truths, which may be assaulted, but can never be conquered, and which *pessimism*, just like optimism, has to acknowledge.

Schopenhauer refers to the savages, which he is obviously not justified to do; for the savages, despite living in the most miserable society, are no longer in the state of nature and have an unwritten customary law, which separates “yours” and “mine” as good as the best code of law of civilized nations.

Regarding the creation of the state, it is well-known, that some believe that it can be led back to instinct, and others believe that it came into existence through a treaty. The former viewpoint is also advocated by our *Schiller*:

>Nature begins with Man no better than with the rest of her works: she acts for him where he cannot yet act as a free intelligence for himself. He comes to himself out of his sensuous slumber, recognizes himself as Man, looks around and finds himself—*in the State*. An unavoidable exigency had thrown him there before he could freely choose his station; need ordained it through mere natural laws before he could do so by the laws of reason. (*On the Aesthetic Education of Man*, Third Letter)

In contrast, Schopenhauer adopts the social contract theory.

>However agreeable it is to the egoism of the individual to inflict wrong in particular cases, this has yet a necessary correlative in the suffering of wrong of another individual, to whom it is a great pain. And because the reason which surveys the whole left the one-sided point of view of the individual to which it belongs, and freed itself for the moment from its dependence upon it, it saw the pleasure of an individual in inflicting wrong always outweighed by the relatively greater pain of the other who suffered the wrong ; and it found further, that because here everything was left to chance, every one had to fear that the pleasure of conveniently inflicting wrong would far more rarely fall to his lot than the pain of enduring it. From this reason recognised that both in order to diminish the suffering which is everywhere disseminated, and as far as possible to divide it equally, the best and only means was to spare all the pain of suffering wrong by renouncing all the pleasure to be obtained by inflicting it. This — by egoism invented and gradually perfected means is the contract of the state or law. (*WWR* V1, § 63)

I have also subscribed the social contract theory.

About the state itself *Schopenhauer* speaks only with contempt. It is for him nothing but an institution for compelling.

>Because the requirement of justice is purely negative, it can be compelled: for the ‘Harm no one’ can be practised by everyone at the same time. The institution for compelling, this is the state, whose *sole* end is to protect individuals from one another and the whole from external enemies. Some German philosophers of this venal age would like to twist it into an institution of education in morality, and of improvement – and here there lurks in the background the jesuitical aim of removing each one’s personal freedom and individual development. (*Morality*, ib.)

How is it possible, is the instinctive question, that such an eminent thinker could have such a *night-watchman* idea (as *Lassalle* unsurpassably says) about the state? Who taught him to read and write? who gave him his education in antiquity? who offered him its libraries for his researching mind? who has done all of this and besides that has also protected him from thieves and murderers, and, as part of the whole, protected him from foreign aggressors – who else but the state? For, could he,

without the state, ever have written but one page of his immortal works? How small does the great man appear here!

The state is the historical form, in which alone the human race can find salvation, and will only collapse at the moment of the death of humanity. It forces, first, all people to act legally, and this coercion subdues the natural egoism of most citizens. Even if we cannot admit that *Fichte* is right, who says:

>Nevertheless the State, by its mere existence, conduces to the possibility of a general development of Virtue throughout the Human Race,—although, strictly considered, it does not expressly make this its purpose except as concealed under another form,—by the production of external good manners and morality, which indeed are yet far off from Virtue. ... When the Nation had lived in peace and quietness for a series of Ages under this constitution, and new generations had been born and had grown to manhood beneath its sway, and from them again younger races had arisen; then the habit *even of inward* temptation to injustice would gradually disappear altogether. (*Characteristics of the Present Age*, Lecture 11)

then, nevertheless, it is certain that fierce, tenacious will-qualities are modified and weakened under the constant pressure. Secondly, the state protects religions, which, as long as not all people are ripe for philosophy, is necessary for the awakening of love and charity for the neighbor, i.e. virtues, which the state cannot enforce. Thirdly, as said before, only in the state it is possible for humanity to find salvation; for not only does it empower some individuals, through intellectual development, to gain the overview that is needed, in order to recognize that non-existence is better than existence, but it also prepares the masses for the denial of the will to live by this, that in the state *suffering* is maximized.

>Through a red sea of blood and war humanity moves towards the promised land and the wilderness is long. (— Jean Paul, Titan, 105)

Only in the state man can develop his will and his intellectual talents, and therefore in the state alone the *ripening* that is needed for redemption can take place. The *suffering* increases *and the sensitivity for it.* This way it has to be, should the ideal state come into existence; for savage people cannot be its citizens, man in his natural egoism is a beast of prey, is *l'animal méchant par excellence* (the most malicious of all animals). In order to tame him, iron tongs have to be thrust in his flesh: the social sufferings, the psychical and mental torments, boredom and all other means of taming. The changing of the rogue will goes hand in hand with the development of the *mind*, and through the continually strengthening intellect the *reformed demon* elevates himself to objective knowledge and moral rapture.

The might and benefit of severe, persisting suffering has been well recognized by *Schopenhauer*, but he did not want to see, that the *state* is a *precondition* for this. He says very rightly:

>Suffering in general, as it is inflicted by fate, is a second way of attaining to that denial. Indeed, we may assume that most men only attain to it in this way, and that it is the suffering which is personally experienced, not that which is merely known, which most frequently, produces complete resignation, often only at the approach of death. — Thus in most cases the will must be broken by great personal suffering before its self-conquest appears. Then we see the man who has passed through all the increasing degrees of affliction with the most vehement resistance, and is finally brought to the verge of despair, suddenly retire into himself, know himself and the world, change his whole nature, rise above himself and all suffering, as if purified and sanctified by it, in inviolable peace, blessedness, and sublimity, willingly renounce everything he previously desired with all his might, and joyfully embrace death. (*WWR* V1, § 68)

I cannot repeat here, how the state, by the development of the community which it encompasses, will develop into the ideal state. There is just one more thing I would like to say. In the time of *Kant* the ideal state was not more than a dream image of some philanthropists. In reality there was merely an uncertain indication towards it. Since then the fog has started to disappear, and although it may still lie

in the far, far future – it already casts its treasures over humanity. What pervades the bodies of the lowest classes is the desire for development, i.e. the desire for a better carriage, for another movement. This desire is rooted, with necessity, in the general movement of the universe from being into non-being. Only fools can believe, that the movement of the world can be stemmed, and only fools can let themselves be misled by the dirty foam that lies on the lower classes, and to confuse that foam on the surface with the towards something totally different pointing crystals that lie beneath it. When the common man opens the innermost part of his heart, one will always hear: “I want to escape from my misery, I want to eat and drink like the rich and famous: it has to be the best; they are the happy ones, we are the unhappy ones, the cast-outs, the disinherited.” The knowledge, of those who are developed in the true sense of the word, that the higher the mind is developed, the less life can satisfy, that the will to live has to be essentially unhappy in all life forms – this knowledge does not soothe the rogue man. It is impossible to argue with him, who believes that *he alone* is unhappy. “You want to appease me, you’re lying, you speak on behalf of the bourgeoisie,” he shouts to the philosopher. “Well then,” he answers, “you will experience it yourself.”

And he will, he *has* to experience it in a new organization of the things. –

And who does not recognize the treasures of the ideal state in the international arbitration of our time, in the [League of Peace](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/League_of_Peace_and_Freedom), in the slogan: “The United States of Europe,” in the awakening of the Asian people’s, in the abolition of serfdom and slavery, to conclude, in the words of the leader of one of the mightiest countries in the world:

>As commerce, education, and rapid transit of thought and matter by telegraph and steam have changed everything, I do believe that God is preparing the world, in his own good time, to become *one* nation, speaking *one* language, where armies and navies will be no longer required. (— Ulysses S. Grant)

Not that we are at the brink of summer, but the cold winter is fading from the vales and humanity anticipates the start of spring. –

Now, how does *Schopenhauer* imagine himself the development of humanity?

>If the state attained its end completely, then to a certain extent something approaching to an Utopia might finally, by the removal of all kinds of evil, be brought about. For by the human powers united in it, it is able to make the rest of nature more and more serviceable. But as yet the state has always remained very far from this goal. And even if it attained to it, innumerable evils essential to all life would still keep it in suffering ; and finally, if they were all removed, ennui would at once occupy every place they left. Finally, Eris, happily expelled from within, turns to what is without ; as the conflict of individuals, she is banished by the institution of the state ; but she reappears from without and now demands in bulk and at once, as an accumulated debt, the bloody sacrifice which by wise precautions has been denied her in the particular – – – as the war of nations. Yes, even supposing that all this were finally overcome and removed, by wisdom founded on the experience of thousands of years, at the end the result would be the actual over-population of the whole planet, the terrible evil of which only a bold imagination can now realise. (*WWR* V1, § 68)

We have to laugh aloud. Economic works seem to have been totally unknown to *Schopenhauer* ; for otherwise he should have known from *Carey*’s polemic against *Malthus* , what an enormous amount of people our planet can still support and feed. Is there actually anyone, who knows how the food production will develop? But regardless of this, it can be said with certainty, that if a maximum population of the earth would be reached, then its appearance must fall together with the redemption of humanity; for humanity is a part of the cosmos, and the cosmos moves from existence into non-existence. –

Our philosopher lacks in general all understanding for political question, which is very easy to prove. He says:

>The whole of humanity, with the exception of an extremely small portion, was always unrefined and *must remain so*, because the great amount of bodily labour that is unavoidably necessary for the whole does not permit the edification of the mind. (*Morality*, § 19, 8)

>The monarchical form of government is natural to man. – There is a *monarchical instinct* in man. (*Paralipomena*, § 127)

>Trial by jury is the *worst* of all criminal courts. (ib.)

>It is *absurd*, to want to concede Jews a share in the government or administration of any state. (*Paralipomena*, § 132)

On *Parerga* II p. 274 [*Paralipomena*, § 127] he proposes, in all seriousness, that

>the imperial throne should pass *alternately* to Austria and Prussia for the duration of the emperor's life.

He sees in wars *nothing but* theft and violence, and with deep satisfaction he cites, whenever the occasion is there, the statement of *Voltaire*:

> *Dans toutes les guerres il ne s'agit que de voler.*

>(In all wars it is only a question of stealing.)

He suggests exemption from military service as *reward* (!) for hard-working students, even though every sensible and noble individual *happily* and *gladly* fulfills his military duty.

> They are without intellect, love of truth, honesty, taste, and are devoid of any noble impulse or of an urge for anything lying beyond material interests, *which also includes political interests.* (*Parerga*, On the Philosophy at the Universities)

>*A mean being remains a mean being.* (*Paralipomena*, § 50)

Here the reaction can only be indignation: Disgusting! and *proh pudor*!

This is also the right place to reprimand his injustice towards the Jews. The ground for this lies in the *immanence* of the Jewish religion. That it has no doctrine of immortality, this could *not* be forgiven by the transcendent philosopher.

The only thing that is really uplifting in *Schopenhauer*'s works in relation to politics, are the observations on *destiny*. Although *Schopenhauer* speaks hesitantly, granting and immediately withdrawing, asserting and revoking, in convoluted wording, he nevertheless had to admit, that the complete world is a firm, closed, whole with *one* essential movement. He says:

> And so the demand, or metaphysical moral postulate, of an ultimate unity of necessity and contingency here irresistibly forces itself on us. However, I regard it as *impossible* to arrive at a clear conception of this central root of both.

>Accordingly, all those causal chains,

that move in the direction of time, now form a large, common, much-interwoven net which with its whole breadth likewise moves forward in the direction of time and constitutes the course of the world.

>Therefore everything is reflected and echoed in everything else.

>In the great dream of life all the dreams of life are so ingeniously interwoven that *everyone* gets to know what is *beneficial* to him and at the same time does for others what is necessary. Accordingly, some great world event *conforms* to the destiny of many thousands, to *each* in an individual way.

>Would it not be on our part a want of courage to regard it as impossible that the lives of all men in their mutual dealings should have just as much *concentus* (concord) and harmony as the composer is able to give to the many apparently confused and stormy parts of his symphony? Our aversion to that colossal thought will grow less if we remember that the subject of the great dream of life is in a *certain sense* (!) only *one* thing, the will to live. (*Parerga*, Transcendent Speculation on the Apparent Deliberateness in the Fate of the Individual)

If one assumes a basic unity that is *co-existing* with the world of plurality, then everything in the world is obscure, confusing, contradictory, mysterious. If one assumes, however, a basic unity that existed before the world, that split itself into a world of multiplicity, and that only the latter still exists, then the hardest philosophical problems solve themselves with a playful lightness, as I have shown. The disintegration of the original unity, which we cannot cognize, into multiplicity, was the first movement. All other movements are merely necessary consequences of this first movement. *Destiny is no mystery anymore* and one *can* arrive at a clear conception of the common root of necessity and contingency, which *Schopenhauer*, who always *mixed* the transcendent with the immanent, had to deny.

If we look back from here, on the Ethics and Politics of *Schopenhauer* and mine, then the difference shows itself in all its magnitude.

A philosophy that wants to supersede religion must, before everything, be able to announce the consolation of religion: the uplifting, the heart strengthening message, that the sins of everyone will be forgiven, and that a benevolent providence guides humanity to its best. Does the *Schopenhauerian* philosophy announce this message? No! Just like Mephistopheles, *Schopenhauer* sits on the bank of the stream of humans, scornfully telling those who struggle with suffering, long to salvation: your reason cannot help you. Only the intellectual intuition can save you, but only those, who are predestined by mysterious might. Many are called, but few are chosen. All the others are condemned, to languish "forever" in the hell of existence. And woe upon the poor, who believes that he can be saved in the whole; he cannot die for his Idea lies outside of time.

> It is true, all wish to be delivered from the state of suffering and death; they would like, as it is expressed, to attain to eternal blessedness, to enter the kingdom of heaven, only not upon their own feet; they would like to be carried there by the *course of nature*. That, however, is impossible.* (*WWR* 2, Denial of the Will to Live)

I, on the hand, say, based on nature, whoever wants to be saved, can do so "through reason and science, Man's highest power." The infallible method, to be omitted from the rest of the world, is for the real individuality, whose development depends in no way on time, *virginity*. But for those who live

already on through children, as well as those who can still embrace the method, but have not the power to do so – they should all take courage and continue their way: sooner or later they will be saved, be it *before* the whole, or *in* the whole, for the *universe* moves from existence into non-existence.

Metaphysics

https://old.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/62r2kx/denial_of_the_will_to_live_accounts_from/

Denial of the Will to Live; Accounts from Christian mysticism and Buddhism

Among all religions two distinguish themselves by their focus, which falls in the center of the truth, in the individuality: the true Christianity and the teachings of the Indian prince Siddharta (Buddha). These so different teachings agree with each other in essence and confirm the by me refined *Schopenhauer*ian system, which is why we will now have a short look on them: the first one in the form, as given by the *Frankfurter* in ***Theologia Germanica***, because the individuality is much more purely reflected in it than in the Gospel.

First of all the Frankfurter distinguishes God as Godhead from God as God.

> To God, as Godhead, appertain neither *will*, nor *knowledge*, nor *manifestation*, nor anything that we can name, or say, or conceive. But to God as God, it belongeth to express Himself, and know and love Himself, and to reveal Himself to Himself; and all this without any creature. And all this resteth in God as a substance but not as a working, so long as there is no creature. And out of this expressing and revealing of Himself unto Himself, ariseth the distinction of *Persons*. ^^ (XXXI)

And now, making the monstrous step from potential-existence to actual-existence, he says:

> Now God will have it to be exercised and clothed in a form, for it is there only to be wrought out and executed. What else is it for? Shall it lie idle? What then would it profit? As good were it that it had never been; nay better, for what is of no use existeth in vain, and that is abhorred by God and Nature. However God will have it wrought out, and this cannot come to pass (which it ought to do) without the creature. Nay, if there ought not to be, and were not this and that—works, and a world full of real things, and the like, —what were God Himself, and what had He to do, and whose God would He be? ^^ (XXXI)

Here the virtuous man becomes scared and afraid. He gazes into the abyss and shakes back from the bottomless pit:

> Here we must turn and stop, or we might follow this matter and grope along until we knew not where we were, nor how we should find our way out again.

From now he stays on real ground and the most important part of his teaching begins. He indeed has an *idealistic* mood (all pantheism is *necessarily* empirical idealism), when he declares all creatures to be mere illusion.

> That which hath flowed forth from it, is no true Being, and hath no Being except in the Perfect, but is an accident, or a brightness, or a visible appearance, which is no Being, and hath no Being except in the fire whence the brightness flowed forth, such as the sun or a candle. ^^ (I)

But he does not continue the false way and immediately goes back on the right path. On it he finds the only thing which can be encountered in nature at all, the essential, core of all beings: the real individuality, or *single-wills*.

>That is to say: of all things that are, nothing is forbidden and nothing is contrary to God but one thing only: that is, *Self-will*, or to will otherwise than as the Eternal Will would have it. ^^ (L)

>What did the devil do else, or what was his going astray and his fall else, but that he claimed for himself to be also somewhat, and would have it that somewhat was his, and somewhat was due to him? This setting up of a claim and his *I* and *Me* and *Mine*, these were his going astray, and his fall. ^^ (II)

>What else did Adam do but this same thing? It is said, it was because Adam ate the apple that he was lost, or fell. I say, it was because of his claiming something for his own, and because of his *I, Mine, Me*, and the like. Had he eaten seven apples, and yet never claimed anything for his own, he would not have fallen. ^^ (III)

>Now he who liveth to *himself* after the old man, is called and is truly a child of Adam. ^^ (XVI)

>All who follow Adam in pride, in lust of the flesh, and in disobedience, are dead in soul. ^^ (XVI)

>The more of *Self* and *Me*, the more of sin and wickedness. ^^ (XVI)

>Nothing burneth in hell but *self-will*. ^^ (XXXIV)

>Adam, the I, the Me, self-willing, sin or the old man, contrary and remaining without God: it is all one and the same thing. ^^ (XXXIV)

> Therefore all will apart from God's will (that is, all self-will) is sin, and so is all that is done from self-will. ^^ (XLIV)

>If there were no self-will, there would be no Devil and no hell. ^^ (XLIX)

> Were there no self-will, there would be also no *ownership*. In heaven there is no ownership; hence there are found content, true peace, and all blessedness. ^^ (LI)

> He who hath something, or seeketh or longeth to have something of his own, is himself owned; and he who hath nothing of his own, nor seeketh nor longeth thereafter, is free and at large, and in bondage to none. ^^ (LI)

> A man should so stand free, being quit of himself, that is, of his I, and Me, and Self, and Mine, and the like, that in all things, he should no more seek or regard himself, than if he did not exist, and should take as little account of himself as if he were not, and another had done all his works. ^^ (XV)

> For where this is brought about in a true divine light, there the new man is born again. In like manner, it hath been said that man should die unto himself, that is, to earthly pleasures, consolations, joys, appetites, the I, the Self, and all that is thereof in man, to which he clingeth and on which he is yet leaning with content, and thinketh much of. Whether it be the man himself, or any other creature, whatever it be, it must depart and die, if the man is to be brought aright to another mind, according to the truth. ^^ (XVI)

Should a union with God take place, then the single-wills must completely be killed; since

> Thus the Self and the Me are wholly sundered from God, and belong to Him only in so far as they are necessary for Him to be a *Person*. ^^ (XXXII)

The last sentence is a good testimony of the mystic's prudence, which did not allow the perverse reason to make the universe melt away in a gaseous, floppy, weak infiniteness.

Now, how can man come to self-denial, how can he destroy the single-will in himself? The mystic talks before everything about the truth, that *everyone* can be redeemed:

>And truly there is no one to blame for this but themselves. For if a man were looking and striving after nothing but to find a preparation in all things, and diligently gave his whole mind to see how he might become prepared; verily God would well prepare him, for God giveth as much care and earnestness and love to the preparing of a man, as to the pouring in of His Spirit when the man is prepared.

^(XXII)

And continuing to the execution, he says:

> The most noble and delightful gift that is bestowed on any creature is that of perceiving, or *Reason*, and *Will*. And these *two* are so bound together, that where the one is, there the other is also. And if it were not for these two gifts, there would be no reasonable creatures, but only brutes and brutishness; and that were a great loss, for God would never have His due, and behold Himself and His attributes manifested in deeds and works; the which ought to be, and is, necessary to perfection.

^(L)

With his reason man starts to know himself and therefore his very peculiar state, strikingly called *"the lust of hell"*, from which it is redeemed by God.

> For, of a truth, thoroughly to know oneself, is above all art, for it is the highest art. If thou knowest thyself well, thou art better and more praiseworthy before God, than if thou didst not know thyself, but didst understand the course of the heavens and of all the planets and stars, also the dispositions of all mankind, also the nature of all beasts, and, in such matters, hadst all the skill of all who are in heaven and on earth. ^(IX)

> When a man truly Perceiveth and considereth himself, who and what he is, and findeth himself utterly vile and wicked, and unworthy of all the comfort and kindness that he hath ever received from God, or from the creatures, he falleth into such a deep abasement and despising of himself, that he thinketh himself unworthy that the earth should bear him, and it seemeth to him reasonable that all creatures in heaven and earth should rise up against him and avenge their Creator on him, and should punish and torment him; and that he were unworthy even of that. ^(XI)

>And therefore also he will not and dare not desire any consolation or release, either from God or from any creature that is in heaven or on earth; but he is willing to be unconsoled and unreleased, and he doth not grieve over his condemnation and sufferings; for they are right and just. ^(XI)

> Now God hath not forsaken a man in this hell, but He is laying His hand upon him, that the man may not desire nor regard anything but the Eternal Good only, and may come to know that that is so noble and passing good, that none can search out or express its bliss, consolation and joy, peace, rest and satisfaction. And then, when the man neither careth for, nor seeketh, nor desireth, anything but the Eternal Good alone, and seeketh not himself, nor his own things, but the honour of God only, he is made a partaker of all manner of joy, bliss, peace, rest and consolation, and so the man is henceforth in the Kingdom of Heaven. ^(XI)

Our mystic knows however also a second, more natural way.

> But ye must know that this Light or knowledge is worth nothing without Love. ^(XLI)

> It is indeed true that Love must be guided and taught of Knowledge, but if Knowledge be not followed by love, it will avail nothing. ^^ (XLI)

> And each kind of Love is taught or guided by its own kind of Light or Reason. Now, the True Light maketh True Love, and the False Light maketh False Love; *for whatever Light deemeth to be best, she delivereth unto Love as the best*, and biddeth her love it, and Love obeyeth, and fulfilleth her commands. ^^ (XLII)

> True Love is taught and guided by the true Light and Reason, and this true, eternal and divine Light teacheth Love to love nothing but the One true and Perfect Good, and that simply for its own sake, and not for the sake of a reward, or in the hope of obtaining anything, but simply for the Love of Goodness, because it is good and hath a right to be loved. ^^ (XLII)

> And then there beginneth in him a true inward life, wherein from henceforward, *God Himself* becometh *the man*, so that nothing is left in him but what is God's or of God, and nothing is left which taketh anything unto itself. ^^ (LIII)

The conduct of such a "Godlike" man is painted by the mystic as follows:

> But if a man ought and is willing to lie still under God's hand, he must and ought also to be still under all things, whether they come from God himself, or the creatures, nothing excepted. And he who would be obedient, resigned and submissive to God, must and ought to be also resigned, obedient and submissive to all things, in a spirit of yielding, and not of resistance, and take them in *silent inside-staying*, resting on the hidden foundations of his soul, and having a, *secret inward patience*, that enableth him to take all chances or crosses willingly. ^^ (XXIII)

> Hence it followeth that the man doth not and will not crave or beg for anything, either from God or the creatures, beyond mere *needful things*, and for those only with shamefacedness, as a favour and not as a right. And he will not minister unto or gratify his body or any of his natural desires, beyond what is needful, nor allow that any should help or serve him except in case of necessity, and then always in trembling. ^^ (XXVI)

And the state of being of such a Godlike man is painted by the *Frankfurter* as follows:

> Now what is this union? It is that we should be of a truth purely, simply, and wholly at one with the One Eternal Will of God, or altogether without will, so that the created will should flow out into the Eternal Will, and be swallowed up and lost therein, so that the Eternal Will alone should do and leave undone in us. ^^ (XXVII)

> Moreover, these men are in a state of freedom, because they have lost the fear of pain or hell, and the hope of reward or heaven, but are living in pure submission to the Eternal Goodness, in the perfect freedom of *fervent love*. ^^ (X)

> Now, when this union truly cometh to pass and becometh established, the inward man standeth henceforward immovable in this union; and God suffereth the outward man to be moved hither and thither, from this to that, of such things as are necessary and right. So that the outward man saith in sincerity "I have no will to be or not to be, to live or die, to know or not to know, to do or to leave undone and the like; but I am ready for all that is to be, or ought to be, and obedient thereunto, whether I have to do or to suffer." ^^ (XXVIII)

> And in his heart there is a content and a quietness, so that he doth not desire to know more or less, to have, to live, to die, to be, or not to be, or anything of the kind; these become all one and alike to him, and he complaineth of nothing but of sin only. ^^ (XLIII)

But despite that the Godlike man must endure and willingly endures, his *will* revolts with *strength* and *complete energy* against the only foe: falling back in the world. The mystic expresses here in a naïve way, that the individual, until his last breath of air, *cannot deny the* I, the *self*. One can deny the natural self, the original I, the “Adam”, but not the self itself.

>Now, wherever a man hath been made a partaker of the divine nature, in him is fulfilled the best and noblest life, and the worthiest in God's eyes, that hath been or can be. And of that eternal love which loveth Goodness as Goodness and for the sake of Goodness, a true, noble, Christ-like life is so greatly beloved, that it will never be forsaken or cast off. Where a man hath tasted this life, it is impossible for him ever to part with it, were he to live until the Judgment Day. And though he must die a thousand deaths, and though all the sufferings that ever befell all creatures could be heaped upon him, he would rather undergo them all, than fall away from this excellent life; and if he could exchange it for an angel's life, he would not. ^^(\XXXVIII)

>And he who is a truly virtuous man would not cease to be so, to gain the whole world, yea, he would rather die a miserable death. ^^(\XLI)

The core of the great, mild *Buddha*'s teaching is *karma*.

The five main components of humans are the 5 khandas: 1) the body, 2) feelings, 3) representations, 4) judgements (thinking), 5) consciousness. The 5 khandas are hold together and the product is karma.

Karma is activity, motion, moral force, *omnipotence* (action, moral action, supreme power).

Karma is in bodies, like fruit in trees, one cannot say in which part of the tree is it; it is everywhere.

Karma contains kusala (merit) and akusala (guilt).

Akusala consists of klesha-Kama (cleaving to existence, will to live) and wastu-Kama (cleaving to existing objects, specific will, *demon*).

Karma is *individual*.

> All sentient beings have their own *individual* karma, or the most essential property of all beings is their karma ; karma comes by inheritance, or that which is inherited (not from parentage, but from previous births) is karma ; karma is the cause of all good and evil, or they come by means of karma, or on account of karma ; karma is a kinsman, but all its power is from kusala and akusala ; karma is an assistant, or that which promotes the prosperity of any one is his good karma ; it is the difference in the karma, as to whether it be good or evil, that causes the difference *in the lot of men*, so that some are mean and others are exalted, some are miserable and others happy.
(Spence Hardy. A Manual of Budhism)

Karma is thus an individual, completely determined moral force. At *birth* karma is so to speak like an account balance. The *merit*-balance is made up of the sum of all good actions in past ways of existing, subtracted by rewards; the *guilt*-balance is made up of the sum of all bad actions in previous life courses, subtracted by punishments. At the *death* of an individual his karma is the karma of his birth plus all his good and bad actions of the finished life course, minus the sentences of guilt in this life course and the rewarded merits of previous times.

The specific state of karma is therefore not a from the parents obtained onto the child passed individual character, but the karma of an individual is something which is *completely independent* from the *parents*. The begetting of the parents is merely the occasional cause for the appearance of

karma, which builds itself a new body, without strange support from outside. Or with other words: the karma-teaching is occasionalism. If a karma of a specific state becomes free by death, then it causes the conception, where its being conforms with the individual which has to be produced, i.e. it cloaks itself in such a new body, which is most suited for the its composition of specific guilt with specific merit. It thus becomes either a Brahmin, or a King, or a beggar, or a woman, or a man, or a lion, or a dog, or a swine, or a worm etc.

>With the exception of those beings who have entered into one of the four paths leading to nirwana, there may be an interchange of condition between the highest and lowest. He who is now the most degraded of the demons, may one day rule the highest of the heavens ; he who is at present seated upon the most honorable of the celestial thrones may one day writhe amidst the agonies of a place of torment ; and the worm, that we crush under our feet may, in the course of ages, become a supreme budha.

>A woman or a man takes life ; the blood of that which they have slain is continually upon their hands ; they live by murder ; they have no compassion upon any living thing ; such persons, on the breaking up of the elements (the five khandas), will be born in one of the hells ; or if, on account of the merit received in some former birth, they are born as men, it will be of some inferior caste, or if of a high caste, they will die young, and this shortness of life is on account of former cruelties. But if any one avoid the destruction of life, not taking a weapon into his hand that he may shed blood, and be kind to all, and merciful to all, he will, after death, be born in the world of the dewas, or if he appear in this world, it will be as a brahman, or some other high caste, and he will live to see old age.

Karma works in the world, sangsara; it disappears and gets annihilated however if one enters nirwana.

What is nirwana? Four paths lead to the same:

>1) the path Sowán,

>2) the path Sakradágami,

>3) the path Anágami,

>4) the path Arya.

Nagaséna, a Buddhist priest with a very fine dialectical mind, paints the beings on the 4 paths as follows:

>1. There is the being, who has entered the path sowán. He entirely approves of the doctrines of the great teacher ; he also rejects the error called sakkáya – drishti, which teaches, *I am, this is mine* ; he sees that the practises enjoined by the Budhas must be attended to if nirwana is to be gained. Thus, in three degrees his mind is pure ; but in all others it is yet under the influence of impurity.

>2. There is the being that has entered the path Sakradágami. He has rejected the three errors overcome by the man, who has entered sowan, and he is also saved from the evils of Kama-raga (evil desire, sensuous passion) and the wishing evil to others. Thus in five degrees his mind is pure ; but as to the rest it is entangled, slow.

>3. There is the being that has entered the path anágami. He is free from the five errors overcome by the man who has entered Sakradagami, and also from evil desire, ignorance, doubt, the precepts of the sceptics and hatred.

>4. There is the rahat. He has vomited up klesha, as if it were an indigested mass ; he has arrived at the happiness which is obtained from the sight of nirwana ; his mind is light, free and quick towards the rahatship.
(Spence Hardy. Eastern Monachism)

The conformity of the portrayal of the state of such a rahat below with the portrayal of the *Frankfurter*, of the state of a Godlike man, is astonishing.

>The rahats are subject to the endurance of pain of body, such as proceeds from hunger, disease ; but they are entirely free from sorrow or pain of mind. The rahats have entirely overcome fear. Were a 100,000 men, armed with various weapons, to assault a single rahat, he would be unmoved, and entirely free from fear.

>Seriyyut, a rahat, knowing neither desire nor aversion declared: I am like a servant awaiting the command of the master, ready to obey it, whatever it may be ; I await the appointed time for the cessation of existence ; I have no wish to live ; I have no wish to die ; desire is extinct.

Nirwana itself is *non-existence*.

>Nirwana is the destruction of all the elements of existence. The being who is purified, perceiving the evils arising from the sensual organs, does not rejoice therein ; by the destruction of the 108 modes of evil desire he has released himself from birth, as from the jaws of an alligator ; he has overcome all attachment to outward objects ; he is released from birth ; and all the afflictions connected with the repetition of existence are overcome. Thus all the principles of existence are annihilated, and that *annihilation is nirwana*.

Nirwana is factually non-existence, *absolute annihilation*, although the successors of Buddha made efforts, to present it as something real of the world, sangsara, and to teach about a life in it, the life of the rahats and Buddha's. Nirwana should not be a place and nevertheless the blessed ones should live there: in the death of the redeemed ones every principle of life should be annihilated and nevertheless the rahats should *live*.

The union with God, about which the *Frankfurter* speaks, takes, as we have seen, place already in the world and is precisely the kingdom of heaven. The kingdom of heaven after death is, like nirwana, *non-existence* ; since if one transgresses this world and life in it and speaks about a world, which is not this world and about a life, which is not this life – then where is somewhere a point of reference?

If one compares now the teaching of the *Frankfurter*, the teaching of *Buddha* and the by me refined *Schopenhauer*ian teaching with each, then one will find, that they, in essence, show the greatest possible conformity; since single-wills, Karma and individual will to live are one and the same. All three systems furthermore teach, that life is essentially an unhappy one, and that one should free oneself through knowledge and can. Ultimately, the kingdom of heaven after death, nirwana and absolute nothingness are one and the same.

PHILOSOPHY OF SALVATION VOLUME 2

The True Trust

https://old.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/63ce8t/the_true_trust/

>“I am God, who can do something against me, if I didn’t want in the deepest part of my soul?”
(Buddha, philosophical atheism)

>Commit your way to the Lord

>Trust in him and he will do this (Psalm 37;5)

Once, I witnessed how an old good lady visited an acquaintance, who had lost her husband a few days ago and was in a depressed state. As the old, withered, silver-haired lady said goodbye, she spoke: “Stay calm. God does not forsake the widows and orphans.”

Not these words themselves moved and shook me: it was the sound of the voice, the tone of great determination, of the most unshakable faith, of unconditional trust; it was the glance of the blue eyes, that flashed light and then glowed calmly, brightly, mildly, peacefully again.

What she said, was a clear expression of the adamant trust, which *Christ* painted with the words:

>Truly I tell you, whoever says to this mountain: Be lifted up and thrown into the sea! and does not doubt at all in his heart but believes that what he says will take place: it will be done for him. (Mark 11;23)

These words of the Savior express very well, that which we talk about, in a bold image; since whoever rests upon the real trust, which may have emerged in whatever way, does not want to move mountains, either he blissfully sits in his firm faith like a child in its fairy world, or he has much more important things to do than moving mountains, has to fulfill much harder achievements and he does fulfill them, so that, in fact, he does more than moving a mountain in the air and plummeting it in the sea.

Man wants life no matter what. He wants it consciously and due to a demonic (unconscious) drive. Secondly, he wants life in a specific form. If we ignore the wise (the holy Indian Brahmins, Buddhists, Christians and wise philosophers such as Spinoza), then everyone hopes, that divine breath will carry them, like the wings of a butterfly, from flower to flower. This is the normal trust in the goodness of God.

However, since the experience of even the stupidest learns, that the divine breath is not only a soft Zephyr, but can also be a cold icy wind of the north or a frightening storm, that may annihilate flower and butterfly, besides trust, also *fear for God* appears.

Let us imagine a human of the ordinary kind, even he, built from a hardworking priest, comes from the Church and says: "I trust upon God, I stand in His hand, He will do good for me." Could we open in his heart the most hidden ply, we would find, that with this confident expression he actually wants to express:

"My God will save me from doom and destruction." He fears unhappiness and death, most of all a sudden death.

Does this human trust upon God? He trusts in fear: his trust is nothing else than God-fear in the shredded robe of trust: fear glimpses outward from a thousand holes and ruptures.

One can rightly assume, that between this God-trust, resp. this God-fear and the trust of the real believers lies no other grade of trust. Differences exist only in the way and manner, how the believer puts up with the blows and benefits of fate: if in the poles prevail absolute downheartedness and absolute rest on one side, absolute joy and absolute rest on the other side, or if there's always a point somewhere in between these boundaries; for always he says:

>What God does, is done well.

It is only the flesh, as the theologians say, which shivers or rejoices: the soul is always full of trust.

From these believers those immediately become a Saint (like how a doubter immediately becomes a wise the moment he starts to have contempt for death) who love death [on earth].

God-fear is fear for death, God-trust is contempt for death.

He who has overcome the fear of death, he and only he can generate the delightful, most aromatic flower in his soul: unassailability, immovability, unconditional trust; because what in the world could move such a human in any way? Need? He knows no fear of starvation. Enemies? At most they could kill him and it is death what cannot frighten him. Bodily pain? If it becomes unbearable, then he throws, the "foreigner on earth", himself together with his body away.

This is why contempt for death is the prerequisite **sine qua non** for the true trust.

But how can it be achieved? Through religion and through philosophy.

As religion gives the individual the marvelous trust, it gives it in the cloak of pretty delusion. It lures the humans with a sweet image, which awakens in them the passionate desire and with the embrace of the marvelous illusion it crushes the fear of death away from his breast. He has contempt for the earthly life, to maintain a more beautiful heavenly life.

Faith is therefore the prerequisite of religious trust and the more humanity's capability to believe decreases, as a result the rarer the real God-trust becomes, or (which is the same) the more fearful, disoriented, groundless, unhappy humans become.

We live now in a period, where the blissful internalization by the continuous decrease of faith becomes more and more rare, the unhappy groundlessness and peacelessness become more and more common: it is the period of inconsolable unbelief.

Only the philosophy remains. Can she help? Can she, without a personal God and without a Kingdom of Heaven on the other side of the grave, give a motive, which internalizes, concentrates and thereby sprouts the blossom of the real trust, the unshakable peace of mind? Yes, she can; certainly, she can do it. She bases the trust upon pure **knowledge**, like religion grounded it upon **faith**.

As little as the *Religion* of Salvation, Christianity, can be moved further, this little my *Philosophy* of Salvation can be moved further: she can only be perfected, i.e. in details, namely in Physics, be expanded; since in the world there is no miracle nor unfathomable mystery. Nature can fully be fathomed. Only the *origin* of the world is a miracle and an unfathomable mystery. I have nevertheless shown that for us even the divine action, i.e. the origin of the world, is explicable as an image, namely when we purposely attribute the worldly principles Will and Mind as *regulative* (not constitutive) principles to the pre-worldly deity. With that, in my conviction, human's speculative desire has come at the end of its path; since I dare to state, that about the *being* of the pre-worldly deity no human mind can give account. On the other hand, the by me as an *image* mirrored origin of the divine decision to embody itself in a world of multiplicity, in order to free itself from existence, should be satisfying enough for all reasonable ones.

What has now followed from my metaphysics. Precisely a scientific foundation, i.e. *knowledge* (not *faith*), on which the unshakable God-trust, the absolute contempt for death, yes *love for death* can be built.

Namely I showed first of all, that everything in the world is unconscious *will to death*. This will to death is, in humans, fully and completely concealed by will to *live*, since life is the *method* for death, which presents itself clearly for even the stupidest ones: we continually die, our life is a slow death struggle, every day death gains, against every human, more might, until it extinguishes of everyone the light of life.

Should such an organization of the things be possible at all, *if* human in essence, in the primordial core of his being, doesn't *want death*? The rogue wants life as an delectable *method* to die, the wise wants death *directly*.

One only has to make himself clear, that we in the inner core of our being want death, i.e. one has to strip off the cloak of our being and at once the *conscious* love of death is there, i.e. complete unassailability in life or the most blissful delightful God-trust.

This unveiling of our being through a clear look at the world, where one finds everywhere the great truth:

> that life is essentially unhappy and non-existence should be preferred;

then as result of speculation:

>that everything, which is, was *before* the world in God and that, figuratively spoken, everyone has partaken in God's decision to *not* be as well as the method for this goal.

From this follows:

>that in life nothing can hit me, good nor bad, which I have not chosen myself, in full freedom, *before* the world.

Therefore a strange hand does not add anything in life, only indirectly, i.e. the strange hand only executes, what *I myself* have chosen, as fruitful for myself.

If I now use this principle on everything which hits me in life, on happiness and unhappiness, pain and lust, pleasure and displeasure, sickness and health, life or death, if I have made the case completely plain and clear, has my heart passionately seized the thought of salvation, then I must accept all events of life with a smiling visage, and face all possible incidents with absolute rest and serenity.

Philosopher, c'est apprendre à mourir (Philosophizing, that's learning to die): That is wisdom's "last conclusion".

He who does not fear death, he plunges himself in burning houses; he who does not fear death, he jumps without wavering in raging water floods; he who does not fear death; he throws himself in the densest hail of bullets; he who does not fear death, he takes on unarmed a thousand equipped giants – with one word, he who does not fear death, he alone can do something for others, can bleed for others and have at the same time the only desirable good in this world, the real peace of heart.

With right the greatest fame of the Savior is that:

>that he has conquered the horrors of the hell and the terrors of death,

i.e. the suffering of life and death.

This is why I see my philosophy, which is nothing else than the purified philosophy of the genius *Schopenhauer*, as a motive, which will lead to the same internalization, absorption and concentration in humans of our *present time* of history, which the motive of the Savior brought forth in the first centuries after his death.

However like the day is only day, because night precedes and follows it, likewise the adamant trust, the deep peace of heart cannot be achieved without the dark terrible night of despair. It must choke and distress, whip and lash them, must break them, kill them in a sense: Adam must die, if Christ wants to resurrect.

Let however no one believe, that this night relies upon harsh beatings by fate: on sicknesses, hunger, broken existence, fatalities of loved ones, difficult worries about existence. Human's doubts are what shake the most, as well as the wasteland of the heart. Not a single enlightened one has been spared the thorns. Before he becomes enlightened, he looked into his eroding storming breast or in his desolate heart: there was only coldness, stiffness, wasteland: no hint of enthusiasm to be found, no sparkling sources splatter in the treasures of trees, on whose branches sing joyful birds.

Comment to “The True Trust”

I wanted to share an example of this immovability in the form of *religious trust* of someone living in a society with permanent unbearable fear; life under the Stalin terror.

The story is about a pianist named Maria Yudina.

>One Sunday afternoon during the war Yudina was the featured soloist in a live broadcast over Radio Moscow of Mozart's piano concerto 23. It just so happened that Stalin was listening to the broadcast that afternoon and was most favorably impressed. The following day he phoned Radio Moscow and "requested" that they send him the recording of the Mozart piano concerto, "played by Yudina" he added. So they told him that of course they had it. Obviously, having been a live performance, no such recording existed, but nobody at Radio Moscow was going to risk Stalin's wrath by telling him that.

>

>The committee panicked, but they had to do something. They called in Yudina and an orchestra to an emergency recording session that night. Everyone was shaking with fright, except for Yudina, naturally. But she was a special case, that one, the ocean was only knee-deep for her.

>

>It was already after 10 p. m. before everyone showed up, and the original conductor was so nervous about making a "mistake" and incurring Stalin's ire that he could not beat time effectively. After several false starts, he was sent home, they called another conductor, who trembled and got everything mixed up, confusing the orchestra. Only a third conductor was in any shape to finish the recording.

>
>About two weeks later Yudina received a note from Stalin himself congratulating her on a marvelous performance and expressing how much he approved of her interpretation of Mozart. Enclosed with the note was
a personal check from Stalin to Yudina for 20,000 rubles!
>
>She answered:
>
>>"Dear Josef Vissairyonovich,
>>
>>I wish to thank you for your most generous gift and express to you how much it touched my heart. I will continue to pray for you and your soul every day and every night for the rest of my life. Please remember that
God's love for you is as infinite as His mercy, and if you but confess and repent He will forgive your many sins against our homeland and our countrymen.
>>
>>Once again, I wish to thank you for your gift. I have donated it in its entirety to the church which I regularly attend.
>>
>>Most sincerely,
>>Maria V. Yudina"
>
>And Yudina sent this suicidal letter to Stalin but there was no reaction.

User Sunques:

>This is why ****contempt for death**** is the prerequisite sine qua non for the true trust.
But how can it be achieved? Through religion and through philosophy.

Should that read "love for death"? Meaning that the true trust is ***love for death***?

He really writes contempt for death (Todes*verachtung*). He writes that it's a ***prerequisite***, and certainly, contempt for death is a prerequisite for love for death.

My impression is that he doesn't separate it that much, since he writes that a wise is someone who has contempt for death (in the Characters post of 2months ago, and here too) and a saint someone who loves death. But then he writes: the wise wants death directly.

Edit: Now that I rethink and reread, it seems that saint is always about Christians, meaning attaining this state through faith, whereas a wise attains it through knowledge.

Aphorisms

<https://old.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/6iull9/aphorisms/>

§

Schopenhauer's philosophy can be seen as the bridge that lifts the people from faith to philosophy. It is therefore a deed in not only in the history of philosophy, but in the history of *mankind*. The building blocks for this bridge are taken from his Ethics and the sum is called: *individual salvation through knowledge*. Hereby the will of the common man is given a sufficient motive and object which he can seize in such love as the Buddhist the blissful knowledge, that he will experience no rebirth, the Mohammedan the hope for the joys of paradise, the faithful Christian the promise of the Kingdom of Heaven.

§

The teaching of the *denial of the individual will to live* is the first philosophical truth and also the *only one* that will be able, like religious teachings, to move and ignite the masses. But therefore it may also not remain the exclusive property of a few privileged ones, who, in happy contemplativeness and individual delight stand highly above the striving and tumult of life, as it were guarding on the pinnacle of the temple the "safe treasure", while the great crowd of "disinherited ones" stands in vain before the closed gate of incomprehension with longing gazes.

It must give *all* those who feel burdened and soul-tired, who thirst after it, hand the consolation of salvation without distinction; it must become common good; it must be the sweetest and most delightful, which the "highest power" can offer humanity, carried *out of* the temple of science to the summit of mountains: visible for everyone, concrete and attainable, enlightening the night, "slowly waning from the vales", into bright *day*.

In a word: it may not remain "caviar for the people", it must become the life bread for its starving *heart*. And for this the purification from all transcendent notions was the first and necessary step.

§

The riddle of life is extraordinarily simple; and nevertheless the highest intellectual cultivation and the greatest experience are needed to figure it out, these requirements must always be fulfilled in order to solve it.

Therefore education, equal education for everyone and all!

§

Two very aromatic blossoms of Christianity are the concepts: alienness on earth and religious homesickness. Whoever starts to see and feel himself as a guest on earth, has entered the path of salvation and this immediately becomes the pay-off for his wisdom: from now on he sits until death in the world, like a spectator in theatre.

§

The pessimistic philosophy will be for the coming period of history what the pessimistic religion of Christianity was for the past. The sign of our flag is not the crucified savior, but the death angel with huge, calm, mild eyes, carried by the dove of the redemption thought: in essence the same sign.

§

I must repeat it one more time: the goal of the whole world history, i.e. all battles, religious systems, inventions, discoveries, revolutions, sects, parties etc. is: bringing to the mass, what some have possessed since the beginning of culture. The goal is not to rear a race of angels, which will then exist forever, but salvation from existence. The realization of the boldest ideals of the socialists can merely bring for everyone a state of comfort, in which some have lived since the beginning.

And what did these people do, when they achieved this state? They turned themselves away from life.

Something else is also not possible.

§

Blessed are those who can say: I feel that my life is in accordance with the movement of the universe, or, which is the same: I feel that my will has flown into the divine Will. It is wisdom's last conclusion and the completion of all morality.

§

Everyone is slave and lord at the same time, tool and master, seen from the perspective of destiny.

§

The indifference of all those, who have renounced the world, towards history and politics has its ground in the fact, that the development of humanity can bring these people nothing, which they already possess.

§

One could call the [First] [Vatican Council](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/First_Vatican_Council) a suicide attempt of the papacy. It has afflicted itself a wound that is mortal. Its death is only a matter of time.

§

If Gregory VII¹ or Innocent III² would sit on the papal throne, then the papacy would place itself in front of the social movement.

And what would Innocent think of it?

He would think: since the papacy must fall, the emperorship must fall as well; for his sharp mind would recognize that in the new order of things there is no place for the papacy.

¹ Made celibacy mandatory for priests.

² Wrote **De miseria humanæ conditionis**: the text is divided into three parts; in the first part the wretchedness of the human body and the various hardships one has to bear throughout life are described; the second lists man's futile ambitions, i.e. affluence, pleasure and esteem, and the third deals with the decay of the human corpse. Mainländer cites a passage of this work in the first volume of his main work.

--

§

The sexual urge is the bond that binds us most firmly to the world; it is the great cliff that separates us from the peace of heart; it is the tightest veil, that conceals the starflowers of the divine law.

§

I must say it again and again: we humans have been there, when the world was created, yes, its creation and its composition can be lead back to our decision. This is the real and true aseity of the Will, not the miraculous one maintained by *Schopenhauer* which should reveal itself at the deathbed. In life there is no freedom. Before the world there was only freedom.

§

Whenever I read *Schopenhauer*'s treatise on death and the indestructability of our being, I had to think of two things: an advocate who has to defend a lost cause, and a human who is scared, but who, shaking like leaves, says the most splendid and powerful words of consolation.

§

Humboldt's remark: "Procreation is a crime" goes maybe a bit too far. Humboldt could express it only under the deception, that the child something *new*. Begetting children cannot be a crime, for child and father are one. But it is gigantic foolishness, the *greatest* foolishness.

User Sunques:

>Humboldt's remark: "Procreation is a crime" goes maybe a bit too far.

Mainlander is correct. The use of the word "crime" is a form of 'dramatic license'. In fact, antinatalism is the true crime because it breaks the "The Law" of nature!

The set of essays “Realism and Idealism”

Realism

<https://old.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/69dnbz/realism/>

>Fear first made gods in the world.

>(*Petronius*)

>Let the race of mankind

>fear the gods!

>For they hold dominion

>over them in their eternal hands,

>and can demand

>what they please of us.

>(*Goethe*)

--

When the first objectively tempered rogue reflected for the first time about himself and the world, it was not a deceptive image that floated in his soul: he had seen the truth through a very thin veil.

He had seen on one side himself and his force, his often victorious, proud, splendid I; – on the other side *powers*, not a unitary power, that intervened with his individual might, powers towards which he sometimes felt completely powerless.

The worldview which was built on this correct *aperçu*, was polytheism: *the rogue truth*.

Around these both points, like the two focal points of an ellipse, so around the in his egoism contained I and around the not-I, the sum of all these other individuals of this world, rotated and rotate all religions and all philosophies, all (animist) religions and great ethical religions, all philosophical systems.

What separates particular religions and particular philosophical systems from each other, is only the *relationship*, in which the I is placed to the outside world. Sometimes the greatest power is assigned to the I, sometimes to the outer world, sometimes *all* power to the I, sometimes all power to the outer world, which shows itself to every impartial clear eye of a thinker always as the result of many forces, later on it was made into a hidden, holy, all-powerful unity. And this unity was sometimes placed outside the world while only controlling it, sometimes it was placed inside the world as stimulation of it (world soul).

The correct relation of the individual to the outer world and the correct determination of the being of these limbs form the *truth*, the sublime light, whose footprint the noble follows, this bowl of the grail, whose sweet liquid is the only thing every Parsifal can desire, after having voluntarily banished himself, fulfilled with disgust, from the table of life.

And all of them, every one of them, who have searched the truth, the wise, the great founders of religions, prophets and geniuses have seen the light of the truth, some have seen it more purely than the others, and few completely pure. And why have they all seen the light of the truth? Because it is in essence about something extremely simple: only two limbs, which the stupidest human recognizes, should be contemplatively examined and brought in a relation to each other. The correct relation demands only a free judgement-power, since nature shows it *correctly* at every moment. The sphinx of the world-riddle has, from the moment when a human for the first time stood still for her and looked into her eyes, spoken:

>In my eyes lies the key to the world-riddle. Stay calm and keep yourself free from confusion, then you will recognize it and thereby solve the riddle!

and she has repeated these words to every Parsifal who has come to her and she will repeat them until the end of the human race, for everyone who searches her.

That which was recognized in the eyes of the sphinx in this search for the truth since the beginning of culture until our present day will be our topic, and first of all that which is summarized in the concept realism. We will thereby come to the surprising conclusion, that the Indian pantheism is despite its idealism: pure naked, over-the-top realism that overturned itself.

Before everything we must precisely define the concept realism.

Since *Kant*, we understand under realism (naïve realism, critique-less realism) every view on nature that is established without being preceded by a precise examination of the human cognition. The world is precisely taken as they eye sees it, the ear hears it, brief, how the senses perceive it. One can therefore also say that realism *skips over the knowing I*.

Critical idealism however is every view of nature that sees the world as an image, a mirror in the mind of the I, and emphasizes and establishes the dependency of this mirror-image on the mirror: the cognition. One can therefore also say, that critical idealism makes the *knowing I*, its foothold, the *main issue*.

Naïve realism and critical idealism do not fill up the complete spheres of the concepts realism and idealism, since they rest upon the *knowing* I. They are joined by absolute realism and absolute idealism.

We have therefore in regard to the pure knowing I:

1. naïve realism,
2. critical idealism,

and in regard to the complete I:

1. absolute realism,
2. absolute idealism, which I also call the thing-in-itself-idealism.

Absolute realism skips over the *complete*, knowing *and* willing I.

Absolute idealism raises the knowing and willing I, the single individual, to the throne of the world.

From these explanations becomes already clear, that the *phenomenality* of the world can perfectly co-exist with absolute *realism*. The individual is a dead puppet: his mind *and* his will, his whole being is phenomenal.

These definitions are very important to remember.

What was the *core of all* religions of primitive people's¹, that lied in the shine of the dawn of culture?

Their core was the extremely *loosely* with the world connected individual.

The individual man ate, drank and begot. He killed animals, reared animals and ordered the field. When a poisonous snake gave him a mortal wound, or when a lion broke an arm, when he battled with fellow men and lost, then he saw in all this nothing remarkable, nothing astonishing, nothing fearsome, nothing wondrous. The snake, lion and fellow man have exercised a violence, that was limited and completely known. He knew that he, under the right circumstances, could kill the fellow men, lions and snakes. What would become of them? They were dead and no trace of them could be found anymore.

Man calmly dealt with his issues and did not ponder. He relied upon his own proud I, which, as long as he could exercise his power, satisfied him completely. He rested upon himself, on his firm individual living ground, which he recognized as small, limited by other individuals, his equals, but nevertheless a firm, solid, powerful ground.

But in case a plague broke out among his herd, if heaven did not fertilize his seeds or the glowing sun sucked away all force from the crops and dried them up like freshly mown grass, if the firmament became black and under frightening thunders heavenly fire fell upon his wife and children, if the earth quacked and swallowed his hut without trace, all his possessions, if sickness made him weak and powerless and let him with horror look in the cold night of death – then he fell down on earth in desperation, his body was shaking and his individual proud living ground was wavering, there he lost his individual might and importance completely from his consciousness, there he contritely prayed to the invisible violence that presented itself

through the earthquake, plague, the heavenly fire, the scorching heat of the sun, his sickness, in all its almightiness, he gave it everything, also his own force, and in his anxiety he felt as if he were a *pure nothing*.

He could kill the snake, lion and fellow humans, but not the heavenly fire, the sun, the earthquake, – these were powers that were totally independent of him, because he was totally dependent on them.

But when the thunder went away, the earthquake stopped, brief, when nature was back to its normal activity – then he relied on his proud I again, then he rested again on himself, on his firm individual living ground.

The polytheism of primitive people's shows the great truth, an important one-sidedness and a very remarkable unclarity.

The great truth is:

1. that the individual stands on equal footing next the remaining world, is a force like them,
2. that this remaining world is made up of individuals, is a collective-unity, not a basic unity.

The important one-sidedness is:

>that one moment the individual gave himself full might, and on another moment the remaining world.

The remarkable unclarity is:

>that the individual indeed very correctly recognized the might of the remaining world as activities of *single* individuals, but did not build it further to the knowledge, that these single activities are connected and interrelated and indeed so intimately, as if they deflocculate from a *basic unity*.

This is why above I also called polytheism the rogue truth.

This rogue truth was seized only by a few brilliant minds, who were due to social arrangement in the favorable position, to make it their life task, to look in the eyes of the sphinx: by privilege they were relieved from the harsh struggle for daily bread.

Those geniuses, "whose names God only knows", started to pull, while staying in polytheism, the weak bond between individual and world more tightly. *They extended the activity of the gods into the human heart as well.* In the original completely rogue polytheism no god, no fetish, no demon had power over the human heart. Their force reached only to the skin of the individual. The possessions and lives of humans depended upon supernatural powers, his deeds in life however flew from his self-delighting heart alone.

This relationship was changed by the reformers of the rogue polytheism with firm hand and by this they entered the road, which necessarily leads to absolute realism at its end; for, as I said above, the great truth of rogue polytheism is that:

>that the individual stands *on equal footing* next the remaining world, is a force like them.

The reformers now delivered one part of the heart of the individual, not the complete heart, to the supernatural powers, when they taught that certain good or bad deeds do not immediately flow from the will of the individual, but only mediately because of strange demonic or divine stimulation, i.e. they *extended* the power-sum of the outside of the individual remaining cosmos at the *price* of the might of the individual.

This change was certainly an improvement of the rogue polytheism, but also a dangerous one. It was an improvement, because it expressed the great truth,

>that an individual cannot act without an *outer* motive that is totally independent from him;

but it was also a *dangerous* improvement, because it was made without philosophical clarity and the correct principle relation of individual to the world was moved. It placed the single human one step lower on the fatal ladder, on which he ends as a dead puppet, where he lies completely in the power of a basic unity.

In the further course of the reformation of polytheism, a new, equally *dangerous improvement* appeared. Here, for the first time, we encounter out of the darkness of the ancient times an immortal name: *Zarathustra (Zoroaster)*.

When he recognized that the sun, the air, fire, water and earth are sometimes active in a destructive and sometimes in a beneficial way, and indeed individually, but that nevertheless an invisible interconnection exists between these individual things and that their activity exists, he taught the great truth

>about the dynamic interconnection of the things,

but at the price of the fundamental-truth specified above

>that the remaining world is made up of individuals.

He did not separate these both truths, because he was not able to. Philosophy must, like everything on earth, go through a course of development. In that time the human mind was not clear and powerful enough, to accomplish this extraordinarily important separation of the world made up of individuals only and the invisible dynamic interconnection that contains them.

This improvement was also dangerous insofar it placed the individual again one step lower, giving him the deep imprint of a powerless creature, a puppet. Zarathustra did not already make him a complete puppet. He also stayed within the boundaries of polytheism, by bringing it to its simplest expression, dualism. The God of Light (Ormuzd), supported by a legion of good angels battles with the God of Darkness (Ahriman, Satan, devil), supported by a legion of loyal demons. They battle as it were in the air and the reflection of this battle in the human breast is the *impulse* to good and bad deeds, whose execution still depends on the individual wills. As said already, the individual is also in the teaching of the Persian genius not a pure puppet, but still has self-sufficient power. The footing where he can exercise it is, however, very small.

Now only one step remained and the human mind *had* to make it. When it was made, the complete road of realism was covered. It was then exactly like in the song Erlkönig:

> In his arms, the child was dead, (Goethe)

i.e. the dead individual, a lifeless puppet lies in the arms of absolute realism, galvanized by an almighty unitary being.

What has first of all happened in Jewish monotheism and Indian pantheism?

Before everything the high truth

> about the dynamic interconnection of the things

was recorded with unsurpassable clarity. The dualism of Zarathustra was pressed away with bold hand and its place was taken by the strictest monism. The course of the world was no longer determined by two mighty deities, who continuously battled with each other, instead it was the outflow of a single God, next to which there are no other gods. Instead of an erratic world development, the whimsical play of good and bad spirits, a necessary progress according unchangeable laws came forward, according to a wise world-plan.

How this unity was imagined, is a total side-issue. Whether it was not imagined at all, or as a spirit, an immaterial infinite force, or if one thought of a humanlike being with nice eyes and a long white beard, all of this is of accessory meaning. The main issue remains the recognition of a dynamic interconnection of the world, a unitary management of it and a world course, which bears the imprint of necessity.

But this truth was bought dearly, disastrously dearly, at the price of other truths.

The great truth of polytheism,

1. that the individual stands on equal footing next the remaining world, is a force like them,
2. that this remaining world is made up of individuals, is a collective-unity, not a basic unity,

received a mortal wound. The principle relation of the individual to the world, which nature always expresses truthfully, never lying, for all attentive and reasonable ones, was completely confused and made unnatural. All might was taken away of the individual and given to the unity. The individual possessed no might anymore, was a pure zero, a dead puppet; God however possessed all might, was the inexhaustible wealth, the primordial source of all life.

What separates monotheism from pantheism, the ramifications of both these great religious systems in general, whose profundity fulfills the observer always and always again with admiration, all of this has no worth for our research. For us the main issue is that, which they have in common. They have one common root: absolute realism and both have exactly the same crown: the dead individual which lies in the hands of an almighty God.

But how is it possible, will be asked, that the truth can battle with the truth? How is it possible, that in the course of development of the human mind the truth was recognized only at the price of the truth?

These questions ask the world riddle in the point, where it must drop all veils and must show itself.

TN: This is followed by a large section about ancient Judaism, with many Biblical quotes. (...)

David and the ancient Jews in general, were pure realists in the strictest sense, according to which the nature of the outer world is identical with the image of it in our mind (naïve realism). Just this characteristic, which relied on a sharp understanding only, protected them from the absolute realism, which as I defined, skips over the whole individual, its knowing *and willing* part. With the lips they certainly drew the consequences of absolute realism: almighty God and dead creature, but their sharp penetrating mind did not let loose in their heart: the real individual, the fact of inner and outer experience, as little as they could believe in an immortality of the soul or punishment for immoral or reward for moral deeds in another life than the *earthly* life. Also from this regard their sober mind stayed with the statement of nature, which leaves about the essence of death no unclarity.

He completely trusted his senses and his cognition: no trace of critical idealism to be found in the Old or New Testament. If an Indian would have said to David: Jerusalem exists only such, as you see it, in your imagination; without your eyes it would be something completely different; if he had said to him: your body is an appearance, which falls and stands with the mirror in yourself, – then he would be met with overwhelming ridicule, thrown out of the guest house and considered to be a jester.

Paradoxical as it may sound, so true it is: the realism of the Jews has protected them from the poison of realism; for one has to distinguish very well cognition-realism (naïve realism) from absolute realism, as I have shown at the beginning.

^1 Mainländer uses a term which knows no exact English equivalent:
[Naturvolk](<https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Naturvolk>)

Pantheism

<https://old.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/69dn9x/pantheism/>

>Who dares name the nameless?

>Or who dares to confess:

>I believe in him?

>Yet who, in feeling,

>Self-revealing,

>Says: I don't believe?

>The all-clasping,

>The all-upholding,

>Does it not clasp, uphold,

>You: me, itself?

>(*Goethe*)

The blossom of realism, the pure, naked, on a needle tip balancing absolute realism, is pantheism.

What did the rogue primitive people's fear, the rogue polytheists? They feared a small amount of chemical basic elements, or better, some basic elements and some compositions of them, resp. their process.

Later on the activities of these basic elements were fused and hypostatized, i.e. it was assumed that a single force is present and it was given personality and omnipotence.

At the same time one began to see in the bite of a snake no longer a completely natural simple operation, but instead the activity of a higher power, exactly like how the heroes of Iliad imagined themselves to be supported or overwhelmed by Gods during the battle. And not only this, not merely the *outer* world, but also the *heart* of the individual was handed to the higher power. Man sometimes felt himself irresistibly attracted to bad deeds, which his mind did not approve of, and sometimes a bright inspiration, a flaming desire, fulfilled him to perform deeds which his mind did not even think of. This deep desire sprung from a concealed depth, which his eye could not fathom. Therefore he did not attribute it to the dark foreman in his breast, the blood, but rather to a strange spirit which climbed into his heart and has seized it.

After the entrance of law in the life of humanity, and with it the important distinction between justice and injustice, good and bad, initially great individual acts were assigned to good or bad

spirits. Later on in the process of development of the spirit, God was made the sole cause of all deeds, which come from the with darkness covered part of human's inside. Now God was the impulse of all deeds, good and bad ones.

This becomes very clear in the Old Testament. Not Satan is the cause of Saul's depression, but God.

>Now the Spirit of the Lord had departed from Saul, and an *evil spirit from the Lord* tormented him. Saul's attendants said to him, "See, an evil spirit from God is tormenting you. Let our lord command his servants here to search for someone who can play the lyre. He will play when the evil spirit from God comes on you, and you will feel better." (1. Sam. 16:14-16)

>The next day an evil spirit from God came forcefully on Saul. He was prophesying in his house, while David was playing the lyre, as he usually did. Saul had a spear in his hand and he hurled it, saying to himself, "I'll pin David to the wall." (1. Sam. 18:10-11)

Here God is forthrightly accused, in accordance with rigid theoretical monotheism, of having caused a murder attempt.

I have called into attention, that in essence monotheism and pantheism are not different. They have the root and crown in common, which the citation above attests again. I have furthermore shown, that it is only due to the sober sense of the Jews, that in the practical life of the people monotheism did not take root and hereby a purified truth was passed onto Christ, which he could shape further into the pure, absolute truth.

In India all consequences of pantheism are boldly accepted. This fact finds its natural explanation in the being of the old Indians. The character of the Indians was weaker, milder, softer than that of the Jews and their mind more dreamful, creative, deeper. Both people's, the Jews and the Indians, went the same way: the road of realism. Both started with polytheism, both molded it and purified it and both encountered the abyss, which is found at the end on the road of realism: the absolute realism. But whereas the Jews were horrified and shied back, retreated with fear, rather than standing on that point, the Indians, trapped in dreams, confidently plunged in the abyss, where their feet found a needle tip on which they balanced.

I do not have to discuss pantheism here in its entirety, I have done this thoroughly and exhaustively, although briefly, in my main work. Here I will view it from the limited point of realism.

In its calamitous fall the Indian pantheism drew three consequences without hesitation. The first one was: the dead individual; the second one: the unity in the world and the third one: the phenomenality of the world, its illusionary-existence. All of them required the other ones and all required the ironed, by the most rigorous necessity ruled, interconnection of things in this world.

This interconnection is undeniable. Although the world is composed of individuals, its movement is nevertheless a unitary one, so that it *must* indeed lead back to a basic unity. About this there *can* be no doubt. This unity is, as I have said above, one part of the world mystery, which stands in complete opposition to the other part, the individual, the principle of the world. It so irresistibly intoxicated the contemplative mind of the wise Indian geniuses, captured it so much, that the despair of the choice between unity and individual murdered

itself and sank into the arms of the basic unity. One has to grasp the magnitude of the sacrifice, which was made in ancient India; otherwise it is impossible to understand the development course of the human mind and one hopelessly sinks in the swamp of thousand religious and philosophical systems.

What have the Indians done, when they placed in the world a basic unity, the mystic world soul? They offered the undoubtedly real, the immediately given, the self-conscious individual I, for the doubtfully real, mediately given, strange world. What is more real in the world than the individual I? Does not everyone swear "True as I live" before everything, because when man transfers his real existence to the world, he gives it a firm ground and thereby makes it *real*.

Or as *Schopenhauer* expresses it:

> If we wish to attribute the greatest known reality to the material world which exists immediately only in our representation, we give it the reality which our own body has for each of us; for that is the most real thing for every one. But if we now analyse the reality of this body and its actions, beyond the fact that it is representation, we find nothing in it except the will; with this its reality is exhausted. (*WWR* V1, § 19)

What is more real, certain than the in its skin contained, itself feeling and self-conscious individual? Everything which lies outside his skin, that may and can be marked with the stamp of doubtfulness, possibility of *illusion*; for he has only *mediate* knowledge of everything outside him. It *can* be, that there are other humans, humans who feel and think like I do, who are real like I am, - but must it be so? Who or what can give me certainty about that?

But if the whole external world might be an illusion, then also its dynamic interconnection might be an illusion; and this uncertainty, this on the small thread of human consciousness of other things depending, basic unity, for this perspective on the world of doubtful worth, the Indians offered the only undoubtedly real, the individual, or with other words: they offered the *bearer* of the idea.

And why? Because they were realists, because they were on the trajectory of realism, because no *Kant* had stood up among them who shook the dreamers and said:

>Stop! Come to your senses! This whole, seemingly solid, diverse world with its necessary interconnection there outside before your eyes is foremost *only an image in your head*. Before you dare to determine something about it, examine your brain and the way and manner how you come to objective perception!

The Indians had to plunge into the abyss of pantheism, because they could not build themselves further to critical idealism, since they skipped over the *knowing I*. They shattered their most precious property, their invaluable gem, their individuality, and threw one half of it in the jaws of the external world; then, when they arrived at the abyss, they threw also to other half: the *willing* I. It was accomplished. An imagined unity in the world, which has been seen by no one, which one can suspect only on basis of the *recognized interconnection of individuals* in mystical glow and rapture of the heart, they brought themselves as offer. They took the crown from their head and placed it before the feet of a hazy, unknown, untouchable, incomprehensible being, they pressed themselves in dust, yes, thrust the knife in their heart and made of themselves a dead vessel, in which a single God is active, causes sometimes

this and sometimes that deed. They made of themselves a dead tool in the hand of an omnipotent performer.

And now one can admire the subtle irony of the truth, which lies in the Indian pantheism, the reflex of an mischievous smile, which is always formed on the lips of the truth, when it looks at a one-sided reproduction of its lovely being by a human hand. Without the lamp of critical idealism the old Brahmins have entered the road of realism so what did they therefore become at the end of the road, what did they have to become? They became *idealists, i.e.* not *critical*, but *insane* idealists: *illusionists*.

Because if the individual is nothing, a pure zero, but the in the world hidden, unknowable, mystical unity (world soul) everything, the only real, then this world cannot be such as the eye sees it; since the eye sees only *individuals* and the mind recognizes only, that they stand in an *interconnection*; a basic unity he sees nowhere; consequently, out of love for the imagined basic unity, the world must be an *illusion*.

The Vedas and Puranas openly express this too in innumerable forms. Often they compare the world with a dream, then with sunshine on the sand which one deems to be water coming from a distance, then with a rope which one views as a snake: brief, the world is an illusory image.

This idealism must be called illusionism; as it is neither critical idealism, nor thing-in-itself-idealism, which we will get to know later on as Buddhism. One has to pull it out of the concept-sphere "Idealism", because as I have sufficiently explained, idealism falls and stands with the reality of the *individual* (the knowing or the *complete* individual).

The despair lies here in all openness and the *comicality* in this whole process is unspeakably amusing. Because what does the Indian pantheism do? After arriving on the road of uncritical realism at this unity, it declares this path, which has lead them to it, *to be illusion* and *unreal*.

One sees here clearly, how important, how exceptionally important, the precise definition of a philosophical definition is. If we had not immediately determined the content of the concepts idealism and realism, then we would now helplessly stand before the Indian pantheism and in our confusion clamp ourselves at its non-essential by-product: the phenomenality of the world, i.e. declare it to be an idealistic system. Nearly all historians and critics of philosophy are trapped in this great mistake. Also *Schopenhauer* indulged in this unfortunate mistake. He kept monotheism and pantheism so strictly separated, as if a deep unbridgeable gap separates both systems, which, as we have seen, is fundamentally false, and he excessively glorified the Indian pantheism, because it is, in his view, idealism, though it is the blossom of realism. (See *WWR* V1 page 4 and 9.)

He fell in the same mistake with *Plato's* Theory of Forms, which is equally naked realism, nothing else. He says:

> It is clear, and requires no further proof that the inner meaning of the doctrines of Kant and Plato is entirely the same; that both explain the visible world as a manifestation, which in itself is nothing, and which only has meaning and a borrowed reality through that which expresses itself in it (in the one case the thing-in-itself, in the other the Idea). To this last, which has true

being, all the forms of that phenomenal existence, even the most universal and essential, are, according to both doctrines, entirely foreign. (*WWR* V1, § 33)

I repeat my own definition of absolute realism here, which is the only correct one and which every reasonable one will agree with:

>Absolute realism skips over the complete, *knowing* and willing I.

It is just like a dowsing rod, which alone can bring correct classification in the products of philosophical minds from the ancient times until our present time. If one uses it on philosophical systems, which are now considered to be idealistic, then one will immediately recognize, that they are all saplings of realism in the *illusion* of *idealism of despair, i.e.* they are *illusionism*, which has nothing, absolutely nothing, to do with critical idealism on one hand and the true thing-in-itself-idealism on the other hand, two concepts which alone fill the complete sphere of the concept idealism.

Armed with this real criterion of realism, we find that although in rogue polytheism as well as in refined polytheism (dualism, Zoroastrianism) and in the practical religion of the Jews (David's and Solomon's Judaism) no hint of critical idealism can be found, that these systems nevertheless by a correct instinct of their originators more or less float in the right center between absolute idealism and absolute realism, and have saved themselves from adulation of the individual as well as the it opposing ironed interconnection of the things.

To this must, as more or less the right foundation of the truth, the real philosophy connect itself, just like *Christ* took it as starting point.

All other systems, philosophical as well as religious ones, with exception of Buddhism and the systems of critical idealism, are in their core naked realism, which is very noteworthy. In them the couterpole of the individual, the hypostasized interconnection of the things, is inflated and glorified on at *expense of the individual*. They are all one-sided teachings and rest upon a half of the truth.

The idealistic by-product may not confuse. It would give away an unbelievable lack of prudence if one would want to make this by-product into main issue; for it is only the result of the despair. The by his own doctrine cornered thinker *must* draw, with bleeding heart, the last conclusion. The dagger pressed his throat, it was *nolens volens* (against his will).

As paradoxical it may sound, so true it is from our correct critical standpoint, that those philosophical systems which were always called idealistic par excellence, so the teaching of the *Eleatics*, *Plato's* theory of forms, *Berkeley's* idealism and *Fichte's* science of knowledge are nothing else than *absolute realism* (like the clumsy materialism of today). They start as critical idealism and end as absolute realism; since their creators indeed started with the *knowing* I, are therefore initially not naïve realists, who make the external world *independent* from subject, our cognition power, but their small byway quickly leads to the great military road of realism, because they suddenly let the *willing* I fall out of their hands and placed it, (like how the Babylonian mothers placed their children in the red hot arms of Moloch,) in the murdering arms of an imagined basic unity.

For example *Berkeley*, who indeed teaches the phenomenality of the world, but only because an almighty God has placed it, who should bring forth all impressions in the human

brain, to which the realist ascribes the activity of the things and on which he concludes that the brain reacts as long as the external world is fabricated by it; and also *Fichte*, who indeed spins out the world from the knowing I, but then suddenly forgets the wondrous silk worm and jumps to the absolute I, to whom he gives all reality.

The same is the case with all other saplings of philosophical pantheism, with the teachings of *Bruno, Scotus Erigena, Malebranche, Spinoza, Hegel* and *Schelling*: they are all realism, more or less *absolute* realism, glorification of one basic unity, which galvanizes the puppet-individual, like how the director of a puppet theatre makes the puppets dance here and there, makes them kiss, drub and kill each other, brief, *moves* them.

Comment to “Pantheism”

User Sunques:

Schopenhauer on Pantheism:

>Even much more unsuitable is the method of expression of the so-called pantheists; their whole philosophy consists principally in their giving the title "God" to the inner nature of the world which is unknown to them, and by this they imagine they have achieved a great deal. Accordingly, the world would be a theophany. But let us merely look at it; this world of constantly needy creatures who continue for a time merely by devouring one another, pass their existence in anxiety and want, and often endure terrible afflictions, until they fall at last into the arms of death. He who has this clearly in view will allow that Aristotle is right when he says: *natura daemonia est, non divina* De Divinatione, c. 2, p. 463); in fact he will have to admit that a God who should presume to transform himself into such a world would certainly have been inevitably troubled and tormented by the devil. - (WWR II, XXVIII)

[He sets out his 5 minor disagreements with pantheism in the last chapter of WaWuV V2, "Epiphilosophy".](#)

[M's critique of Pantheism is a more fundamental. It kills off all ideas about existence from critique-less \(people not under the influence of Kant\) saloon thinkers. For example, I heard a scientist talk about his idea on existence, his suspicion that what is actually real is only information, only zero's and one's exist, and like all "extreme realists" the phenomenality in the mind of the individual, is a by-product of these zero's and one's. Theories like this, Plato's Theory of Forms as well as materialism, can quickly be ignored due them being ****transcendent**** systems with a transcendent assumption without justification.](#)

>...due them being transcendent systems with a transcendent assumption without justification.

In this context is transcendent = supernatural?

>supernatural: (of a manifestation or event) attributed to some force beyond scientific understanding or the laws of nature (space and time).

supernatural = outside of space and time?

I mean that these assumptions transgress experience.

Thales, who claimed that everything is made up of water ; Anaximenes who claimed that everything is made up of air ; this scientist who suggests that everything is made up of information ; materialists who claim that everything is made up of matter.

What are they doing? They see an appearance and transgress the boundaries of experience, by saying: *this one* appearance is the foundation of all appearances.

Nature never shows this. The assumption is hyperphysical/transcendent.

Idealism (Part 1)

https://old.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/69dn82/idealism_i/

>If I take away the thinking subject, the whole material world must vanish, for it is nothing but an appearance in the sensibility of our subject, and a class of its representations.

>(*Kant*)

>No object without subject.

>(*Schopenhauer*)

I recall my definition of idealism given above:

1. Critical idealism is every view of nature, which sees the world as an image, a mirror in the mind of the I, and emphasizes and establishes the dependency of this mirror-image on the mirror: the cognition. Thereby idealism makes the knowing I the main issue.
2. Absolute idealism raises the knowing and willing single-being to the throne of the world.

We therefore have to distinguish between two forms of idealism:

1. Critical or transcendental idealism,
2. Absolute or thing-in-itself-idealism.

There is only one system of absolute idealism and that is the profound, magical, wonderfully beautiful teaching of the Indian prince and genius *Siddhartha* (*Buddha*), to which we will dedicate a special section. In this section we will occupy ourselves with the critical or transcendental idealism only.

The word transcendental, which in recent times is being misused, must be well separated from transcendent. *Kant* has introduced both these concepts in the critical philosophy and gave them a very specific meaning. They are not without owner and the reverent gratitude, which

every sober person should feel for Germany's greatest thinker until his last day, demands us to not distort and change the sense of the by him used words.

Transcendental means: *dependent on the knowing subject*; *transcendent* however is: *transgressing the experience* or *hyper-physical*. (*Kant* did not strictly follow his own definitions by the way, which must be criticized with the intent of exterminating all ambiguity in the critical philosophy.)

Since one only shows foolish conceit, if one says with different words something, which was already very well expressed, we want to introduce the research of critical idealism with two remarks of *Schopenhauer*:

>What is *knowledge*? It is primarily and essentially *representation*. What is *representation*? A very complicated physiological process in the brain of an animal, the result of which is the consciousness of a picture there. Clearly the relation between such a picture and something entirely different from the animal in whose brain it exists can only be a very *indirect* one. This is perhaps the simplest and most comprehensible way of disclosing the *deep gulf* between the *ideal* and the *real*. (*WWR* V2, § 8)

>In our mind images emerge, not due to something inside of us – for example by randomness or associated thoughts – but due to something which lies *outside* of us. These images alone are immediately known by us, that which is given. What relation may they have with the things, that exist completely autonomously and independently from us and somehow become the causes of these images? Do we actually have the certainty that such things exist at all? and do the images give us, in this case, also information about their nature? – This is the problem, which has since two hundred years been the main endeavour of philosophers, to separate that which is *ideal*, i.e. that which belongs to our knowledge alone, from what is *real*, i.e. that which is independently of it present, so that the relationship between the two of them can be determined. (Parerga, first page of “Sketch of a History of the Doctrine of the Ideal and the Real”)

The first one who foresaw the dependency of the world on the knowing subject was *Descartes*. He sought the unshakable firmament for philosophy and found it in the human mind, not in the outer world, whose reality can be questioned, yes must; for it is only mediate knowledge. I cannot transfer myself in the skin of another being and cannot experience here if it thinks and feels as I do. The other being may assure me a hundred times: it thinks and feels and in general exists as I do, – all these assurances prove however nothing and do not give me a firm ground. It could be and it could also not be – *necessary* it is not. For could this other individual and his assurance not be a mere mirage without the least reality, a phantom which in some way is conjured before my eyes? Certainly this could be the case. Where should I find a certain property that it is no phantom? I look for example at my brother and see that he is built like I am, that he talks in a similar way like I do, that his speech reveals that he has a similar mind, that he is sometimes sad and sometimes happy like I am, that he experiences physical pain like I do; I feel my arm and his arm and find that they both make the same impression on my sensory nerves – however is by this in some way proven, that he is a real existing being like I am? In no way. This could all be illusion, sorcery, fantasy; since there is only one immediate certainty and it is:

>my myself knowing and feeling individual I.

This truth was for the first time expressed by *Descartes* with the famous sentence:

>Dubito, cogito, ergo sum,

and is therefore with right called the father of critical idealism and the new philosophy in general. More than this sentence, by which he only showed the right path for philosophy, he did not for critical philosophy, and one can consider it to be very little or a lot, depending on the standpoint which is adopted. The philosophical activity of the great man has been prettily satirized by a jester with the words: *Il commence par douter de tout et finit par tout croire.* (He started doubting all kind of things and ended up believing everything.)

He is immediately followed by, if we look only at the important points for critical idealism, the genius *Locke*.

In his immortal work *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding* he started from the subject and found that the outer world, independently from the human mind, cannot be such as it shows itself to us, that it is mere *appearance* and indeed the product of this thing that is the ground of the appearance and the knowing mind, just like how the by one man and one woman created child, demonstrates traits of the father as well the mother.

He arranged the qualities of the object and placed them in two big classes. The first one he called the primary, the other one the secondary qualities. The former stem from the ground of the appearance, the latter are additions of the human mind. By their union both classes build the appearance, the object, i.e. a thing as we see it.

To the primary qualities belong:

- >Solidity
- >
- >Extension
- >
- >Shape
- >
- >Motion
- >
- >Rest
- >
- >Amount;

To the secondary:

- >Color
- >
- >Sound
- >
- >Taste
- >
- >Smell
- >
- >Hardness

- >
- >Softness
- >
- >Smoothness
- >
- >Coarseness
- >
- >Temperature (warm, cold).

The former are independent from the subject and thus remain to every thing, also then, when they are not known by any human mind; the latter stand and fall however with the human mind.

The former can also be brought back to the more simple expression:

- >Individuality
- >
- >Motion;

the latter can be summarized by the concept: specific sense impression.

Let us take for example a thing which, when it is perceived, a pear tree, then it is, independent from an animal eye, only an itself moving individuality. It is colorless, is hard nor soft, coarse nor smooth, cold nor warm. Only when it weds itself so to speak with the senses of a human, it becomes green (leaves), grey (trunk), hard and coarse (trunk and bark), smooth (leaves), cold or warm.

Obviously this individuality becomes in contact with the senses only therefore green and brown, *not* yellow and blue, hard and course, *not* soft and smooth, warm and *not* cold, because it works in a fully determined way on the senses, because it possesses properties, which bring forth in the senses fully determined impressions – however these properties do not share essence of being with the impressions of the senses, are essentially *different* from them. What they are in themselves – this is determined by *Locke* as unfathomable. He placed their being in their smallest, unperceivable parts and deduced their special activity from the way of impact of this part. (Book II. Ch. 8, § 11; Book IV. Cap. 3, § 11)

With this section of the great thinker through what is ideal and real, the truth itself led him the hand: the section stands in the history of philosophy as a master section, as a philosophical achievement first class, as a proud act of the most brilliant power of thinking.

Meanwhile, *Locke* did not manage, to shed full light on that, which remained lying left and right of the section. He had separated that which is ideal from what is real, but he could not precisely define the ideal and the real.

Let us start with the ideal. Here he committed the error, that he did not ask himself before everything: how come, that after the impact of a tree on my eyes and the processing of the impression in my brain, I see a tree outside of my mind? How is the impact of a thing on something else (which philosophy's artificial language calls *influxus physicus*) possible at all?

With other words: he did not research on the *real* side (because here, it is inseparable of what is *ideal*) the activity of the things and their impact among each other and skipped over the ideal side of causality, i.e. the ideal connection of two states of an object, of what is active and what is afflicted, as *cause* and *effect*.

Furthermore, with the determination of what is real, he let space and time exist independent of the subject and committed the great error, that he let, the by him found and with sharp eye detected individuals, flow together in one indistinguishable matter, which is the *Locke*an ground of the appearance, the *Locke*an thing-in-itself. Hereby he became the father of modern materialism.

I have shown in my criticism of the philosophy of the great man, that it must seem almost unbelievable, that Locke, standing here very close before the unveiled truth, did not recognize what is right. He suddenly placed a tight bandage on his sharp clear eye; the truth deemed that the time had not come for the illumination of this difficult problem, she wanted to let modern materialism emerge first, which –although an absurd philosophical system – is nevertheless important and successful, yes, necessary for human culture and it still is today.

Namely, everything which we can state about *material* relies only and solely on our *sense impressions*. Consequently material and in wider sense matter and substance are thoroughly *ideal*, i.e. lie in our head, not outside of it. Matter belongs thus to the ideal side, not to the real side, where only the *force* lies, the real thing-in-itself, precisely that which, when it weds itself with our senses, becomes object, i.e. *material*. It has been reserved to me, based on the *Berkeley*an idealism and fertilized by the fluctuating doctrines of *Kant* and *Schopenhauer*, to assign matter the right place in the human *understanding*, so on the ideal side.

Locke was followed by *Berkeley*, who was rightfully highlighted by *Schopenhauer*, who has like no other, *Hume* not excluded, influenced the thought of *Kant*, so that one can say, that without *Berkeley* the *Critique of Pure Reason* would not have been written. *Kant* did not want to acknowledge this and only called *Berkeley* with pity the “good” *Berkeley*, an injustice which, as said, *Schopenhauer* fittingly condemned.

Merely because of this relation of *Berkeley* with the *Critique of Pure Reason* his treatise about the principles of human Understanding is an immortal work. That it would be however too without Kant, which we will come to see clearly in the essay on Buddhism; because with two, certainly essential changes, the *Berkeley*an idealism stands in the philosophy of the Occident as the first, bright, steadfast, by Hindustanic spirit pervaded thing-in-itself-idealism as a miraculous flower.

Descartes has so to speak only rang with thundering voice a wakening call for the dreaming minds or also, he was only a caller in the blazing beautiful struggle of the wise for the truth against the lie and the darkness. From *Locke* on however, critical philosophy could only be development. No philosopher after *Locke* could and dared it, to leave the work of the master untouched. It had become the cornerstone for the temple, it was the first member, which is the prerequisite for the chain, without which no other link would have a grip; it was the root, without which no stem, no leaf could exist. Starting from him we always see the successors standing on the shoulders of predecessors and look with delighted eyes on the most wonderful appearance in the life of the European people's: on the *German* row of philosophers.

Locke, Berkeley, Hume, Kant and *Schopenhauer* – what a names! What ornaments of the human race! By the way, the Jews and the Indo-Germans are those people's, which wander around the top of the intellectual life of humanity and lead it. They are, the one like the cloud which led the from Egypt coming Israelites, the other like the pillar of fire:

>By day the Lord went ahead of them in a pillar of cloud to guide them on their way and by night in a pillar of fire to give them light, so that they could travel by day or night. Neither the pillar of cloud by day nor the pillar of fire by night left its place in front of the people. (Exodus 13:21-22)

What does the *critical* philosophy owe to *Berkeley*? The extremely important, although very one-sided result:

> that the secondary qualities, taught by Locke, are that, which we call matter, the substance of a thing, that therefore matter is ideal, in our head.

Berkeley himself has not drawn this result, the solution of one of the greatest problems of psychology, as I will show; however it is the from his teaching extracted indestructible, truthful core.

Berkeley evidently starts with the *subject*. His view on the world showed him two essentially from each other different domains: on one side the limitless diversity of objects (trees, houses, fields, grasslands, flowers, animals, humans etc.) on the other side

>there is likewise something which knows or perceives them, and exercises divers Operations, as Willing, Imagining, Remembering about them. This perceiving, active Being is what I call *Mind, Spirit, Soul* or *my Self*. (On the Principles of Human Knowledge, § 2)

This was nothing new, since mirror (mind) and mirror-image (world) are the main principles of all idealism and the beginning of his path.

But new compared to his predecessors, and original was the explanation of *Berkeley*:

>that the *complete* existence of all *not-thinking* things is percipi (being perceived).

More clearly he expresses this in:

>For can there be a nicer Strain of Abstraction than to distinguish the Existence of sensible Objects from their being perceived, so as to conceive them Existing unperceived? Light and Colours, Heat and Cold, Extension and Figures, in a word the Things we see and feel, what are they but so many Sensations, Notions, Ideas or Impressions on the Sense; and is it possible to separate, even in thought, any of these from Perception? (ib. § 5)

>Some Truths there are so near and obvious to the Mind, that a Man need only open his Eyes to see them. Such I take this Important one to be, to wit, that all the Choir of Heaven and Furniture of the Earth, in a word all those Bodies which compose the mighty Frame of the World, have not any Subsistence without a Mind, that their Being is to be perceived or known; that consequently so long as they are not actually perceived by me, or do not exist in my Mind

or that of any other created Spirit, they must either have no Existence at all, or else subsist in the Mind of some eternal Spirit. (§ 6)

>From what has been said, it follows, there is not any other Substance than *Spirit*, or that which perceives. (§ 7)

These few sentences contain the complete teaching of the English [sic] genius.

The sense of his teaching and at the same time his standpoint compared to *Locke* is this:

1. Not only the *secondary, but also the primary* qualities of all not-thinking things rely on sense impressions.
2. Since everything, which we know of such things, are sense impressions, such a thing exists only in a mind, which perceives and has outside of it no existence.

Expressed:

> Some there are who make a Distinction betwixt Primary and Secondary Qualities: By the former, they mean Extension, Figure, Motion, Rest, Solidity or Impenetrability and Number: By the latter they denote all other sensible Qualities, as Colours, Sounds, Tastes, and so forth. The Ideas we have of these they acknowledge not to be the Resemblances of any thing existing without the Mind or unperceived; but they will have our Ideas of the primary Qualities to be Patterns or Images of Things which exist without the Mind, in an unthinking Substance which they call Matter. By Matter therefore we are to understand an inert, senseless Substance, in which Extension, Figure, and Motion, do actually subsist. But it is evident from what we have already shewn, that Extension, Figure and Motion are only Ideas existing in the Mind, and that an Idea can be like nothing but another Idea, and that consequently neither They nor their Archetypes can exist in an unperceiving Substance. --- Hence it is plain, that that the very Notion of what is called *Matter* or *Corporeal Substance*, involves a Contradiction in it. (§ 9)

Here *Berkeley* throws the baby out with the bathwater and therefore I said above that *he himself* was not capable of drawing the true and real result of his teaching, which, I repeat, is this:

> The secondary qualities are summarized, matter, and it is therefore ideal, in our head.

This has been a very meaningful improvement of the *Locke*an system, which *Berkeley* unconsciously achieved; since the fault, in which it was contained, is easy to present.

Berkeley maintains in passage above:

> The Ideas we have of these Locke acknowledges not to be the Resemblances of any thing existing without the Mind or unperceived;

Which is a fundamentally false statement. Locke does indeed say that that, which for example causes the sweetness in sugar, is not in essence the same as sweetness (the sense impression); however he did not deny, that the ground of the sweetness of the sugar is

independent from the subject. Without subject there indeed would be no *sweet sugar* (object), but nevertheless there would be a thing, with a certain quality: a huge difference!

If we ignore this false view of the *Locke*an system, then *Berkeley* has fundamentally improved this system.

Locke said:

>Matter is the from subject independent thing-in-itself;

Berkeley however says, (i.e. from his teaching follows as the most beautiful result for the critic):

>Matter is the sum of secondary qualities, therefore it is ideal.

Some may blame me that I lie these words in the mouth of *Berkeley*; but I may very well do this, since I thereby decrease my merit in favor of the great man.

We will now pursue the passage above of *Berkeley*,

> that the objects, so long as they are not actually perceived by me, or do not exist in my Mind or that of any other created Spirit, they must either have no Existence at all, or else subsist in the Mind of *some eternal Spirit*.

it has very little to with critical idealism anymore, but what we will find, will benefit us in the essay of Buddhism.

Berkeley flatly denies, as we have seen, the objective matter, the bodily substance, and recognizes no other substance than the mind, initially the human mind, then the eternal mind: God. Everything else: animals, plants, chemical forces have no from subject independent existence: they are through and through *unreal*.

Or with the words of the philosophical bishop:

> But though it were possible that solid, figured, moveable Substances may exist without the Mind, corresponding to the Ideas we have of Bodies, yet how is it possible for us to know this? (ib. § 18)

>The only thing whose Existence we deny, is that which Philosophers call Matter or corporeal Substance. (ib. § 35)

>Thing or Being is the most general Name of all, it comprehends under it two Kinds intirely distinct and heterogeneous, and which have nothing common but the Name, to wit, Spirits and Ideas. The former are active, indivisible Substances: The latter are inert, fleeting, dependent Beings, which subsist not by themselves, but are supported by, or exist in Minds or spiritual Substances. (ib. § 89)

>Wherever Bodies are said to have no Existence without the Mind, I would not be understood to mean this or that particular Mind, but all Minds whatsoever. (§ 48)

The remarkable remainder of the *Berkeley*an is however this: Since on one hand it is not within the might of the human mind to arbitrarily evoke perception, and on the other hand the sense impressions must have a cause, which cannot lie in the objects, an eternal spirit exists, which brings forth in our senses, resp. in our brain, the impressions and the general-cause of all ideas, all phantasm outside called the world: God.

Or with the words of *Berkeley*:

>We perceive a continual Succession of Ideas, some are anew excited, others are changed or totally disappear. There is therefore some Cause of these Ideas whereon they depend, and which produces and changes them. (§ 26)

>When in broad Day-light I open my Eyes, it is not in my Power to choose whether I shall see or no, or to determine what particular Objects shall present themselves to my View; and so likewise as to the Hearing and other Senses, the Ideas imprinted on them are not Creatures of my Will. There is therefore some other Will or Spirit that produces them. (§ 29)

>Did Men but consider that the Sun, Moon, and Stars, and every other Object of the Senses, are only so many Sensations in their Minds, which have no other Existence but barely being perceived, doubtless they would never fall down, and worship their own *Ideas*; but rather address their Homage to that ETERNAL INVISIBLE MIND which produces and sustains all Things. (§ 94)

From this it becomes exceedingly clear, how right I was, when I called *Berkeley*an idealism in the essay "Pantheism", with discount of its critical part, so those remaining parts, which *Berkeley* made the main issue, *absolute realism*. *Berkeley* lays the powerless dead creature in the hand of the "eternal invisible mind, which produces and sustains all things."

That his idealism is not the absolute idealism, as *Schopenhauer* taught and so many believe, also becomes clear by this, that he places next to his knowing I all other humans as real and on equal footing. Essential for the absolute, the thing-in-itself-idealism is however, that it teaches that only one single human is real and is raised as God on the throne of the world. This absolute idealism is also called theoretical egoism or solipsism; it has, like pantheism, the same good right on the famous profound sentence of Upanishads of the Vedas:

>Hae omnes creaturae in totum ego sum et praeter me aliud ens non est.

>

>(All these creatures together I am, and outside me there is no other being.)

I cannot leave *Berkeley*'s teaching, without pointing out again his great merit, placing matter in our head, making it ideal, a merit which stands on par next to the brilliant section of *Locke* through what is ideal and real. Furthermore I have to mention that he brought up all other problems of critical idealism and hereby he offered *Kant* a ploughed land and not a desert. Otherwise the most important work of human profundity: the *Critique of Pure Reason*, would be like an astonishing miracle. It would be a blossom which has freely generated itself, not the efflorescence of a plant with roots, stems and leaves, that slowly grows and needs, like the Agave Americana, a hundred years in order to bloom.

Berkeley touched upon space, time (extension, motion), causality (impact of an object on object) and community (interconnection of nature) and made all these for the thinker hard nuts ideal, only existing in the mind. Naturally this happened as conclusion from his principle: God, who is an unextended eternal substance and makes for the mind, which has the same predicates, appear the things, which have in themselves no real ground. So the world has, independent from the knowing subject, no existence, the things in the world do not stand in a real nexus but in an ideal connection, furthermore, no thing possesses, independently from the human mind, extension and motion, therefore also time and space are not real, but ideal.

All these determinations are correct conclusions from false premises. *Berkeley* made his conclusions in chivalric manner and as saloon-prelate, i.e. superficially. But how pushing and stimulating must these conclusion of the "good" *Berkeley* have affected a thinker like *Kant*! There he found all material for his *Critique of Pure Reason*; the only issue was, trimming the available building stones and then building with it a temple for the transcendental idealism: certainly a task, which he alone could accomplish.

I also want to mention something very remarkable. In the *Berkeley*an system lies again a pretty reflex of the ironic smiling of the truth, which always plays around her lips, whenever a noble Parsifal gives an incorrect solution of the world mystery.

I have already called into attention the comicality, that showed itself in the Indian pantheism. As I made clear, Indian pantheism came to its basic unity in the world on the road of realism and when it happily arrived at its goal, when it fell in the arms of the world-soul, it declared the path to be mere illusion. It would be the same if I would reach the roof of a house with a ladder and declare afterwards: I jumped on here, the ladder which you see, is only an illusion, not a real ladder that can support humans.

In a similar way, the *Berkeley*an teaching, which is after all nothing else than a very refined, transparent monotheism, offers a rich source of innocent comicality; for what was it, that has led him to monotheism, I ask? The deep recognition of the real *interconnection* of the things, which one can explain *by one thing only*: by leading it back to a basic unity. So with other words: God's firm ground is the *real* dynamic interconnection of the world, or also: God is the personified real affinity of the world. And what does *Berkeley* do? He made the *real* interconnection, that which has led to the Jewish God alone, *ideal* i.e. existing in our head only.

>The Ideas of Sense are more strong, lively, and distinct than those of the Imagination; they have likewise a *Steddiessness, Order, and Coherence*, and are not excited at random, as those which are the effects of Humane Wills often are, but in a regular Train or Series, the *admirable Connexion* whereof sufficiently testifies the Wisdom and Benevolence of its Author. Now the set Rules or established Methods, wherein the Mind we depend on excites in us the Ideas of Sense, are called the *Laws of Nature*: And these we learn by *Experience.* (§ 30)

Thus *Berkeley* made (as *Schopenhauer* strikingly says in a similar way about *Kant*'s ethics) into *result* (admirable connection), that which was the principle and premise, and took as premise, that which is deduced as result (God). The comicality does lie here so publicly, that one has to laugh. *Difficile est, satiram non scribere* (It is difficult to not write satire);

since I repeat: only the laws of nature led to the assumption of a God, which by itself is nowhere to be found in nature.

To conclude I have to say a word about my position to *Berkeley* in my criticism of the *Kant-Schopenhauerian* philosophy. There I called the *Berkeley* an idealism the grave of all philosophy. I *had* to do it, because I had to judge it from the limited standpoint of critical idealism. For it is clear, that we can no longer speak about critical philosophy, when an other-worldly God is the initiator of our sense impressions. That is simply saying: stop with philosophizing, and start with more practical useful labor!

In the row of great critical idealists follows after *Berkeley* the brave warrior against the obscurantists, against the lie and all theological deception, *Hume*. From the specific standpoint of critical idealism *Hume* can be compared to an *éclairateur* (illuminator). He gallops on the fiery mare skepticism in advance of the noble clutch of independent thinkers like a fearless cuirassier for his squadron and secures the way for them.

Before highlighting *Hume*'s main merit for the critical philosophy, we briefly summarize the main accomplishments of his predecessors.

Descartes had indicated the right path. *Locke* had made the important correct section between what is ideal and real; *Berkeley* had summarized the on ideal domain falling secondary qualities of the things in the concept matter and at the same time brought up space and time, causality and community.

No one however had asked:

>How come, that I relate my sense impression, resp. the image of an object in my mind to a thing *outside* my mind, to a *cause*?

Or with other words: all of them considered the causal interconnection between the states of two things as self-evidently given, resp. caused by God.

Until this time, on the real domain stood real, themselves moving individuals, connected by a *real* causal-nexus.

Hume's skeptic attacks focused on this *real* causal-nexus or brief the ground of it, causality (relation between cause and effects). He doubted the necessity and objective validity of the law of causality, the highest law of nature, namely: that every effect must have had a cause,

>because experience, which is according to the *Locke*an philosophy the only source of all our knowledge, can never show the *causal interconnection* itself, but always only the mere *succession of states in time*, so never the following *from* but always the following *after*, which always shows itself as *merely accidental*, never as *necessary*, (Parerga, *Philosophy of Kant*)

as *Schopenhauer* summarizes very clearly the *Hume*an doubt.

Consider what this very justified doubt actually means. Since our image of the outer world in our eye, resp. in our mind, relies on the law of causality, the assault on this law indirectly

endangered the real existence of the outer world and directly the intimate interconnection of the things, which is assumed to be firm and unassailable.

To demonstrate the matter with a clear image: I pull the trigger of a gun and my friend drops dead. *Hume* says now, from the mere consequence of my friend's death cannot at all be concluded, that my shot was the cause of the murder, that death was the *consequence* of the shot; it merely *followed* after the shot, like the day follows the night, but is not *caused* by it. At least it is certain that one may doubt the causal interconnection. It can exist and not exist: we cannot obtain certainty about it, since a certain criterion is absent.

If I call this mere assault, which has not even the most insignificant positive result, an immortal deed of the human mind, then many will laugh. And nevertheless it is. This skeptical assault of *Hume* with the goose-quill in the hand, in the quiet study room, on the highest law of nature outbalances the most glorious victory on the in blood drenched battlefield in service of culture. For one will see this clearly only, by recognizing that there is nothing more important in the world than the truth, and that the sourdough in the life of the people's is prepared only by those who seek the truth (and indeed very often in a quiet cold attic or barren deserts).

Idealism (Part 2)

https://old.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/69dn01/idealism_ii/

As such the path was paved and prepared for the messiah of critical idealism, which not the prophets themselves, but their works pointed to with ironed immovable finger. Oh, this *Kant*! Who can be compared to him?

I have made *Kant*'s *Critique of Pure Reason* subject of a thorough examination, which I may give the predicate of being fifteen years old, and have laid down the results in my main work. I will therefore express myself very briefly here and only bring the most significant part of his teaching in connection to what is said here.

We have seen, that already *Berkeley* taught about the ideality of space, time and causality, but in a way, which can satisfy a theologian, but not a philosopher. Furthermore we remember us, that *Hume* made the first *philosophical* assault on the highest law of nature, the law of causality.

That this assault of the Scotsman had a very significant influence of *Kant*'s thinking power, has fertilized and fired it up, *Kant* admitted it openly. He does not call *Hume* the "good" *Hume*; this might be attributed to this, that philosophers are the born enemies of theologians as it were in a demonic way, their souls tremble of joy when they meet each other, which of course does not preclude that they come to quarrel and badmouth each other.

Like how an anatomist lays the stomach or hand of a cadaver before his pupils and clearly shows them, how the stomach digests, how the hand grabs an object, from which components the stomach and hand are made of, how the whole functions etc., in the same way *Kant* took the human mind, dissected it, without forgetting even the smallest cogwheel in the clockwork, how the brain *cognizes*. This is very important to hold onto. There is nothing in the human mind, so on the ideal side, absolutely nothing, which *Kant* has not found or recorded. He has

inventoried (his own expression) the pieces of our mind, like the most diligent merchant the goods of his depository and did not forget anything. He only erred by

>not completely correctly recognizing the nature of every piece and therefore sometimes recording the same piece twice, like the categories quality and substance;

>or incorrectly taxing (defining) a piece, like space and time; or viewing a in two parts sliced piece as a single piece, like causality.

He also erred by,

1. taking the sense impression as simply given and not asking: how come, that one relates the image in his mind to a thing outside his head?
2. that he abused his subjective causal law to obtain the thing-in-itself by fraud;
3. that he deemed the real domain to be inaccessible.

I will examine this within well-defined boundaries.

Kant distinguishes three main capabilities of the human mind:

1. Sensibility
2. Understanding
3. Reason.

The sensibility has two forms: space and time, and one aid: the imagination; the Understanding has twelve primordial concepts: categories, and one consultant, the judgement-power; reason has one peak, one blossom: the self-consciousness.

The sensibility perceives; the Understanding thinks; the reason concludes.

Now like the stomach must have the capability to digest, before mother milk comes in it, like the hand must have the capability to grab, before it touches an object, however also like a stomach does not digest if no nutrition comes in it, and the capability of the hand can only be active if there is an object, likewise the brain has capabilities before all experience, which can only become active in combination with the raw material of experience.

These capabilities before all experience are: receptivity (being sensitive to impressions) and synthesis (composition and connection as action). Their forms were called by *Kant aprioric*, i.e. they are original, before all experience independent forms, which stand and fall with the brain. The outer world lies in the it, like a ball of smooth clay in a hand which encompasses it and gives it its form and the composition of its parts.

I have shown in my critique, that

>Space and time (according to *Kant* forms of sensibility)

2. no relation between cause and effect;

3. no community (reciprocity).

And should there be complete legions of those, whom *Fichte* strikingly characterized with the words: “they consider themselves to be enlightened with halve philosophy and complete confusion” who mock it – so it is and so it remains: the mind has gained these priceless jewels of knowledge and no force can rob them back. *Magna est vis veritatis et praevalebit.* (The truth is mighty and will prevail.)

But these five compositions and connections are not aprioric; the last three are also not categories in the sense of *Kant* (forms of thinking a priori).

What was now – for this is the main issue – the result of the Transcendental Aesthetic?

>We can only talk from the human standpoint of space, of *extended* objects.

And what was the result of the Transcendental Analytic?

>The arrangement and the regularity of the appearances, which we call *nature*, *we bring them ourselves* in it, and we could not find them, if we, or the nature of our mind, had not *initially placed them there*. ^(A125)

>As exaggerated, as nonsensical as it sounds, to say: the Understanding itself is the source of the laws of nature, this right is such an assertion. ^(A128)

What does this mean with dry words? It means, if we also take the expression of *Kant*:

>the empirical content of perception is *given* to us *from without*

as support:

By an inexplicable mysterious way impressions are made on our senses. The senses *furnishes* these impressions with extension and brings them in a relation to time. These phantoms are then furnished by the Understanding with color, temperature, smooth/coarseness, hard/softness etc. (categories of quality) or brief, it makes them substantive. Furthermore it brings these two phantoms in a causal relation, connects then such links into causal rows and finally brings the whole nature in an affinity, i.e. it makes them to a formal unity.

Or with other words:

Of the deceptive image of the senses our Understanding builds an illusionary-nexus, an independently from the mind not existing dynamic interconnection: *the world is nothing*, a being-less wizardry of our mind based upon a for us unknown *strange stimulation*.

And despite all this, despite this destructive result of the Critique of Pure Reason, which no reasonable one will subscribe or accept, it remains an unshakable truth, that

>Space and time

>Matter (Substance)

>General causality

>Community

are ideal and exist merely in our head. How however, one may ask, is this possible? The ghostly, grim phenomenality of the world is yes demanded by the ideality of these forms; how can the reality of the world be saved?

In this question the riddle of the transcendental idealism mirrors itself, like how in the essay "Realism" the mentioned formula of the riddle was mirrored. I will answer it at the end of this essay in a satisfying manner.

We now have to discuss the mistake mentioned under 2).

With *Kant* causality, the relation of the effect to a cause, is a category, a primordial thought a priori, before all experience, which is only present for experience and has without it no meaning, similar to how a hand is set up, to *grab touchable* objects. Without the material of experience it is a dead primordial thought. So if one would want to use causality for something else than bringing necessary connection in the world, one would misuse it. *Kant* therefore did not get tired of emphasizing that one should never make use of the categories there where who do not have safe ground below our feet. So he warns for a *transcendent* usage as impermissible, in opposition to the permissible reasonable transcendental usage, i.e. using them on objects of *experience*.

Nevertheless he himself made on a weak moment such an impermissible transcendent use of the category of causality, because he shied back from the naked result of his philosophy, the ghostly being-less phantasmagoria-world and was shaking in the innermost part of his heart. Rather he preferred the reproach of inconsequence – which he has not been spared of – than being thrown in one pot with *Berkeley*. His hand must have shivered and his forehead been soaked with sweat of fear, as he seized the thing-in-itself with causality, that which lies as ground of the appearance, on that which according to his own teaching the categories can find no application. I stand, as I have said in my main work, with admiration before this act of despair of the great man and always when the absolute idealism of Buddhism lures me in its charming nets, then I do not myself save myself by clamping at my own teaching or something like that, but by imagining *Kant* in this despair. Because if a man like *Kant* brings his work, the most beautiful fruit of human profoundness, *rather* a mortal wound than declaring the world to be a phantasm, which it after all is according to his own teaching – *then* there *can* be no choice, when the thing-in-itself-idealism places itself next to critical idealism, then we *may* not follow the siren calls of the Indian prince.

And once again the truth laughed ironically. Also its greatest genius, its most faithful Parsifal had not solved the world-riddle: he had given an itself contradicting answer.

Anyway – and this is the mistake of *Kant* mentioned under 3) – the *thing-in-itself* would have been a zero or an *x*, if Kant would have been allowed the find it with help of causality. Since according to his Transcendental Aesthetic it is the (ideal) space alone which *furnishes*

the things *extension*, the things-in-themselves being *extensionless*, their being would be forever unrecognizable, i.e. be an *x*, since we can form no image of the being of a thing which is a mathematical point.

As the result of all this *Kant* has improved and corrupted the teaching of *Locke*. He has improved it, since he has completely fathomed and established the ideal part; he has corrupted it, since he moved the itself moving individualities, which *Locke* had left on the real domain, to the ideal domain and made them here to *zero's*.

Kant has two legitimate successors: *Schopenhauer* and *Fichte*. All others are crown-pretenders without legal title. And of these two only *Schopenhauer* is relevant for critical idealism: he is from this regard the only intellectual heir of *Kant*.

I have regarded the critique of the *Schopenhauer*ian works, the separation of the incorrect and transient ones from the significant and immortal ones, as my life-task and must therefore, in order to no repeat myself, refer to the appendix of my work. With him too, I can only mention that, which relates to the topic which we discuss.

As we have seen, with *Kant* the cause of a sense impression was a mystery. Initially he let it be simply *given*, then he used the thing-in-itself for that, although he did not have the right to do so.

Now Schopenhauer was very dissatisfied with this weak spot of the Kantian epistemology and with astounding astuteness he asked the in this essay already often mentioned question:

>How do I come to perception at all?

This question is actually the heart, the cardinal point of critical idealism; for on its answer depends nothing less, than the definitive ruling, if the world possesses reality or is only a phantom, a being-less illusion.

Schopenhauer found that we, without the relation of the change in the sense organ to a cause, would not come to objective perception at all. Thereby the *causal law* lies here as an *aprioric function next to* the sense impression, not, as *Kant* wants, as a primordial concept behind the from outside *given* empirical content of perception. The causal law is therefore not a primordial concept a priori – *Schopenhauer* rejected with full right the whole machine of aprioric *primordial concepts* – but instead a *function* of the Understanding: its *only* function.

In this lies a merit, which is not smaller than *Locke*'s section between what is ideal and real. For this proof, that the causal law is the primordial function of the Understanding, *Schopenhauer* received his first laurel wreath from the truth: famously the German nation has not wreathed one for him during his lifetime, and how did he desire one from its hand, how did he deserve it!

But it is incomprehensible, that *Schopenhauer* remained with the causal law on the subjective side and plainly denied the activity on the *real side*. That the activity is a *cause* – this certainly relies on the causal law: without subject it would not be a *cause*; however that the *activity itself* depends on the causal law, by which it should be placed – this is sheer nonsense. If one thinks about this sentence, then one immediately feels, how in our reason

something is violently hidden. *Schopenhauer* has however not hesitated to apodictically proclaim it:

> But that they should need an external cause at all, is based upon a law whose origin lies demonstrably within us, in our brain ; therefore this necessity is not less subjective than the sensations themselves. (Fourfold Root, § 21)

Schopenhauer simply mixes cause with effect here, and the natural result of this mix-up was that he initially declared, like *Kant*, the outer world to be a deceptive and illusionary image, and that he later on, like *Kant*, fell in glaring contradiction with the fundament of his teaching.

The truth is (and it has been reserved for me, to proclaim it) that as certain it is that the causal law is purely ideal, subjective and aprioric, likewise certain is the from the subject independent activity of the things, thus the activity on the real domain. The ideal function must be triggered, stimulated from outside, otherwise it is dead and just nothing.

The *causal law*, i.e. the transition of effect in the *sense organ* to cause was not specifically mentioned in the inventory of the mind by *Kant*. He noted only the general causality (connection of two *objects*) which is why I said above that he deemed a in two parts sliced part to be one. The distinction between the two of them is however extraordinarily important. One part (connection of *subject* and object) is entirely aprioric and ideal, the other one is *only ideal*, is a connection a posteriori, established by the reason based upon the aprioric causal law.

Schopenhauer also improved the *Kant*'s epistemology

1. by the proof that the senses cannot perceive, that instead the representation is the work of the Understanding, is *intellectual*, not sensible,
2. by this, that he shattered the category-clockwork in a thousand pieces,

which by the way the fools lime and pick up. Repairing this nonsense delivers them unspeakable joy.

On the other hand *Schopenhauer* corrupted *Kant*'s epistemology by destroying alongside the categories, the synthesis (the composing faculty of the reason) and did not know to save the categories,

1. Matter (substance)
2. General causality
3. Community

in another form, namely as compositions and connections by the reason a posteriori.

He also subscribed the great mistake of *Kant*: space and time are pure perceptions a priori. They are, as I have proven: compositions a posteriori based upon aprioric forms (point-space, present). –

We remind us that Kant had obtained by fraud the *thing-in-itself*, i.e. that which is independent from the human mind, the truly real, and nevertheless had to let it be an *x*. *Schopenhauer* determined it in the human breast as *will*.

He determined furthermore, that this will is not merely will-power, the conscious activity of the will, but also that which *Spinoza* called motion of the soul. According to this he separated the will-activity in an unconscious and a conscious one. For this the truth reached him a second laurel wreath.

>The kernel and chief point of my doctrine is that, that what Kant opposed as *thing-in-itself* to mere *appearance* (called more decidedly by me *representation*) and what he held to be absolutely unknowable, that this *thing-in-itself*, I say, this substratum of all appearances, and therefore of the whole of Nature, is nothing but what we know directly and intimately and find within ourselves as *willing*^{*}; that accordingly, this *will*^{*}, far from being inseparable from, like all previous philosophers assumed, and even a mere result of, knowledge, differs radically and entirely from, and is quite independent of, knowledge, which is secondary and of later origin; and can consequently subsist and manifest itself without knowledge: a thing which actually takes place throughout the whole of Nature, from the animal kingdom downwards; that this will, being the one and only thing-in-itself, the sole truly real, primary, metaphysical thing in a world in which everything else is only appearance, i.e., mere representation, gives all things, whatever they may be, the power to exist and to act; ... that we are never able therefore to infer absence of will from absence of knowledge; for the will may be pointed out even in all appearances of unconscious Nature, whether in plants or in inorganic bodies; in short, that the will is not conditioned by knowledge, as has hitherto been universally assumed, although knowledge is conditioned by the will. (On the Will in Nature, Introduction)

It is here, in the kernel of nature, in the will, that he tumbles in the unspeakably sad fluctuating between individual will and the one indivisible will in the world, which is the stamp of his complete teaching. On the ideal domain sometimes he is realist, then idealist, on the real domain he is half pantheist, half thing-in-itself-idealist.

Because of this the truth smiled ironically with him too, but only very weakly; for the love towards him was too strong. He is after all the one, who had almost pulled off her last veil: a deed, which she desires from the depth of her heart, to bless and redeem all humans.

He had found the core of nature in his breast as individual will:

> Man forms no exception to the rest of nature ; he too has a changeless character, which, however, is strictly individual and different in each case. (On the Basis of Morality, II)

Why did he leave this firm ground and threw himself in the arms of an imagined basic unity in the world? How insignificantly little would I have found to improve in his magnificent teaching, if he had remained with the individual! For – hereby I have to say it – if he would have done this and had taken his partition of the individual will in a conscious and an unfathomable unconscious one as support, then his teaching the Occident would stand there as the same blue miraculous flower like Buddhism in the tropical forests of India: only even more magical and aromatic, since it is rooted in the soil of *critical* idealism. Similar to how the painter makes with one single stroke on his image a crying child smiling, I want to make with a single change from *Schopenhauer*’s toxic-soaked by contradictions eroded system a consequent system of thing-in-itself idealism, which one can laugh at, but not rebut. Or as he himself says:

>But whether the objects known to the individual only as representations are yet, like his own body, manifestations of a will, is, as way said in the First Book, the proper meaning of the question as to the reality of the external world. To deny this is *theoretical egoism*, which on that account regards all appearances that are outside its own will as phantoms, just as in a practical reference exactly the same thing is done by *practical egoism*. For in it a man regards and treats himself alone as a person, and all other persons as mere phantoms. Theoretical egoism can never be demonstrably *refuted*, yet in philosophy it has never been used otherwise than as a sceptical sophism, i.e., a pretence. As a serious conviction, on the other hand, it could only be found in a madhouse. (*WWR* 1, § 19)

I *only* need to give the *unconscious*, unfathomable human will *omnipotence*, which Buddha had unequivocally given it and which Schopenhauer *had* to give the one indivisible will in the world, – and Schopenhauer's system is the blue miraculous flower, consequent, unassailable, irrefutable, intoxicating for the individual. Now the *Berkeley* an eternal spirit, God, who brings in our brain the first impulse for the creation of the phenomenal world, now the subrepted (obtaining by illegitimate means) thing-in-itself of Kant, the ground of appearance, is nothing but the unconscious part of the human will, which brings forth from his unfathomable depth with omnipotence the sensible stimuli, that makes this, according to his functions and forms, into a world of illusion, into a pure being-less phantasmagoria.

I confess here openly, that I have for a long time experienced a strong internal struggle between *Buddha* and *Kant* on one side and *Christ* and *Locke* on the other side. Almost equally powerfully I was requested, by one side to establish the blue miraculous flower in the Occident and by the other side to not deny the reality of the outer world. I eventually chose for *Christ* and *Locke*, but I confess that my on myself and my fate focused thoughts have as often moved on the foundations of my teaching as on the charm of Buddhism. And as a human (not as philosopher) I do not favor my teaching above Buddhism. It is just like Dante says:

> Between two kinds of food, both equally

>Remote and tempting, first a man might die

>Of hunger, ere he one could freely choose.

>(Paradise, Canto IV)

The only thing which I still have to do, is solving the riddle of *transcendental* idealism. I summarize it here, since *Schopenhauer* has appeared, with the words:

>The world is dependent on the mirror the human mind, of which the functions and forms are the following:

Functions|

--|

Receptivity of the senses|

Causal law|

Synthesis|

Aprioric forms|

--|

Point-space|

Matter|

Present|

Ideal (a posteriori) forms|

--|

Mathematical space|

Substance|

Time|

General causality|

Community|

>The world is essentially phenomenal, is appearance. Without subject no outer world.

>And *nevertheless* the world is a from the subject independent collective-unity of itself moving individuals, which a real affinity connects, a dynamic interconnection, as if they are weld together.

This is the solution. The whole of intellectual functions and forms are not there for the *creation* of the outer world, but merely for the *cognition* of the outer world, just like the stomach only digests, while not simultaneously bringing forth the nutrition, like the hand only grabs an object, not also produces the object. The causal law leads towards the activity of the things, makes them cause, but does not produce them; space shapes the things, but does not initially lend them extension; time cognizes the motion of the things, does not move them however; reason composes the perceived parts of a thing, but does not first furnish them their individual unity; general causality cognizes the connection of two activities, but does not bring them forth; community cognizes the dynamic interconnection of all things, but does not bring it forth; finally matter (substance) makes the things material, substantive, it objectifies their force, but does not bring forth the force.

Here, as I have proven in my work, here, where the force, the real thing-in-itself, weds itself with matter in the human mind, this is the point, where what is ideal must be separated from what is real.

Therefore I have not made the section between what is ideal and real. This has been done already, excellently, unsurpassably by the genius *Locke*. But he determined the ideal side inadequately and the real side completely false. I have therefore, fertilized by *Berkeley, Hume, Kant* and *Schopenhauer* gone back to *Locke* and have based upon his correct section solved the riddle of the transcendental idealism. The world is not as the mind mirrors it: it is appearance and *toto genere* different in its whole being and indeed merely due to the secondary qualities of *Locke*, which I summarized in the concept matter (substance).

And now we want to continue to the second form of idealism, the true thing-in-itself-idealism, of which there is only one system in the world: *Buddhism*.

Of the essay “Buddhism”: Ex oriente lux!

The esoteric part of the Buddha-teaching

https://old.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/6b34o4/the_esoteric_part_of_the_buddhateaching/

>Whatever exists is far off and most profound – who can discover it? (Kohelet 7:24)

The sources from which one can get to know Buddhism, the holy books of the Buddhists, are numerous, and extensive scriptures. On Sri Lanka alone the Buddhist priests could provide researchers with 465 scriptures. I want to mention the number of pages of these scriptures, so that one can build an image about the magnitude of the Buddhist literature.

The “Book of 550 births” (Pansiya-panas-játaka-pota) has 2400 pages, every page has nine lines and every line one hundred words.

The “Questions of King Milinda” (Milinda prasna) has 720 pages like the one above.

The “Path of the Pure ones” (Wisudhi-margga-sanné) has 1200 of such pages.

Buddha himself has not authored a single one of these scriptures. Nevertheless they contain – supposedly word by word – his complete speeches, comments on them, philosophical treatises and his life story, i.e. not the description of his life as *Buddha*, but also his many other past lifeforms.

For all those who do not speak the concerned oriental languages, the most important books about Buddhism are Spence Hardy’s “Manual of Buddhism” and “Eastern Monachism”.

Merely because of these fantastic books alone every German scholar, no, every cultivated German, must thoroughly understand English. For it is beyond all doubt, that the Buddhist scriptures, whose main parts *Spence Hardy* has translated word-for-word, stand at the same height as the New Testament, “Critique of Pure Reason” and “The World as Will and Representation”; which is why it is better to learn English in order to penetrate in Buddhism, than Greek for Greek philosophy alone, or Latin for the Oupnek’hat or *Spinoza*’s work.

Schopenhauer strongly regretted that the mentioned books of *Spence Hardy* are not translated in German; I agree from the bottom of my heart, since *Spence Hardy* has lived for twenty years as an English missionary on Sri Lanka, which is the only part of India where its inhabitants are Buddhists and the place where the teaching of *Buddha* has remained the purest. His work also clearly gives the image of a hardworking, discerning and great scholar, and the very fact, that a devout but honest Anglican reports about the deep wisdom of the Indian prince, makes the report so uniquely interesting. For it is clearly perceptible how the

Christian faith in the missionary is fluctuating and wavering under the influence of the atheist teaching: *Hardy* must clamp himself as it were at the cross on Golgotha, in order to not break his vow, and become from a sent converter a “heathen”, an adherent of *Buddha*, i.e. become a “heathen” himself. This inexpressibly great is the charm of the Buddha-doctrine.

In Europe it has become “a girl for everything” and it is about time, that the mischief stops. Many think “India is far away” and “what does it matter” if I maintain a false notion and perfume it with it? For example the materialists invoke the high teaching for their absurdities, without having the slightest understanding of it; realists as well as idealists use it as support, yes even pantheists boldly dare to tear off parts of it, in order to conceal the skin of their nonsense; for Buddhism and pantheism stand in absolute opposition to each other and are counterpoles. “Hands away” I shout to all of them. The blue miraculous flower may not be touched, it may only be admired.

If one compares the teaching of *Buddha* with the pantheism of the ancient Brahmins, one will find a lot of identical. Both are pessimistic, i.e. pervaded by the truth that life is an evil; both consider the *outer world* to be unreal, a pure illusion; above both of them floats the concept of salvation. And nevertheless no greater difference exists than between Brahmanism and Buddhism.

This difference is fully and purely reflected in the words:

>The outer world *and* the own person were for the ancient Brahmins a mere illusion, nothing, and the incomprehensible, invisible world soul (Brahma) *alone* was *real*;

>

>However according to *Buddha*'s esoteric teaching *only* the outer world is phenomenal and *he, Buddha alone,* was real.

The latter I will now prove from the Buddhist scriptures. Before I start though, I remind that we possess no writing of *Buddha*, and remark that the same has happened with the deep thinker as with *Christ*: the successors have initially rendered the esoteric part (as far as they could capture it themselves) conceivable for the people, and have then disfigured, distorted and decorated the whole teaching. *Spence Hardy* too has recognized this; he says:

>The grand principles of Buddhism would be complete without the existence of any other orders of being beside those that inhabit our earth, and are perceptible to the senses; and it would agree better to suppose that Buddha believed in neither angel nor demon, than to imagine that the accounts of the déwas and other supernatural beings we meet with in the works called Buddhistical were known at its first promulgation. There is the greater reason to believe that this class of legends has been grafted upon Buddhism from foreign source. It is very probably that his disciples, in deference to common prejudice, have invented these beings. We have a similar process in the hagiology of all the ancient churches of Christendom; and in all the traditions of the Jews and Musselmans, which came not from the founders of the systems, but from the perverted imaginations of their followers in after days. ([Manuel of Buddhism p.41](<https://archive.org/stream/manualofbudhism00hard#page/40/mode/2up>) [not a literal quote])

Thus I must deduce, according to the most rigid logic, from the pile of Buddhist scriptures the golden grains, in order to construct the purely esoteric, essential part.

Buddha started with his own person and indeed the *whole* person, the *knowing* and *willing* I. He was therefore a pure idealist. He was pushed to this standpoint by the teaching of *Sankhya*, who was the first to oppose the rigid Indian pantheism, but in a realistic and clumsy way. The philosopher *Sankhya*, the predecessor of *Buddha*, was actually just as overexcited as the ancient Brahmins. Like how they thrust the dagger in their own breast in favor of an imagined unity in the world, likewise *Sankhya* only saw the individuals in the world and overlooked the firm bond that entangles them. He taught about *independent*, real individuals, which is as far removed from the truth as a basic unity *in* or *above* the world.

Buddha took this standpoint of the *individual* and indeed with such a brilliant force, as humanity can bring forth only once a millennium.

This standpoint is the only correct one in philosophy. In the essay "Idealism" I have already emphasized this. What is besides my own person *immediately* given for me? Nothing. *Under* my skin I immediately *feel* and think; everything which lies *outside* of my skin, might be and might not be. Who will or *can* give me *certainty* about that? What I know about others, *all of this* this is processed sense impression, and can this sense impression not just as well be brought forth by a force *inside* of me?

This is the important problem of critical idealism and the great obstacle on the road of thought. Everything which can be argued against it, is prettily summarized by *Goethe* with the words:

>All *sane* people are convinced of *their* existence and the people *around them*.

The *conviction*! But does this conviction not merely and solely sprout from the order in physical laws, of the outer world, in which no *miracle* ever takes place and of which we thereby become *accustomed* to it? Does one *need* to be convinced of the existence of those around us? Certainly not. *Kant* has proven this and he alone is already a sufficient testimony, that one does not necessarily *need* to have this conviction. The complete order of physical laws of the outer world, from which alone the *Goethe*an "conviction" after all arises, has by *Kant* been, as we know, placed as an ideal affinity of the things *in* the human intellect, and has expressed as *his* conviction:

>The world is phenomenal and its appearances lie in a subjective nexus.

One can clearly see, that that, which makes the clumsy realism valid in opposition to idealism, is simply a bold uncritical assumption, on which one can build only a philosophical system that is as bold and unsolid as its fundament.

We can only construct the esoteric part of Buddhism if every one of us thinks that his person, his I, his individuality, is the only *real* in the world and indeed, every one of us must provisionally think that he is the prince himself, *Buddha*. Otherwise the blue miraculous flower is impossible to generate or understand.

What did *Buddha* find when he looked *in himself*, in the only *real*? He found upádaná, (cleaving to existence, cleaving to existing objects) i.e. desire, hunger, thirst for existence and manner of existing, or simply: *will to live*.

In this general form of will to live, or better (since we have to do with *one* will only, the will of Buddha), in this way of willing karma carries (literally action, supreme power) the specific *character*, i.e. : I, *Buddha*, want life, existence, but I want it in a *specific manner*.

Accordingly, Buddhism relies upon two principles on the surface, but in essence only upon a single one: for karma and upádaná are one and the same. If one is placed, then the other is automatically placed as well. Karma is the being of *Buddha*, upádaná the manner, the general form, or, as the creative mind of India expressed it:

>It is as impossible to separate karma from upádaná, as it would be impossible to separate heat from fire or solidity from the rock. ([Manuel of Buddhism p. 394](<https://archive.org/stream/manualofbudhism00hard#page/394/mode/2up>))

Similarly, these principles, karma and upádaná, which I want to summarize with the concept “individual will to live”, are as intimately connected with *rebirth* as heat with fire, solidity with the rock.

>By upádaná a new existence is produced, but the manner of its operation is controlled by the karma, his character, with which it is connected.

>The karma itself is controlled by its own essential character. (p. 395)

And now take good notice, how *Buddha* moreover determines the primordial core of his being:

>Karma is achinteyya i.e. without consciousness. (p. 396)

>Neither the karma nor the upádaná has self-consciousness. (p. 396)

We have not made three steps in the esoteric part of *Buddha*'s teaching and already we have found the complete fundament of the *Schopenhauer*ian philosophy: the *unconscious will to live*. One may rightly assume, that *Schopenhauer*'s mind has most energetically been fertilized by the Buddhist scriptures: the ancient wisdom of India sank after almost three and a half millennia on the descendent of a migrated son of the miraculous country.

What did *Buddha* find furthermore in himself? He found a mirror for karma and upádaná: the mind, *self-consciousness*.

This mirror however – and one must firmly hold onto this, if one wants to understand Buddhism – belongs not to the being of the will, it is not merely secondary, but it is thoroughly *phenomenal*, i.e. a being-less illusion.

Hereby is the phenomenality of the world of the body and the outer world is given as well. Buddha held his body and the complete remaining world to be the deceptive image of an illusion, the reflection of a reflection.

The human body is thus with *Buddha* not something it is with *Kant*, appearance, but rather illusion: a very great difference, since the former has a ground (i.e. with *Kant* a subrepted ground), the latter on the other hand is being-less, is really nothing. Accordingly, the body is

Thus the prince did simply declare (page 446 of Man. Of Bud.) without stating grounds, and it is *dishonest*, to draw from his teaching conclusions, which stand in contradiction with the fundament of it. But I will immediately show, that the individuality of karma can be actually be *proven* from the principles of Buddhism itself.

We therefore have as only real: the unconscious individual karma. Now we have to determine the being of karma as far as is possible.

When *Buddha* looked into his breast, he found intense urge towards existence and indeed existence in a specific manner. This urge showed itself to him as a *force*. But could it shows itself to him as an *omnipotent* force? No. He found, that his *will-power* was *limited*, that it could cause no *miracles*, brief, that it was not a sorceress, not omnipotent.

But besides this will-power (conscious will-activity) he also recorded in himself expressions of a hidden *concealed* force in feelings and thoughts, of which he could give no account. Such, from an unfathomable depth arising thoughts and feelings can every human record in himself; the same has initiated, as we have seen in the essay "Realism", the first objectively tempered humans, to offer the heart of the individual to imagined light angels and demons. One can be "led by the Spirit of God", "possessed by the devil", with one word "demonic" and with animals "instinctive".

The mysterious *unconscious* force in the human breast now becomes for *Buddha* the main issue and it is the cornerstone of his important teaching.

He gave it *omnipotence*, which by the way logically follows from the fact that he considered his person alone to be real. If there is nothing real outside Buddha, then he had to be omnipotent, since nothing else is present which could *limit* him.

> Karma is supreme power. (p. 399)

From this almighty, unconscious, individual karma we can now deduce everything else, which we know from Buddhism until now and have found by other means, without effort.

First of all, the conscious will-power is an illusion, since it is limited and contradicts omnipotence; furthermore the whole human mind, altogether his sensibility (feeling), is deception, since it cannot mirror the true karma; is however my mind only illusion, then also my body and the outer world must necessarily be illusion, since their whole existence exists only in the reflection of this deceptive-mirror.

Here lies also in Buddhism itself for the proof of the individuality of the karma; firstly because besides one being, that possesses omnipotence, no other being can exist: only one single being can possess omnipotence; secondly, the concept infiniteness relies on the being of space and time, which stand and fall with the mind, since they are ideal. Thus remains a single being, which is not infinite. Such a being is only imaginable as pure individuality, though we can form no concept of it.

Already here we see, that esoteric Buddhism is, based upon a irrefutably real fact, is a firm in itself closed, errorless, strictly consequent system.

Now we have to ask the main question. What is the core of the being of this omnipotent unconscious karma? We immediately see, that we can answer this question only in negations. The predicates unconscious and omnipotent are already negative. Ignoring that unconscious is linguistically negative, is it also essentially negative, since I am not conscious of my unconsciousness and the being of unconsciousness can be given in no experience of the conscious state; omnipotence is furthermore in the deepest sense the negation of "limited", since no being in the world, thus no being of our *experience* is omnipotent. Based on the absolute idealism discussed above we must now give karma the following two negative predicates:

>expansionless

>timeless

What do these four negative predicates: unconscious, omnipotence, timeless, expansionless express? They express, that karma is a mathematical point, or brief, *transcendent*, transgresses experience, is unfathomable for the human mind.

> The wonder-working karma is a mere *abstraction*. (p. 396)

>There are four things which cannot be comprehended by any one who is not a Budha. 1. Karma-wisaya, how it is that effects are produced by the instrumentality of karma. (note on p. 8-9)

So Buddhism is transcendent dogmatism.

At the same time it is thing-in-itself-idealism, because it grants, grounded upon the irrefutable fact of inner experience, reality to the I alone.

And what about the whole esoteric Buddhism is only *positive*? The explanation that karma is *individual* and that it *exists*. About the way and manner, how it is individual and how it exists, *Buddha* gave no information, because he *could* not. He did not lead his recognized and felt living ground back to a lost, transcendent primordial-ground, that had existed in the past, but he placed it on an always present *eternal* transcendent primordial-ground.

This is, which I have to stress, by no means a flaw of his teaching and only a philosophical rogue can assert that therefore the Buddha-teaching is imperfect. I want to expand full light on this.

As long as there are humans – and more perfect beings will certainly not come to exist – no philosophical system can come into appearance without somewhere a transcendent ground or point of support. An absolute philosophy, i.e. one, for which the last ground of the world, up to its *essence*, is *not* a mystery, will *never ever* be.

But two philosophical systems can, like day and night, distinguish themselves, by how they relate to this transcendent ground.

All systems (with the exception of true Christianity resp. my teaching) and most of all pantheism assume the transcendent ground to be *simultaneously* existing (co-existing) with

the world. Thereby they confuse and darken continually the order and clarity in the world, with exception of Buddhism. *Every* action in the world, the greatest as well as the smallest, is according to pantheism an inexplicable *miracle*; since *every* action is moved like a string-puppet by an invisible, mysterious hand. *Every* action contains a logical contradiction, which we will immediately see. If one lies, as I will clearly show in the essay about the dogma of the Christian trinity, the transcendent unresearchable ground of the world *before* the world, such that both exist *alone*, and that the world since the beginning of its existence is present *alone*, then one has a clear and ordered world, whose appearances are in no way *mysterious* anymore, and we have a single mystery: the origin of the world. The world itself is not mysterious, nor an appearance in it. Also not a single action contradicts its laws of thought. Mysterious remains only the way and manner, *how* the basic unity, God, did exist *before* the world.

Yet Buddhism is, as I have already said several times, the only system in the world, which is pure thing-in-itself-idealism, i.e. because *Buddha* considered himself alone to be real, the with *Buddha* co-existing and simultaneously existing transcendent ground of the world not confuse and darken. Confusion and darkening can only be brought in the world by the co-existence of a God, if this God contains more than the human breast.

Even if *Buddha* could form no image of the individuality of his karma, it did not lie in the logic absolute contradiction of pantheism, which teaches about many mathematical points (individuals) and at the same time a basic unity; since the basic unity is simply incompatible with plurality, if they exist both at the same time. Either multiplicity, or basic unity: a third there is not. Because if we have to think, according to pantheism, that God, the basic unity, lies undivided in Jack and at the same time completely and indivisibly in Jill, then we feel in our mind, how something must be bent in it: since we cannot present to ourselves this easy to make connection of words, we cannot think it. It defies all laws of thought and reason: it's a violation of our mind.

As hard, nay, impossible as it is, to imagine the principle of pantheism, so easy it is so think, that I am *God*, but well-understood *only* I, *only Buddha*: a single individual. That is why I said already in the essay "Idealism", that the profound sentence of the Upanishads of the Vedas:

>Hae omnes creaturae in totum ego sum et praeter me aliud ens non est,
>
>(All these creatures together I am, and outside me there is no other being.)

can be applied with the same right on Buddhism as pantheism; because *Buddha* carried God and the world, *in* himself, *in* his breast, and besides *Buddha*, there was nothing else.

Here lies the reason, why Buddhism is so often seen as identical with pantheism, or considered to be a branch of pantheism, more clearly than anywhere else. For example Mr. Von *Hartmann* has dared, to write:

>The sole being, that corresponds with the Idea of the inner cause of my activity, is something *non-individually*, the only-solely unconscious, which *consequently* corresponds as good with the Idea of Peter *his* I, as with the Idea of Paul of his I. *Only the esoteric Buddhist ethics relies on this utmost profound ground*, not the Christian ethics. (Phil. o. Unc. 718)

a judgement that relies on the most shallow research of the great system. I repeat: hands away from the blue miraculous flower!

Furthermore: like how Buddhism is completely free from logical contradiction, which eroded pantheism like corrosive venom, it is also the only system (if a transcendent ground exists *simultaneously* with the world) that knows only one single miracle: just the eternal transcendent ground. If one assumes this single miracle, then everything in nature, every individuality, every action, is transparent, logical, necessary, not mysterious.

I want to show this in detail.

The only miracle of Buddhism is thus the unconscious, omnipotent, timeless, expansionless, individual karma.

First it creates itself the body and that, which we call mind (senses, judgement-power, fantasy, reason). Is this miraculous? In no way; since karma is omnipotent. Then it brings forth feeling (the states of pleasure and displeasure, bodily pain and lust) and representation. Feelings are simply reflected in the consciousness; representations on the other hand are generated in a difficult way. The main issue with representation is the sensuous impression. What causes it according to *Buddha*? The omnipotent karma:

>The eye, that which receives the impression of colour, whether it be green or yellow. The ear, that which receives the impression of sound, whether it be from the drum, harp or thunder. – all these impressions *are caused by karma*. ([p. 401](<https://archive.org/stream/manualofbudhism00hard#page/400/mode/2up>))

Is the representation miraculous? In no way, since it is karma, as is remarked, which is omnipotent.

Now we want to set a small step in the important teaching.

The whole world is, according to esoteric Buddhism, phenomenal; phenomenal as well is the limited will-power of Buddha; real is alone the omnipotent karma in his breast.

How is it explicable, that Buddha can be limited in his actions, though he is the omnipotent God?

In this question lies the core of esoteric Buddhism.

Due to a world, which is indeed in every aspect illusion, but countered by the individual as real might and which limits it; furthermore due to a conscious will-power, which is not omnipotent – a *real conflict* emerges in Buddha's breast.

This important conflict is wanted by the omnipotent karma and because it is wanted, a half-independent body is built with everything that goes along with it: limited will-power, sensation, pleasure, displeasure, pain, lust, perceiving, space, time, causality, representation, an illusionary world of mighty real force.

And why does it want this real conflict?

There is only one answer.

>It wants by a bodification in a world of illusion the *mortification, the transition from existence into non-existence.*

The conflict is the individual destiny, which is *shaped* by karma with unfathomable wisdom and omnipotence. It connects existence primarily with suffering and shows through knowledge, how *Buddha* can free himself from existence.

In my discussion of the *exoteric* part of Buddhism in my main work, I have shown with examples, how the omnipotent karma expresses itself as destiny. It sorts the outer circumstances, the motives; sometimes it leaves the individual no way out, pushes him to a wall, so that he must starve in solitude, sometimes it opens the fields and lets the individual escape in sunlit plains, sometimes it makes the human chase after illusions, sometimes he is bestowed with renunciation and wisdom.

It is always karma which shapes the outer world as well as the motives, as well as the urge and desire in the breast; always keeping the eye on *his* goal, since it can only be achieved by the from conflict emerging states of being: non-existence.

In order to not repeat myself, I refer for the solution of the question: why can the *omnipotent* karma, if it *wants non-existence*, not *immediately* free itself from existence?, to my Metaphysics (main work). I will only write down the answer: omnipotence is not omnipotence towards itself, it requires a process of omnipotent conflict, in order to pass over from existence into non-existence.

The location of karma in the body was determined by Buddha in unsurpassably poetic and lovely images, since he could not specify it with cold intellect. For example, he said:

>Thus, there is a tree, a fruit tree, but at present not in bearing; at this time it cannot be said that its fruit is in this part of the tree, or in that part, nevertheless it exists in the tree; and it is the same with karma. (p. 448)

Although we can form no concept on how the temporal actions of the phenomenal will-power in the own body are affected by that which lies as its ground, the motion- and expansionless point-karma, still the relation between karma and body contains no logical contradiction, since we have to do with *one single* individual only. Pantheism on the other hand lies completely in a logical contradiction, because it teaches about a basic unity behind the *individuals*; since as we have seen it is unthinkable, that the world soul should fully and completely lie in Jack as well as Jill *at the same time*. Modern pantheism has thought, in order to escape the dilemma, of a smart way out, to separate the activity of force from force itself: i.e., the world soul is active all individuals, while not filling them up. As if this in no experience given, with logic struggling separation is not again a new swamp! Where thing works, there it is: there is no *actio in distans* (distant activity) other than the transmission of a force through real media (transferors). I speak a word, it shockwaves the air, meets the ear of someone else, but not in such a way that I speak in Frankfurt and immediately a Mandarin Chinese in Peking suddenly hurries, to carry out my command.

We can image the relation of the body to karma under the image of an immovable sphere, which constantly touches an itself moving tangent in one point:

[Picture](https://imgur.com/a/RrM63vU)

The body and the by it carried image of the outer world are the tangent, karma is the sphere. Every state of *Buddha* is touched by karma and it affects what he wants on that moment. More than this we cannot say, since it is impossible to determine, how something temporary affects upon something eternal. The interrelation is simply transcendent: we stand before the *miracle* of Buddhism.

As simply and naturally everything flew up until now from this miracle, so simply and naturally flows the Buddhist dogma of rebirth from it.

The omnipotent is always incarnated in *one single* individual: this is important to hold onto, since it is a fundament of Buddhism and it separates it from pantheism. karma has not wrapped itself for once and for all in *one* body, which remains its form until karma has achieved its goal, but rather, karma changes the forms. Sometimes it is a worm, sometimes a king, then a lion, then a devadasi.

One can see however that all of this is not necessary, and I doubt whether rebirth really belongs to the esoteric part of Buddhism, if it is not on the contrary exoteric.

I want to expose the inessentiality of rebirth on ground of thing-in-itself-idealism so clearly, that all those, who read this essay, will feel like I do: i.e. I sense clearly, that only a small strip separates me from the domain of insanity. We stand before a problem, of which *Schopenhauer* (who by the way himself, when we has not realist, was incessantly occupied with it) referred all those who wander in its spirit, to the madhouse.

I, writer of this essay, muss imagine myself on ground of Buddhism, that I am the only real in the world, that I am God. Neither my body, nor the quill with which I write, nor the paper, which lies before me, nor the printer, who will print my essay, nor the readers of it, are real. All of this is illusion, phantasmagoria, and only the in my breast hidden and concealed living karma exists.

But not only this, but also everything, which history books tell me about the course of humanity, brief everything alien, which lies begin me and everything alien which I can imagine in the future, is unreal. My parents are not real, my sibling are not real, real however are my childhood, my youth, the past part of my adult life.

Accordingly, also *Buddha himself* and *his teaching* are now for me *a mere phantom.* Neither has once human like *Buddha* lived in India, nor were the words that have been written down in the Buddhist scriptures, ever spoken.

All of this, is just like the currently existing real world, sorcery, phantasmagoria of *my* almighty karma, in order to thereby achieve a certain state in *me* and then a certain goal for *itself.*

And not only this. Let us assume: a reader of this essay feels his I, his person, like I feel mine right now. May he consider *my* existence to be *real*? From the standpoint of Buddhism, the absolute thing-in-itself-idealism, he may *not*. He must consider me and my essay precisely as illusory, as I, while I write this, consider him, reader, *Buddha*, his words, Alexander the

Great, the Roman Empire, the Crusades, the French Revolution, *Kant* and his works etc., etc., for mere illusion without the least reality.

And let no one think that, that this standpoint is unjustified. It is the most justified one which can exist, the only sure and irrefutable one: the standpoint on my immediately feeling and knowing I. Every other standpoint is compared to this one, like water, on whose surface we can only maintain ourselves while swimming with effort. It is also the standpoint of mystics. *Angelus Silesius* openly declared the identity of his I – and only his personal I – with God in the verse:

> I know, God cannot live an instant without me; He must give up the ghost, if I should cease to be.

It is not standpoint of the mad, but rather one that can *make mad.* One may take this to heart. I dare to pronounce this judgement, because I am impartial, since certainly no other foot has stood more firmly than mine on the ground of the absolute I and will ever stand; I have nevertheless left this ground after the most careful consideration. Let someone go through his past under the assumption, that all persons, who he has met, brief everything, which he has seen, learnt, experienced, was *illusion*. He will certainly, when he has made the problem completely clear, come to the result, that the assumption of an absolutely phenomenal world contains really no contradiction in itself and that his complete past life is as well explicable with it as with a *real* world. The principle proposition of Buddhism:

>I, *Buddha*, am God

is a proposition that is irrefutable. *Christ* also taught it with other words (I and the Father are one); I have taught it as well, but only valid *before* the world, not *in* the world.

Hereafter rebirth is a pure side-matter; since it is undeterminable, whether my body is the ten-thousandth or the *first* and last incarnation of God. Only one thing is logically firm, that God or, to stay with Buddha's language, karma as omnipotent pure karma can *not* achieve non-existence. Incarnation is for non-existence a *conditio sine qua non*. Inessential however, as is said, is the question, if a body needs 100.000 forms for the salvation from the chains of existence; since why can the reflecting about the worth of existence, which can only become objective in the bodification and the by it carried outer world, as well present, past and future, not be achieved already in one single body, to redeem karma? *Only* the reflection on existence, which God could not have accomplished without the world, is necessary: the amount of bodies is inessential.

If one makes the choice for many incarnations, then an *uninterrupted* sequence must be accepted and indeed (as I precautionarily want to mention again, so that we do not lose our sight on the fundament of Buddhism) a chain, whose links always represent one single individual. Such chains from about two hundred links (in order to obtain, at hand of history until now, an *uninterrupted* chain) can everyone build at pleasure, the only thing he may not do is forget himself in it as chain in the present. Whether he is the *last* link, whether it is through him that God passes over into non-existence : This may be decided by everyone with his own consciousness.

Hereby we have dealt with the full esoteric part of Buddhism. Was I wrong, when I called it the blue miraculous flower of India? Was I wrong, when I said that everyone would feel with its

consideration, like a brilliant landscape painter, who for the first time looks in the wealth of color of a tropic forest? Who does not bow before the genius greatness of the gentle mild prince, who renounced the shining throne of his father, took off his precious cloths and went begging from door to door in simple garb? – –

But before I finish this section, I have to make some remarks.

1. I hold Christianity, which is based on the reality of the outer world, to be the absolute truth in the cloak of dogma's and will justify my opinion again in a new way in the essay "The dogma of the Christian trinity". Despite this it is my view – and he who has absorbed the essay lying before him clearly in his mind, will concur with me – that the esoteric part of Buddhism, which denies the reality of the outer world, is also the absolute truth. This seems to contradict itself, since there can be only one absolute truth. The contradiction is however only a seeming one; because the absolute truth is merely this: that it is about the transition of God from existence into non-existence. Christianity as well as Buddhism teach this and stand thereby in the center of the truth.

Secondary is: whether God lives in *one* breast or if the world is the splintered God; finally both have in common: that as long as this bodified God is not redeemed, the *world* will exist. The moment he is ripe for non-existence, for nothingness, the world will perish.

2) Buddhism alone is that teaching, which nullifies all the absurdities of life, its cruel appalling character and everything which distresses and torments in science.

The doctrine nullifies the absurdities of life: namely if I stand before a dung heap and stare in feces, then I must, if the world is nothing else than the splintered God, consider the feces itself, every maggot in it, the rats, who dance in it, the spiders and all worms to be *coessential* with myself. How repugnant! – But if I am Buddhist, then all these rats, worms, maggots etc. are only being-less illusion and are only conjured before my eyes by my almighty karma, in order to evoke a certain feeling, a certain state, a state of disgust.

The doctrine nullifies the cruel appalling character of life: If I, my person, am the only real in the world and is the present world just like the past one only illusion, then there has no blood been shed at all, no murder, no theft, no slaughter, no revolution, no earthquake, no mine accident, no shipwreck has taken place. The whole terrible struggle for existence, the unhappiness of millions and millions, who are and were, are only a magical illusion, the greatest main-motive, to bring me to the decision, to forsake such a cold, bleeding, painful world and thereby free my karma from existence. One can also say, that the whole world of experience is only that which has become image, a in wondrous phenomenality expressed *method* for karma, to redeem itself.

Finally, the doctrine nullifies everything that is tormenting and mysterious in science: namely, if the world is only illusion and my person the only real, then there are no scientific problems. Whether the sun turns around the earth, or the earth around the sun, wether there is gravity or not, wether there is a central star for all stars, wether humans descend from apes or from Adam and Eve – all of this is unimportant to me, nor can it concern me.

Brief: just like how someone who is cold, crimps together in his coat, the Buddhist encloses, happily smiling, the whole fantasy world in his breast. What world? What space? What

through which alone we can see something: they are called space and time and their pervasion causality. (Paralipomena, § 136)

> Its fresh existence is paid for by the old age and death of a worn-out existence which has perished, but which contained the indestructible seed out of which this new existence has arisen : they are one being. (*WWR* 2, On Death)

> One can also say: the *will to live* presents itself in only manifestations, which totally become *nothing*. This nothing stays, however, together with the manifestations, within the will to live and rests on its basis. (Paralipomena, § 147a)

are justified. In relation to the last passage *Schopenhauer* himself says: This is admittedly obscure. But it is completely understandable and clear, if one relates it to one single *individual* will, *Buddha*'s karma.

This is how we will say goodbye to the blue miraculous flower with its bewildering, intoxicating scent. It will not be unfortunate, no, one may call it the highest happiness, if one or another succumbs to *Buddha*'s siren calls: he will have the proud feeling that he is God, and he turns himself at the same time away from the world, and will find salvation. Salvation is the main issue, the way that leads to it is of secondary importance.

Comment to “The esoteric part of the Buddha-teaching”

User Sunques:

This is deep while still being terse. It takes a true "spiritual" pessimist to understand and penetrate the core of teachings such as these, and Mainlander is brilliant at this.

>the materialists completely unjustified manner support their [abfinde] teaching on Buddha, because he saw the mind as a product of the body, this way the modern romantic pantheists use Buddha as support for their teaching, because he considered, the self-consciousness to be illusionary in which alone, as they say, individuality, personality can exist. The first ones must be dismissed for all times from Buddhism with the remark, that Buddha proclaimed that also the body, thus their whole imagined, real Matter, is illusion; for the pantheists is however the remark necessary, that individuality can be perceived not only in the self-consciousness, but is simply felt with sensibility.

Very strong rebuttals against the materialists and pantheists in regards to Buddhist philosophy.

>Mr. Von Hartmann has dared, to write:... "a judgement which relies on the most shallow research"

Funny, I was just reading over this section in Philosophy of the Unconscious.

>I, Buddha, am God

>"....but only valid before the world, not in the world."

In the Yogacara school of Buddhism, which is the epitome of the Idealism Mainlander is referring to, the only real "thing" is the Pure Mind/Buddha Mind as the source of existence and "ground of consciousness" (the unconscious).

>What do these four negative predicates [of karma]: unconscious, omnipotence, timeless, expansionless express?

>karma as omnipotent pure karma cannot achieve non-existence. Incarnation is for non-existence a *conditio sine qua non*.

the explanations on karma are original and very astute.

>that it is about the transition of God from existence into non-existence. Christianity as well as Buddhism teach this and stand thereby in the center of the truth.

Good recognition of the correspondence.

>If one lets now simply make the sensuous impression come forth from the unconscious will in us and if one lets fall at the same time Kant's completely groundless assumption: there are many things-in-themselves

>...while the assumption of a million point-characters, who should be expansionless and nevertheless separated from each other, can be understood by no human brain

It seems that extreme of idealism claims that all things/beings are merely projections of our inner sense/Understanding, even created by our inner sense, while "sensible" idealism stops short of this and only seeks to prove that all things/beings that we experience - our impressions - are "transformed" into something by our inner sense/Understanding that they actually are not in of themselves.

Do you think Locke's idealism, which preceded Kant, hints at "many things-in-themselves" due to his admission that ****the apple exists outside of us**** yet ***we only know it's qualities "ideally"*** and not as-they-are in actuality?

>Kant's completely groundless assumption: there are many things-in-themselves

The assumption itself is completely correct.^{^1} Groundless it is according to his own system. Multiplicity exists only in our head; because it exists thanks to time and space (which exist in our head only).

It's a case where Kant intuitively knows what the truth is (there are many things-as-they-are, apples/trees/etc) but he can't prove it with his system. Because according to his system the thing-in-itself is a single point.

^{^1} (Unless you accept extreme idealism.)

>Do you think Locke's idealism, which preceded Kant, hints at "many things-in-themselves" due to his admission that the apple exists outside of us.

Yes because amount belongs to the primary qualities that exist independently of us (the primary qualities can, according to Mainländer, be summarized with: individuality and motion).

It is nice to read your thoughts on Mainländer's text. I really appreciate it.

I also want to mention that Von Hartmann was, although a pessimist, a pro-natalist. Pessimism was fashionable at that time in Germany.

>It seems that extreme of idealism claims that all things/beings are merely projections of our inner sense/Understanding, even created by our inner sense, while "sensible" idealism stops short of this and only seeks to prove that all things/beings that we experience - our impressions - are "transformed" into something by our inner sense/Understanding that they actually are not in of themselves.

Yes indeed. The right foundation of "sensible" idealism, critical/transcendental idealism:

>In fact, when we (rightly) regard the objects of the senses as mere appearances, we thereby admit that they have a thing in itself as their ground—namely, the thing of which they are appearances. We don't know what this thing is like in itself; all we know is its appearance, viz. how this unknown something affects our senses. (Prolegomena, § 32)

In the absolute/extreme, thing-in-itself-idealism, all objects are like in a dream brought forth by ourself.

>The human body is thus with Buddha not something it is with Kant, appearance, but rather illusion: a very great difference, since the first one has a ground (i.e. with Kant a subtlet ground), the last one on the other hand is being-less, is really nothing.

"Transcendental idealism: Space and things in it are mere appearance. We can have no knowledge of things in themselves, that is, things existing independently of us; rather we have knowledge only of appearances.

Empirical realism: we do have knowledge of things outside us, though, that is things in space. Since space is ideal, things in space are not to be inferred on the basis of perception, but are rather immediately perceived. **Transcendental idealism leads to empirical realism**

- Kant's Refutations of Idealism

The exoteric part of the Buddha-teaching

https://old.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/6gztm2/the_exoteric_part_of_the_buddhateaching/

>*Tat tavam asi.* (That thou art.)

>(Oupnek'hat I.60.)

>Light is sweet, and it pleases the eyes to see the sun.

>(Kohelet 11:7)

Why is there an exoteric part of Buddhism at all? or better: why did *Buddha teach* at all, if he considered himself to be the only real in the world, and consequently, there could be no other *real* humans for him?

The answer to this is: *Buddha had* to teach, *Buddha had* to see his fellow humans as *real* beings and try, to lead them to the path of salvation, because *Buddha* could bring forth through *teaching* those effects on his karma, which it required for its salvation. The lectureship of *Buddha* was as necessary for the karma as the whole phenomenal world in which *Buddha* lived: it was merely a *means*, through which the karma shaped itself, like everything else.

Hereby the existence of popular Buddhism is completely justified.

But hereby is also given, that the exoteric part must be a very paradoxical system. And it is indeed equal to the pantheism of the Brahmins, i.e. it is a *half*-truth. Nevertheless, it is a magnificent ethical religion that can redeem its adherents. Is more or less absurdity and faith not the case with every religion? Not all humans have the critical mind and seek the naked truth. Religion is present for good behavior and to give every human a grip in the storm of life. *Buddha* has given the people a firm hold, which protects as well against storm as the rock-solid cross on Golgotha. Blessed we are, that we can let the mild light of their eyes fall upon us: illuminating our spirit, warming our heart.

Also in Buddhism as *religion*, the foundation is the almighty karma. The destiny of every human is sovereignly shaped by his determined individual karma.

Here a corrosive paradox lies in the open air. I can imagine *one single almighty* being, which produces the world and its whole order of physical laws, like a spin its net, but imagining two of them is already impossible. Omnipotence is a predicate, which can be assigned to one being only. Yet, if we can reconcile ourselves with the logical paradox of two omnipotent beings, we will get startled again, when we look at the arrangement of nature; for this arrangement too imperatively desires a unity and is incompatible with plurality. Let us image only two beings on earth, our Jack and our Jill, who both carry an omnipotent God in their breast, then it would be unthinkable, despite the established omnipotence, that the world of the one does not disturb the world of the other. If the mutual disturbance should not take place, then both must be mediated by an omnipotent third that nullifies the disturbance, neutralizes it: a combination of which one will seek in vain its equal in absurdity.

midst of a fire that is fiercer than the sun-beam, raging continually, casting forth flames above, below, and on the four sides, to the distance of 100 yojanas.

>*Yet even these miserable beings are afraid of death. – If one would let them choose between such a life of torment and complete annihilation, they would choose the former.*

>[(p. 60)](<https://archive.org/stream/manualofbudhism00hard#page/60/mode/2up>)

Can one characterize the hunger for existence, the love for life, in a more terse manner?

>The passion of the sexes is sharper than the hook ; it is hotter than the burning flame ; it is like an arrow piercing the mind.

>Passion is mischievous, cruel, brutal, and unruly ; it is the cause of all anger and distress. (p. 91)

The relation between the *deeds* of the individual to its karma is shaped based on this exoteric ethics as follows:

All bad deeds, all sins, which man lets flow, despite the by *Buddha* given counter-motives, from the source in his breast, the passionate desire for life, are absorbed by karma in its being. Every committed sin *changes* the nature of karma. Likewise, every virtuous action is absorbed in the nature of karma. And like how sin is necessarily connected with *punishment*, every good action is necessarily followed by a *reward*. Sin is as intimately connected with punishment, and good deeds with reward, as heat with fire.

Let us imagine an initial karma, which cannot be indifferent, it *must* rather be thoroughly fulfilled with desire for life, therefore at the end of a first individual life course it *must* either be the same as at the beginning, since a bad deed cannot increase the badness, or it is better than at the beginning, because it has been *changed* by good deeds in the first life course.

This in the dead of the first individual free becoming karma immediately embodies itself according to its quality (transcendent occasionalism). At the end of the *second* life course it is now or as bad again, as it originally was, because its improvements were nullified by sins in the second life course, or it is better due good deeds. This way karma incessantly changes itself and always the individual destiny will precisely comply with the adequate nature of karma. Every individual life is the adequate expression of the as its ground lying specific karma.

>Karma includes both merit and demerit ; it is *that which controls* the destiny of all sentient beings. (p. 445)

Buddhism knows two punishments and three rewards:

1. Punishment and reward in this world.
2. Reward in heaven (déwa-lóka, brahma-lóka).
3. Punishment in hell (naraka).
4. Nirwana – Non-existence

With *Buddha* the rewards and punishments are based on the different sentient beings and the diverse social forms of humans. Here the remark is to be made, that the genius prince, he, who as we will clearly come to see, had an as *practical* mind, as he had a sharp, subtle, dialectical mind, that he broke natural heredity with a bold hand out practical need and replaced it with transcendent occasionalism, which I can credit the religion founder not enough for. Philosophy must be strictly separated from religion, as long as not all humans are ripe for the former. The former is, as long as both forms must exist next to each other, essentially theoretical, the latter is essentially practical, and if the latter can achieve, with something which is in philosophy absurd, a great practical success, then it must stout-heartedly be used. All religion founders have done this without exception, for they were all very practical people.

If we take a look at the world, then we see inorganic substances, plants, animals and humans. As we have seen above, *Buddha* gave only the sentient beings karma: inorganic substances and plants are excluded from his ethics. They are for the sentient being that what for the actors is the stage: mere decoration. If we consider the sentient beings, then we will find some that we might very well would like to be once, and others which disgust us. Who would not like to be a bird for once?

(...)

The social circumstances of the caste system in India are well-known. The castes were in the time of *Buddha* separated by even higher and thicker walls than today. If one considers the relationship between a Greek slave towards his lord and the relationship of a Brahmin to a pariah, then the former seems as mild as a fraternal one. The *glowing desire* of the excluded ones for the laborless, easy, prestigious life of a Brahmin or a warrior, and on the other hand the *fear* of a prince to become for example a pariah, were two additional foundations for the dogma of rebirth.

If *Buddha* had retained the natural hereditariness, then the all three discussed foundations, the disgust for animal-existence, the desire after a better lifeform and the fear, to be degraded to a worse one, would not be; since first of all nature teaches that worms bear always worms, lions always only lions, humans always only humans, and thus a human can never become in a natural way for example a lion. Secondly, the caste separation was so strict and the condition of the state in general so extremely firm, that something like the threat of being cast off the throne through revolution would have seemed sheer nonsense.

Therefore, as religion founder, *Buddha had* to replace the natural law with miraculous occasionalism. The child is not the rejuvenated parents, but instead the begetting is merely the occasional cause for the incarnation of karma, or with other words: if somewhere a begetting takes place, then somewhere a by the death of individual liberated karma builds the whole nature in the fertilized egg.

>All sentient beings have their own individual karma, or the most essential property of all beings is their karma ; karma comes by inheritance, not form parentage, but form previous births. (p. 446)

Now, based on this teaching, this miraculous occasionalism, *Buddha* could let the three mentioned mighty motives flow into the human breast. It was a brilliant power trick, full of practical sharpness. Every Buddhist must think looking at a maggot, that he can become such a disgusting animal, if he does not live morally, every rich and prestigious one must think in

the same way, that he can become a day laborer after death, and everyone who is poor and deplored, must, when he sees a ruler in gold and gems on splendid horses, say to himself: you can become such a wonderful human yourself too, if you are virtuous. What a motives with driving force!

But the threatening punishments and rewards in *this* world were not enough for *Buddha*. He therefore also taught about a supernatural residence for the extreme sinners (hell, naraka) and a garden for the virtuous (heaven, déwa-lóka, brahma-lóka).

We will not stall ourselves at the hell. My readers know it well enough from the reports of fanatic theologians and I personally consider the dark breast, the lacerated heart of the villain, a sufficient punishment for the worst crime. Worldly violence can through the greatest outer punishment barely intensify the punishment which a villain carries *in* himself.

Instead, we will delight ourselves with the exquisite descriptions of the déwa- and brahma-lokás. They contain the most beautiful flowers of the Oriental fantasy.

Buddha described the residences of the blessed ones very briefly, because he obviously could not tell a lot about it; but every word which he used, exercises an effect on the human heart like the magnet on iron.

The déwa-lókas are the worlds, where the purest intellectual joys, the highest *conscious* happiness, is experienced. There are six of them.

The brahma-lókas on the other hand are the worlds where – and this is very characteristic for Buddhism – complete rest reigns and the inhabitants are *completely unconscious*. There are sixteen of them.

The brahma-lokás stand above the déwa-lókas.

The more delicate differences between the blessedness of the individuals in the déwa-lókas on one hand and the brahma-lókas on the other hand, these I skip. The Buddhist scriptures contradict themselves on this point: a proof that we have to do with disimprovements of the teaching. Some even claim that in the déwa-lókas the blessed experience bodily pleasures like in the paradise of Muhammad, which is totally contrary to the spirit of Buddhism. I believe that *Buddha* taught about only *one* déwa- and *one* brahma-paradise, with distinction only in the *duration* of stay; as, besides indulging in lust, there are only two desirable states: deep aesthetic contemplation and unconsciousness.

Since in the brahma-lókas unconsciousness reigns, *Buddha* did not describe them at all. Very natural. When I am unconscious, I could not care less, whether I lie in a palace or a horse stall. The déwa-lókas on the other hand are built from the most beautiful material.

>The déwa-lóka called Cháturmaharájika is situated at an elevation of 420,000 miles above the surface of earth. The four guardian déwas, Dhrataráshttra, Wirúdhya, Wirúpaksha, and Waisráwana, have palaces on the summit of rocks.

>

>The palace of the first guardian, Dhrataráshttra, is on the east. His attendants are the gandhárwas, 10 million in number, who have white garments, adorned with white ornaments,

hold a sword and a shield of crystal, and are mounted on white horses. The déwa is arrayed and mounted in a similar manner, and shining like ten million silver lamps.

>

>The palace of the second guardian, Wirúdha, is on the south. His ten million attendants are the kumbhándas, who have blue garments, hold a sword and shield of sapphire, and are mounted on blue horses. The déwa is arrayed and mounted in a similar manner, and shining like ten million lamps composed of gems.

>

>The palace of the third guardian, Wirúpaksha, is on the west. His ten million attendants are the nágas, who have red garments, hold a sword and shield of coral, and are mounted on red horses. The déwa is arrayed and mounted in a similar manner, and shining like ten million shining torches.

>

>The palace of the fourth guardian, Waisráwana, is on the north. His ten million attendants are the yakás, who have garments adorned with gold, and are mounted on horses shining like gold. The déwa is arrayed and mounted in a similar manner, and shining like ten million golden lamps.

>

>(M.o.B. p. 24-25)

>

>In one of our years the déwas breath 216 times, which is 18 times in one of our months, and once in 100 hours.

>

>In one hundred of our years they eat once.

>

>(M.o.B. p. 50)

Is it possible to paint more beautifully and visualizably, the splendor, the needlessness, the rest and deep peace of paradise?

Exoteric Buddhism intensifies the punishments and joys too, by on one hand making the possibility of getting out of the hell extremely small, and on the other hand making the joys in paradise very long, up to 9216 million years.

Buddha tried to make the extremely small possibility for the individual of escape the torments of hell, understandable with the following parable:

>A man throws a yoke into the sea. The east wind sends it in a westerly direction, and the west wind sends it in an easterly direction ; the north wind sends it in a southern direction, the south wind sends it in a northern direction. In the same sea here is a blind tortoise, which after the laps of a hundred, a thousand, or a hundred thousand years, rises to the surface of the water. Will the time ever come, when the tortoise will rise so up that its neck shall enter the hole of the yoke? It may ; but the time that would be required for the happening of this chance cannot be told; and it is equally difficult for the unwise being that has once entered any of the great hells to obtain birth as man. (M. o. B. p. 442)

Since an individual can free itself from existence *only* as a *human*, everything expresses the great warning of not letting slip this precious opportunity.

The great promise of Buddhism for the virtuous, the most important reward is nirwana, nothingness, the complete annihilation.

I have discussed in my main work nirwana briefly, but exhaustively [and refer to it](https://www.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/62r2kx/denial_of_the_will_to_live_accounts_from/). Here I only want to note that nirwana is absolute nothingness already because of this, since otherwise the brahma-lókas would have no sense. For an improvement of a complete unconscious existence, which is taught about the brahma-lókas, is only possible in the complete annihilation of existence. The explanation, that nirwana is a place though not a place, that life in it is life while not being life, that it is merely a relative nothing, as mere negation of this world and that it deals with a life, of which we can have no representation: this is to be accounted for by the shrewd students of the great master, like so much else, that deserves no attention, but which is made by every uncalled critic of Buddhism into the main issue.

We will now have a small after-discussion in the domain of exoteric Buddhism, which will give very interesting results.

First, I want to touch upon two main points of the teaching itself: world-renunciation and suicide.

He who renounces the world, absolutely renounces, is a ráhat and the ráhat finds in death absolute annihilation: he is fully and completely freed (*final emancipation*). *Buddha* now has explicitly taught that from the moment, where the world-renunciation starts, it is unimportant what character the individual shows, whether it is severe or bright, loving or cold-hearted. Nirwana is ensured for them under all circumstances.

>The prince Samona said to *Budha*, “Sire, there are two of your disciples, equal in purity, wisdom and the observance of the precepts ; but one gives to others the food he eats, and the other does not ; what will be the difference in their position after death?”

>

>*Budha* replied, “There will be no difference whatsoever.”

>

>[(Eastern Monachism p. 293)](

<https://archive.org/stream/easternmonachism00hard#page/293/mode/1up>)

Regarding suicide, *Buddha* takes a very unique position. The highest to which charitable, mild, loving humans in the Occident can attain, is that they do not stone the corpse of the self-murderer and feel the pain of the “poor, without doubt insane” neighbor in themselves.

Buddha however boldly declares suicide, in accordance with the spirit of his brilliant teaching, to be extremely meritorious and unconditionally offers it as an option. Only for his priests he prohibited it to, to kill themselves, since otherwise the world could not be redeemed. He therefore demanded *renunciation* of self-annihilation as a heavy *sacrifice*.

>If thou didst ever hold me in thy heart,

>

>*Absent thee from felicity awhile.*

>

>(Shakespeare)

Spence Hardy reports on this:

>It was said by *Budha*, on one occasion, that the priests were not to throw themselves down from rocks. But on another occasion he said that he preached it in order that those who heard it might be released from old age, disease, decay, and death ; and he declared that those were the most honourable of his disciples by whom this purpose was accomplished. The reconciliation of the differences lies in the following. The members of the priesthood are like a medicine for the destruction of the disease of evil desire in all sentient beings ; like water, for the washing away of its dust ; a talisman, for the giving of all treasures ; a ship, by which to sail to the opposite shore of the sea of carnal desire ; the chief of a convey of wagons, to guide across the desert ; a wind, to extinguish the fire of anger and ignorance ; a shower of rain, to wash away earthly affection ; an instructor, to teach the three forms of merit, and to point out the way to nirwána. It was therefore, out of *compassion* to the world that Budha commanded the priests *not to precipitate themselves from the peace of death.* (M.o.B. p.464)

What should I say here? If one thinks about the unhappiness which people, whose religion obstructs the way out of the world, experience, then certainly one can here only exclaim: you kinder, mild, dearer and – *brilliant* Indian!

Let us now admire the practical sense of the noble man.

>When Málunka asked Budha whether the existence of the world is eternal or not eternal, he made him no reply ; but the reason of this was, that it was considered by Budha as an enquiry that tended to no profit ; and it was not the practice of the Budhas to reply to any question, the purport of which was not designed in some way or other to assist in the overcoming of successive existence and the reception of nirwána. [(M.o.B. p.375)](<https://archive.org/stream/manualofbudhism00hard#page/375/mode/1up>)

Furthermore he declared for once and for all, that only a Buddha (teacher of humanity) understands the core of the truth.

>The absolute truth is known to the Budhas alone; even for déwas and brahmas it is concealed. (p. 299)

>

>It is exceedingly subtle and occult ; like a hair that is split a hundred times, or a treasure covered by a great rock. (p. 380)

Likewise, he declared:

>There are four things which cannot be comprehended by any one who is not a Budha.

>1. Karma-wisaya, how it is that effects are produced by the instrumentality of karma.

>

>2. Irdhi-wisaya, how it was that Budha could go in the snapping of a finger from the world of the men to the brahma-lókas.

>

>3. Lóka-wisaya, the size of the universe, or how it was first brought into existence.

>

>4. Budha-wisaya, the power and wisdom of Budha. (note on p. 8-9)

Very practical! Because what would his audience have said, if he had concealed the esoteric part of his teaching? He would have been ridiculed, if not stoned to death. But this way he lovingly deflected them from philosophical problems, for which they were not ripe, and directed their attention towards their deeds, on which alone their salvation depended.

His practical sense found its expression also by how he bound the people, based on the dogma of rebirth, to himself with chains of gratitude.

>A great part of the respect paid to Gótama Budha arises from the supposition that he voluntarily endured, throughout the myriads of ages, and in numberless rebirths, the most severe deprivations and afflictions, that he may thereby gain the power to free sentient beings from the misery to which they are exposed under every possible form of existence. It is thought that myriads of ages previous to his reception of the Budhaship, he might have become arahat, and therefore ceased to exist, but that of his own free will, he forwent the privilege, and threw himself in the stream of successive existence, for the benefit of the three worlds. (p. 98)

At most we have to admire *Buddha*'s mildness and practical sense regarding to external things, which we will be the case if one is familiar with Brahmanism and its formalities. He demanded to not chasten oneself and made not chastening oneself a prerequisite for the office of priesthood.

>There are two things which must be avoided by him who seeks to be a priest ; evil desires, and the bodily austerities practiced by the (brahmin) ascetics. (p. 187)

He energetically opposed all Brahmin teachings which are, which made the salvation depend on the observation of statues that had become pointless [for attaining salvation].

>They who keep the precepts, whether they live in a village, or in a hole, or upon a rock, or in a cave, are equally my children.

>

>Those who take life are in fault, but not the persons who eat the flesh ; my priests have the permission to eat whatever food it is customary to eat in any place or country.

>

>If one uniform law were enforced, it would be an hindrance in the way to those who are seeking nirwána ; but it is to reveal this way that the office of the Budhas is assumed. (p. 326-327)

I wish from the bottom of my heart, that everyone who reads this will feel like I do. O, this *Buddha*! How he knew to build a temple in the breast of the people!

Consider also the courage that is needed, to proclaim such a teaching, in a time where Brahmanism, its ceremonies and its centuries old external statutes were still adamant ordinances. Even today every Brahmin does not leave his house without a broom, in order to sweep the way before him, *so that his foot will crush not even the smallest insect!*

But *Buddha* showed the greatest possible moral courage by daring, he alone, to fight against the state constitution of India.

His father, the old king Sudhódana, who first observed with dismay the life-path of his son, but eventually accepted his teaching, said with pride:

>My son regardeth not tribe, nor family extraction : his delight is in good qualities, in truth, and in virtue alone. [(p. 78)](
<https://archive.org/stream/manualofbudhism00hard#page/78/mode/1up>)

Alone, godforsaken alone, the social reformer threw himself against everything rock-solid, against the high castes, — *and was victorious*. This great is the might of the truth. The Brahmins indeed eventually succeeded in eradicating Buddhism from the subcontinent, but before that, it managed to penetrate into Tibet, China, Indochina and the islands and today it has around 396 million adherents, – more than Christianity.

And against such a teaching, which stands completely coequal next to Christianity, the narrow-minded English priests send year after year, droves of missionaries: a folly which *Schopenhauer* fittingly branded with holy anger as “audacity of Anglican parsons and of their slavish followers”.

At the end of this part of the essay, i.e. standing at the end of the discussion of all main systems of realism and idealism, I still have to make one remark.

We have seen, that the world riddle, because its two sentences contradict themselves, has found a lot of solutions in the past part of the movement of humanity. Always, objective minds circled around the truth like the earth around the sun, but no pure idealist or pure realist has reached it. We have indeed found that the esoteric Buddhism stands in the center of the truth, but *only* its kernel. As a complete system it is indeed unassailable, but cannot fully satisfy man, because there can after all be no reasonable ones, who consider the external world to be *pure illusion*.

Therefore in many of my readers the intuition may have emerged, whether, with a correct combination of realism and idealism, a system might be created, that *satisfies* in all its aspects. And indeed, this system does exist. Christianity contains the full and complete truth in the cloak of myth: it stands between absolute idealism and absolute realism as the naked truth, as transfiguration of the refined naïve truth that lied in David’s religion.

The esoteric part of Buddhism (blossom of idealism), which is *absolute* truth, can really not be compared with pantheism (blossom of realism), which is *half*-truth. On the other hand, exoteric Buddhism, which I have pointed out in my main work already, is on par with pantheism, i.e. equally the half-truth and they stand indeed to each other as counterpoles, which one can visualize with the following image:

[Picture](<https://imgur.com/a/5dH8Vco>)

Namely, pantheism makes, killing the individuals, a basic unity almighty, Buddhism on the other hand makes the individual almighty, killing the interconnection of the individuals.

One rests upon the truth, that the world has one single fundamental-movement, a single destiny, the other one on the truth, that in the world only individuals can be encountered. Or with other words: the former stands completely on the first sentence of the world riddle, the latter on the second sentence, which contradicts the first sentence.

If we focus only on this relation, then the image of above is very correct: Buddhism is as far away from the truth as pantheism.

If one considers on the other hand, that pantheism has lost the most real thing of all, yes, the only real, the individual I, while Buddhism stands on this only real and does not leave it, then the relationship shifts greatly in favor of Buddhism. Then the following image emerges:

[Picture](<https://imgur.com/a/MhZj2Dq>)

i.e. then Buddhism is like the planet Mercury, which moves in an ellipse *nearby* the sun and around it, pantheism on the other hand like a comet, which closes up to the sun *once* and then is lost in space, never coming nearby it ever again.

It is about that time that the Occident follows the Orient and stands up against pantheism, in whatever form it may emerge; and indeed to banish it from the world forever. Pantheism is the most unrefined realism. The pantheist lets in favor of the *apparent dominance* of the external world, which has after all only *mediate* reality, the most real of all, the individual I, and eventually also the reality of the external world, from which it started, become illusion. It thus offers all results of his knowledge and himself to an in the imagination *living*, still in the world existing unity in the world. This is pure insanity: a confusion which could only appear because of the undeniable intimate interconnection of all things. But we will not give up this relation. Let us take it, this precious diamond on the neck of a wooden idol, and burn down its worthless corpse in cold blood.

I have viewed the fight against pantheism as the core of my life-task already in my youth and if not all signs deceive, then already in this generation, the idol, which has once been necessary for the intellectual development of humanity, but is nowadays merely an empty husk, will be destroyed.

Character Image of Buddha

https://old.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/6gztm2/the_exoteric_part_of_the_buddhateaching/

>When he saw the crowds, he was moved with compassion for them.

> (Matthew 9:36)

>Then Budha spoke: *Budha compassionates the world.*

--

Buddha was a *genius*. The brilliance shows itself to us, in this great appearance, as the blossom of a brain that stands there virtually alone in mankind; for it is the sharp power of

isolation and composition of *Kant* combined with the artistic imagination of *Raphael* or *Goethe*. I repeat here with the greatest determination, since I know that I can be refuted by no one, that it will always be uncertain, which branch of the truth is the correct one: the one in the esoteric part of the Buddha-teaching or the one which lies in esoteric Christianity. I remind that the *essence* of both teachings is the same: it is the absolute truth, which can be one only; but it is questionable and will always be questionable whether God has *shattered* into a world of multiplicity, as *Christ* taught, or if God is always incarnated in a single individual only, as *Buddha* taught. Fortunately, this is a side-matter; because it is really the same, whether God lies in a real world of multiplicity or in a single being: his *salvation* is the main issue and this is taught identically by *Buddha* and *Christ*; likewise, the path of which they determined that it leads to salvation, is identical.

After his hermit life *Buddha* was no longer subjected to inner temptations, consequently, his whole blood-life focused itself in the most precious organ of man, in the head. One might say, that he was only a pure knowing being. He floated above the world and above himself. In this enchanting, free game of his mental power, he must have led the most beautiful life imaginable, on one hand when he reflected on his inside and the world in solitude, as well as when he looked at the real motley tumult of India. He sat as it were always in theatre, in deep contemplation watching the great image of life. And hours passed like minutes.

His irony and sarcasm were devastating, his sharpness was admirable. He could, as the saying goes, split a hair into a thousand hairs. I refer to the by *Spence Hardy* translated debates with studied Brahmins. He conquered them all, all of them, and he shows here a great similarity with *Plato*'s dialectical mind, who also spins a thousand threads, that seem to not belong to each other, and yet connects them into a single knot. All those who wanted to combat *Buddha* were warned beforehand:

>... the danger he would incur by conversing with Gótama, as he knew his artful method of gaining over persons to his opinion. [*Manual of Budhism* p. 267-268](<https://archive.org/stream/manualofbudhism00hard#page/267/mode/1up>)

His eloquence must have been enchanting, especially when there was no dialectical struggle and he could freely develop his teaching.

As one can image, the Brahmins clamped in their despair at the fact that *Buddha* was born in the warrior caste, that he was no Brahmin. They tried to persuade the people with the ridiculous statement: Only a Brahmin can find the truth. *Buddha* is no Brahmin, not a scholar, consequently his teachings *must* be false. We stand here before the same reasoning as:

>All humans have ten fingers;

>You have nine fingers:

>Consequently you are no human.

The Brahmins of all time, of all places in whatever form they appear, have always, as is well-known, used fallacies of this nature. However the geniuses have always acted like *Buddha*, i.e. they calmly ignored them and their lips merely formed a fine, charming, ironic smile.

When *Buddha* started to teach, he had no time anymore to study; as little as a noble human can calmly reread a letter, while before him someone is struggling in torrents with death, or when a house burns and from its windows he hears screams for help. And what should he actually have studied? He had – forgive me for this daring but striking line – separated in two hours by virtue of his judgement-power the gold from the sand in the Vedas, took the gold in the pocket, and left behind the sand. Should he perhaps have rummaged through the sand for years, in which no grain of gold was left? He should have been a Brahmin without judgement-power in order to sacrifice himself to such unholy, fruitless labor. On the contrary, he focused all his power, that had become free now, first on his rebirth, on his complete refinement, then on the hallway of completely rotten hearts of his human brothers. And how he worked, the layman, the victorious-perfected one, despite the caste that claimed to own the truth!

As I mentioned, Buddha *had* to see all people he encountered, to be phantoms, to be unreal. Nevertheless, he *had* to teach and try, to free them from their dreadful fake-sufferings and lead them to the way of salvation, because he had to deal with a *positive*, totally real torment *inside* of him, of which he had to free himself, in order to maintain his so dearly bought peace of mind. Whoever possesses a vivid phantasy and has had for just one moment, a clear and objective look at the world, he will suffer forever under the reality of the world, even if his *head* says a thousand times: All of this is but illusion and conjuring of your own mind. If Buddha was seriously right, i.e. – I repeat it – if *he alone* was the real being of the world, if God lied in his breast alone and the world merely an illusion – then it would simultaneously be an illusion that takes over the *heart* and gives this illusion such an intense reality, that it *had* to bring forth *positive* states in *Buddha*, which exercised a determined and intended influence on the hidden karma.

So that's it – and with that we continue to the other property of his heart – the overwhelming compassion with his fellow humans, the most boundless mercifulness of the Indian Savior, that lashed him out of his cozy royal life into the muddy flood of the world, and made from a prince a wandering beggar.

>Then Budha spoke:

>Budha compassionates the world.

>[*Manual of Buddhism* p. 47](<https://archive.org/stream/manualofbudhism00hard#page/47/mode/1up>)

Very beautifully and profoundly the Buddha's way of conduct, i.e. his transfer from an easy, carefree life to the struggle with the roughness of mankind, is represented in the image, that he left the paradise, and was born a human, because he wanted to save everything, which possesses life. He was lured by neither power, honor nor fame, but was driven by his mercifulness alone, that stopped tormenting him only, when he knew he was fighting for the salvation of humanity. If he had stayed in his harem, in his gold gleaming, marble palace, in his magic garden, he would have been suffocated by compassion; but now he found peace. He would also have found peace, if his activity had been without success; because a true redeemer of mankind, i.e. a human, who is motivated by compassion with others alone, desires no external success, but merely the consciousness, that he struggles with all his power for others. This he had to have. This consciousness is the *conditio sine qua non* for the death of his suffering in his breast. That he often gains by the pure aspiration the greatest worldly power, namely, the violence over the hearts of millions, yes, fame in the highest

degree: worship during life and deification after death – That is for him a side-matter, which he coldly laughs about. Compassion is what drives the true redeemer back to the world; it dies however, from the moment on that he walks on that path. Now, what keeps him back to life? Life itself? Certainly not, for he would be no redeemer at all, if he had no contempt for death and did not love death, if he did not condemn this world and places non-existence above existence with head *and* heart. So what should cause him, foreigner on earth, to be shackled in the dark room and to refrain from the peace of nirwana, this city of eternal peace, towards which he carries burning desire like an injured deer towards water? Money? Goods? Power? Fame? Women? Father? Mother? Brothers? Sisters? – Not compassion, not simply life, also not a charm it offers, holds him back. He stands merely under the violence of the work he has started, a violence that drives and spurs him until the eye shatters, either in a garden before the city Kusinara of old age, or at the cross of Golgotha. (A *third* example is not known to us, because although perhaps other redeemers might have lived, history deprives of characteristics, by which alone we are able to recognize a true redeemer of *humanity*.)

Therefore *Buddha*, perfectly pure, was, when he plunged himself in the filthy stream of the world, due the knowledge of his activity for others *free from suffering*. The Horatian Laetitia reigned in him, the by *Shakespeare* in the image of Horatio exalted equanimity, the Christian peace that is higher than all reason. His *inner* human could be moved by absolutely nothing anymore: He was living already in the eternity of nothingness, in the immovability of nirwana. But the *outer* human, he let him churn. Restlessly he wandered from city to city, from village to village, always teaching and struggling.

The dispassion of the great man is most closely connected with this. That before he renounced the world, bluntly and completely, before he obtained the pure alienness on earth or in other words his ministry as redeemer, there had to be terrible war in his breast with the love for life, is symbolically expressed in the colorful, enchanting fairytale of his struggle with Wasawartti-Mara. *Buddha* needed his glowing love for the *truth*, his significant *wisdom*, the total *conviction* of the trueness of his *teaching*, his suffocating *love for his fellow humans*, the rock-solid *trust* in his mission and the enormous *resilience* against suffering of any form, to make himself totally stainless, and from a lambent by smoke covered flame a peaceful, clear and illuminating light.

It is meanwhile very remarkable, that he fought all these heartbreaking wars before assuming the ministry as redeemer. As victorious-perfected one he went back to the world, from which he had fled in a more demonic way, i.e. more out of an unclear drive than with full consciousness.

From the moment he started to preach, he was a rahat, i.e. a Saint and indeed a Saint, who no longer has to endure inner temptations. No fluctuations, no passion or high tide on one side, no depression or low tide on the other side, no oscillating between two poles; but instead absolute inner immovability and external lucid indifference: peace of mind and external rest.

Very noteworthy and remarkable is the *fatalistic* character trait of *Buddha* during the time of his *last* struggle. Afterwards, this side had to vanish completely, because it *had* to vanish.

I remind the enormous difficulties, that had to show themselves in the clear eye of *Buddha*, when he we was thinking of the ministry as redeemer. He saw all of those, who have *power* in the state, with the intention to stand up to him, to render him harmless; for his teaching led a

battle of annihilation, as well against the foundations of the state, the constitution, as well as against all millennia old products based on this constitution: so against the reigning religion, the ancient rituals, the complete culture, as it had entered the blood of Indians in history. Totally alone, godforsaken alone, he had to take on the battle with a thousand giants of custom; for the ignoble people, whom he wanted to save, was beastlike, stupid, timid.

When thinking about that, serious doubts about the external success, no, his teaching in general, and about himself, must have seized the great thinker. He fluctuated, and when the inner voice was silent, the external world was silent as well: doubt alone lived in the benighted soul of the splendid one.

On moments like that, he had, in order to not succumb in the waves, he had to *furnish himself* a talking mouth, that gave him courage, he had to *get himself* a bar of wood at which he could clamp himself. As said before, his inside was silent the external world completely mute. What to do? He *forced* the external world, to speak clearly.

Therefore, he threw a hair cut off, in the air and thought: if it does not fall the ground, you will conquer, but if it falls, give up all hope!

So, he also threw a golden alms jar of Sujata in the and thought: if it swims against the stream, you will take upon the ministry of redeemer, but if the waves take it with them, you will not succeed.

Obviously, these miracles are based on simple natural events. It may be that *Buddha*, before he threw the hair in the air, made a few steps with closed eyes, with the thought, if the hair happens to hang on the branches of a tree, I will be victorious; but if there is no tree at the place where I stand, and consequently the hair falls on the ground, my teaching will not ignite. He also may have thrown a jar in the stream with the thought: if no water comes in it, so that it will float, then you will be a Buddha, otherwise you will not.

So, by how he *forced* the external world here to give him a sign, he forced also his inside, to speak clearly. I recall the suspense that captivated him, when he thought about the depth of his teaching, a teaching which is hard to establish, and on the other hand the stubbornness and the wickedness of humans. His frightened inside was freed by this suspense and now, in flaring rapture, the soul cheered:

>The world will most certainly be saved by you!

This fatalism has a certain uniqueness if one considers it from the standpoint of esoteric Buddhism. The karma of *Buddha*, the only real in the world, creates for itself a body, consciousness and external world; since it was, as only real in the world, omnipotent. Now it forces in these important moments the *secondary* and *dependent* (the consciousness, the mind) to activate the *primary* and *omnipotent* (the unconscious karma): and it has to obey, since it is subdued to the laws of its phenomenality.

This character trait extinguished however, as was already mentioned, when *Buddha* entered in public life. Now the Godlike was only fulfilled with the feeling of his omnipotence and from this feeling flew the most rock-solid unshakable *trust*, the greatest possible *perseverance*, the most boundless *pride* and the most unsurpassable *kindness* and *gentleness*.

--

* The rock-solid *trust.*

>Budha declared: it is not possible that someone who has the merit to obtain nirvána, can perish or be exposed to a danger that ending in death. (p. 502)

Buddha would have thrown himself defenselessly before a thousand warriors, he would have plunged in burning houses or mountain torrents, he would have swallowed the most deadly poison without hesitation, if he had deemed it to be necessary for the salvation of humanity: for he was inspired by the *faith* that he was immune to everything. And this faith did not budge, because it flew out of a consciousness that is possible only due the teaching of *Buddha*, namely, that the itself feeling and perceiving being is *God*. If *Buddha* is *God* and everything else illusion, sorcery of this God, what should cause him fear? This consciousness is the most steadfast soil, on which the individual can rest. And on this soil alone one attains the feeling of absolute freedom.

>*Budha* is free from all the doubts and fears to which others are subject. (p. 372)

>*Budha* is free from the restraint of the commands given by himself. (p. 292, 293)

Jean Paul gave this absolute freedom a beautiful expression with the words:

>Whoever still fears something in the universe, be it in hell, he is still a slave. (*Titan.*)

--

* *Buddha*'s *perseverance.*

His perseverance is merely the other side of his trust. He knew, that he was almighty, although his almighty being has hidden itself, which it was capable of exactly because of this omnipotence, in empirical laws and dependence of a phenomenal world. When he had recognized his goal, he delicately seized all methods, that led him towards it, and let them fall from his hand when they no longer served him. Step by step his inside scrapped all external matters, without slowing down this process, from one chain to the next one, until he floated above the world, in complete emancipation. First, he renounced power, fame and possessions: what a heavy chains for humans! Then he tore up all family ties: the ties that connected him with his old father, his loyal stepmother, his dear wife and his only child: what a firm ties! Now he stood totally free alone, but still in chains: sometimes the arising desire for the chains power, fame and possessions and for the four family ties: furthermore, doubt about his mission and the truth of his teaching, fear, and inclination towards a comfortable individual life. He destroyed all these chains one by one. The most laborious one was for him, the Prince, the pleasure in a life of enjoyment. He mortified his body with harsh self-torture and conquered the disgust for filthy begged food. How magnificent does the sublime one appear in the critical moment at brink of his beggar life, when he gathered courage, while he investigates with a grim glaze the content of his alms jar and his stomach turns around in pain!

Yes, yes, the individual life of enjoyment is a terrible chain. How many forego, facilitated by good circumstances, with ease the sexual pleasure and the conveniences of a marriage in general?; many people also favor a comfortable life over the dusty and bloody laurel wreath.

But how much care they have to take for their body! How much concern they have for the pleasant titillation of the palate and taste buds! They patiently let themselves get bumped on the markets and stepped on their feet, only in order to obtain that delicious good for their belly. And how their eyes sparkle when someone else wants to snatch away the goods, which they inspect with lascivious eyes, while the salivary glands enter in higher activity! Was Satan not right, when he said to the Lord:

>Skin for skin! A man will give all he has for his own life. But now stretch out your hand and strike his flesh and bones, and he will surely curse you to your face. (Job 2:4-5)

How quickly did *Job* regain balance in his soul, when he had lost his sons and daughter, and his herds! All of that was a mere appendage of his beloved I. At that moment he spoke indifferently: "The Lord has given, the Lord has taken; may the name of the Lord be praised." But when the Lord allowed Satan to touch the dear body of the righteous one, then the hate with God started, then the worm that had been stepped on turned around, then the proud individual started to revolt and the foaming mouth blasphemed with pleasure.

Buddha destroyed the chain and for that immediately he gained the great reward: carelessness about the needs of the body. How often the beautiful words of *Christ* get disparaged:

>Do not worry about your life, what you will eat or drink; or about your body, what you will wear. Is not life more than food, and the body more than clothes?

>Look at the birds of the air; they do not sow or reap or store away in barns, and yet your heavenly Father feeds them. Are you not much more valuable than they?

>Therefore do not worry about tomorrow, for tomorrow will worry about itself. Each day has enough trouble of its own.

>(Matthew 6:25-34)

If someone expresses his mocking doubt in the most kind manner, then he says: "Yes, in the time of the Savior and in the East these words still had sense, but today, in the current battle for existence, they are meaningless." And while he says this he consumes an oyster and wets it with sparkling wine. I however say: never a frugal man has starved nor will a frugal man starve, even if the social circumstances will become even more grim than they are today. The words of the Savior sprouted from a beneficial discipline and were the pure outflow from the fruit of such a flesh: from the sweetest carelessness.

--

* *Buddha*'s *pride*

Buddha's pride can be characterized with two words: It was God mirroring himself in a human consciousness. The mirror was miraculously pure and the reflection of enchanting beauty: spotless, clear, colorful, gorgeous.

The breast was too small; the blissful self-feeling would have scattered, if he had not relieved it. And he exulted and swirled the glowing words from his overflowing soul, and he breathed out the bewildering and intoxicating scent of the sweet flower into the wide world:

>I am the most exalted in the world! I am the chief of the world! I am the most excellent in the world! Hereafter there is to me no other birth. (p. 146)

>Priests! There is no one, whether in heaven, or on earth, who is superior to me. He who trusts in me relies upon him who is supreme ; and he who trusts in the supreme will receive the highest of all rewards. No one has been my teacher ; there is none like me ; there is no one who resembles me, whether among déwas or men. (p. 361)

In this overwhelming feeling of God and self he appeared under men and he wandered forty-five years amongst them: he did not abandon them. It was God walking on earth. How could this great being, this divine individuality just bow but a little bit? For who exactly? For the starry sky? It was his work. For lightning and thunder? He was the one who gave lightning and thunder the power to frighten and the master should be frightened for his own work? For the emperors and kings of India? Really, for these worms and craving sinners?

>He does not address the great ones of the earth by high titles, but speaks to them as other men. (p. 373)

This proud head sat on a proud neck, and the hand of the Magnificent held the lash of the absolute truth. It was a magic wand, that eliminated all barriers and placed the heart of men naked before *Buddha*.

--

* *Buddha*'s *kindness*

It is assumed that pride and humility cannot live in one breast, since they are mutually exclusive: they only have to be *boundless*, in that case they do not hinder but flow into each other.

There is a very nice story, wherein the defeat of a wild demon by *Buddha*'s humility and kindness gets portrayed. I will give a quick narration.

“The frightening demon Alawaka was informed by a servant that *Budha* had dared it to sit down on his throne. The demon became greatly enraged and asked : “Who is this *Budha* that has dared to enter my dwelling?” But before this question could be answered, two other demons, friends of Alawaka, came, passing through the sky, to give him the inquired information. “Know you not *Budha*, the lord of the world?” “Whoever he might be,” shouted Alawaka “I will drive him from my dwelling!” – They said with pity : “You are like a calf, just born, near a mighty bull ; like a tiny elephant, near the king of the tribe ; like an old jackal, near a strong lion ; what can you do ?”

The demon Alawaka rose from his seat full of rage and raged: “Now we shall see whose power is the greater.” He struck with his foot upon the mountain, which sent forth sparks like a red hot iron bar struck by the sledge hammer of a smith. “I am the demon Alawaka,” he called

out again and again "I am I !" Without delay the demon went to his dwelling, and endeavored to drive *Budha* away by a violent storm, but *Budha* calmly remained sitting on the throne. After this showers were poured down of glowing sand, weapons, charcoal and rocks; but *Budha* remained unmoved. He then assumed a fearful form, but *Budha* kept a straight face. He then threw his giant spear, but it was equally impotent. The demon was surprised, and looked to see what was the cause ;

>it was the *kindness* of *Budha*, and kindness must be overcome by kindness, and not by anger.

So he quietly asked the sage to retire from his dwelling ; and immediately *Budha* arose and departed from the place. Seeing this, the demon thought, "I have been contending with *Budha* a whole night without producing any effect, and now at a single word he retires." By this his heart was softened. But he again thought it would be better to see whether he went away from anger or from a spirit of disobedience, and called him back. *Budha* came. Thrice this was repeated, the sage returning when called, after he had been allowed so many times to depart, as he knew the intention of Alawaka. When a child cries its mother gives what it cries for in order to pacify it ; and as Budha knew that if the demon were angry he would not have a heart to hear truth, he yielded to his command, that he might become tranquillised by obedience and kindness.

Alawaka was conquered. He asked *Budha* to open the treasure of his wisdom ; and when he heard him speak, he adopted his teaching, and from that time he would go from city to city and from house to house, proclaiming everywhere the kindness of *Budha* and the truth of the teaching."

Is this story not charming?

> The hook of the driver subdues the elephant and other animals ; but Budha subdues by *kindness*. (p. 253)

--

* *Budha*'s *gentleness*

was boundless. He laid his soft arm on the breast of a rueful father-murderer, consoled him and accepted him in his order. He said for example to Anguli-mala, a murderer, whose hands were tainted by the blood of thousands:

>these things are the same as if they had been done in a former life. Take heart! You will find salvation already in this life. (p. 252)

A final delectable word:

> The strongest term of reproach that he ever addressed to any one was, *mogha purisa*, *vain man.* (p. 374)

Yes, Prince, you were magnificent, you were brilliant, you were noble like only one other person, of which history gives account.

>Whose glory is equal to yours? (Jesus Sirach 48:4)

On the sultry, dusty, thorny and tearful path, soaked by blood and suffering, of the poor, erring, fighting and struggling mankind, your refreshing image of a true wise hero shines

>like the morning star shining through the clouds, like the full moon, like the sun shining on the Temple of the Most High, like the rainbow gleaming in glory against the clouds, like roses in springtime, like lilies beside a stream. (Sirach 50:6-8)

If someone wants to exploit your splendid teaching, the joy of your sympathetic personality, such a person should with glowing iron be – but no! no! no! he should be – called *mogha purisa*!

The 12th (Final) Essay

Critique of the philosophy of Hartmann (0)

https://old.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/6o6wm5/critique_of_the_philosophy_of_hartmann_0/

>That is but mere *old dreck;*

>Get once brighter!

>Stop making always the same steck,

>Continue wider!

>(Goethe)

****Preface****

****[1.**

Introduction](https://old.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/6o6xqy/critique_of_the_philosophy_of_hartmann_1/)**

**[2.

Psychology](https://old.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/6o6xxc/critique_of_the_philosophy_of_hartmann_2/)**

3. Physics #Unavailable as of 6/25/2019

**4. Metaphysics

(Excerpts)](https://old.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/6omo0w/critique_of_the_philosophy_of_hartmann_excerpts/)**

Closing words

--

Preface

--

>He who has once assumed the philosopher's cloak, has sworn allegiance to truth

>*and from that moment every other consideration, no matter of what kind,*

>*becomes base treachery.*

>>(*Schopenhauer*)

If I take on the tiresome labor of criticizing the *Hartmann*ian pantheism fundamentally and exhaustively, the thought leads me, that I fight not only against the philosophical system of this sir, but also against diverse corrupting movements on the domain of modern natural sciences, which if they are not brought to a still stand, can darken and disorganize the mind of a complete generation. Against Mr. von *Hartmann* alone I would not have stood up. He and his system, to dismantle them, I can leave that to the sane human understanding, for *Goethe* rightly says:

>Spreading the unreasonable,

>Is endeavored to sides all;

>It takes but a small time,

>And how bad it is comes to light.

The pantheism of the ancient Brahmins was necessary for the development of the human race and no reasonable one may desire its absence in our history; for the same reason it was not hard for me to reconcile myself with the pantheism of the Middle Ages (Christian mystics, *Scotus Erigena*, *Giordano Bruno*, *Vanini*, *Spinoza*); the pantheism of Mr. von *Hartmann* however in our time stands like a children's shoe in the wardrobe of an adult, i.e.

in a *romantic* manner, which *David Strauß* calls in a very fitting manner the conflation of the old with the new:

>(…)

The spirited characterization above of a philosophical romantic completely suits Mr. von *Hartmann*: he gives “the critically empty philosophy the content, which he knows not to produce with thought, by fantastically adding religious material.” But at the same time he supported this material sometimes in a fine, sometimes in clumsy sophistic manner, on right and false results of the *Schopenhauer*ian philosophy and modern science, and has thereby brought forth a system, which I consider to be eminently harmful, as harmful as raging animals, so that I therefore have to handle it. I do not know Mr. von *Hartmann* nor does he know me; nor has he read anything from me, and therefore there can be no personal grudge between us; for while I am writing this, my main work: “The Philosophy of Salvation” is being pressed.

My position towards *Schopenhauer* and thereby determined position towards Mr. von *Hartmann* clearly follow from the following passage of a letter, which I sent together with my main work to my publisher:

>Two systems dominate the philosophical domain of our time: materialism and pantheism.

>Materialism is a totally untenable system. It starts with a real undistinguishable Matter, which no one has seen nor anyone will ever see. It throws, although no human has succeeded to make oxygen, hydrogen from chlorine and iodine etc., all *basic* chemical elements in one bowl and calls this porridge: Matter. This is its first, downrightly with violence invoked fundamental defect. But because this [subrepted](<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Subreption>) unity, as indistinguishable unity, can from itself cause no changes, materialism is compelled to transgress experience for the second time and to postulate natural forces (metaphysical essences), that inhere the quality-less Matter and should bring forth the qualities of the things. This is its second fundamental defect, and I say therefore in my work, that materialism is transcendent dogmatic dualism.

>Pantheism is equally a totally untenable system. After *Kant* had declared the thing-in-itself to be completely unknowable, and had destroyed all hypostases of the scholastic philosophy, all those, who have metaphysical needs, experienced a feeling a tormenting emptiness. Since it was no longer possible to believe in an *other*worldly being after *Kant*’s definitive and successful appearance, *Spinoza* came to high honor, and everyone clamped himself, in order to not lose all footing, at a basic unity *in* the world. All relevant successors of *Kant*: *Fichte*, *Schelling*, *Hegel* and *Schopenhauer*, crossed around this innerworldly mystic unity, which was given diverse names, such as: absolute I, absolute Subject-Object, Idea, Will. What leads to such a unity at all is the undeniable dynamic interconnection of the things and their unitary movement, which, as I merely want notice for now, can*not* be explained with empirical individuals *alone*.

>Of the systems of all names mentioned only the *Schopenhauer*ian one has survived, for two reasons: first because of the perfected clear style, secondly – as paradoxical as it may sound – because of its great contradiction with itself. That is, *Schopenhauer* incessantly fluctuates between the mystical, unknowable, unfathomable unity in the world and the with it irreconcilable real individuals. Hereby his work exercises the greatest possible charm on

transcendent (metaphysical) minds as well as on immanent (empirical) minds, because everyone reads in it what pleases him.

>From this follows that the *Schopenhauer*ian philosophy can be built further in two directions, and since a contradiction cannot continue to exist, that it *must* be built further: either to the side of the all-unity in the world, or to the side of the real individuality.

>Building it further to the first direction has been undertaken by Mr. von *Hartmann* in his "Philosophy of the Unconscious". The *Goethe*an expression:

>>There may be eclectic philosophers, but not an eclectic philosophy,

>completely fits its purpose on him and his work, i.e. Mr. von *Hartmann* is an eclectic philosopher and his philosophy can therefore have no content.

>This talented, but compilatory mind has taken from the teachings of Hegel and *Schopenhauer* as much as he needed, in order to construct from Schelling's absolute Identity of Will and Idea, the pantheism of the mind, a new system.

>I can obviously not address in this letter all the errors, the screaming contradictions, the palpable absurdities of the *Hartmann*ian philosophy. I will do this when my philosophy has been published; for although it will be unpleasant labor, I have to do it, for anyone who has sworn to the banner of the truth is not merely obliged to preach the truth, but also to fight the lie in whatever form it may appear. I only want to mention this, that in the *Hartmann*ian philosophy pantheism is taken to its extreme. The mystical transcendent unity, which will *always* leave the human heart cold, is praised with exuberant hymns, whereas the real individual is made into a dead puppet, a completely unimportant tool.

>Pantheism is a half-truth, for it contradicts the *fact* of inner and outer experience: the real individuality, because it is undeniable, that the unitary course of development of the universe can only be derived from a basic unity.

>Towards the second direction, the side of the real individual, *Schopenhauer*'s philosophy has only been built further in completely shallow and untenable manners. A few have tried to do so, but not one of them with the slightest success: they only accomplished flat systems. Meanwhile, even when they have defended with mind and cleverness the indestructible right of the individual, they will not have accomplished anything fruitful, because every philosophy which is built on the individual *alone* can only be a *half*-truth like pantheism, for, as I already mentioned, the world cannot be explained with the individual alone. The *complete* truth can only lie in the *reconciliation* of the individual with the unity. I have achieved this reconciliation in my work and indeed, according to my firm conviction, for all times.

>All philosophers until now have come unstuck because they did not manage to obtain a *purely* immanent domain and no *purely* transcendent domain. Both domains were constantly mixed and thereby the world (the immanent domain) confusing, unclear, mysterious.

>I have first of all carefully researched the human cognition and have thereby found, that the important section between the ideal and real has been made by neither *Kant* nor

Schopenhauer. Both pulled the *whole world* to the *ideal* side and let on the real side only stay an unknowable *x*. (Thing-in-itself; unextended, eternal will.)

>Then I showed, that space and time are indeed *ideal*, but not *aprioric*, but compositions a posteriori of reason based on the aprioric *point-space* and the aprioric *present*; that therefore individuality and development are *real, i.e. independent* from a knowing subject. *Matter* alone separates the ideal from the real, for the ground of appearance is, as I have shown, *only* force.

>Supported by this and the sum of other results in the Analytic of the Cognition, I furthermore showed, that with *causality* we can*not* reach the past of the things, which before me all philosophers have tried to do, and only with help of *time*. By this I found a transcendent domain, i.e. a basic unity: pre-worldly and lost. The basic unity *fell apart* in a world of plurality, thus *died*, when this one was *born*.

>Hereby I gained two domains, which *follow* each other, one always *excludes* the other, and therefore, because they do not *co-exist*, cannot reciprocally confuse and darken each other. I have not subverted the preworldly transcendent domain, but *proven* with logical rigor, that before the world a for us unknowable unity existed.

>It was only now that I could establish philosophy on the real individual *alone*; because now the individual is indeed the only real in the world, but the *origin* from a basic unity embraces the sum of individuals with an untearable bond; or with other words: the dynamic interconnection and the unitary movement of the universe are established without basic unity in or above the world *although* there are only individuals in the world.

>How fruitful this separation of immanent and transcendent domain turns out to be, you will see in the work itself: the greatest philosophical problems, of which I mention only the co-existence of freedom and necessity, the true essence of destiny and the autonomy of the individual, solve themselves with ease and completely unforced.

>You will also find, that the *Philosophy of Salvation* is nothing else but the affirmation of the pure and veritable Christianity: the *Religion of Salvation*. It establishes its indestructible core on *knowledge*, and I say therefore in my work that pure knowledge is not the *opposite* but the *metamorphosis* of faith.

My position towards *Schopenhauer* is thus that I abide to the individual will to live, which he had found in himself, but made in opposition to all laws of logic into an All-Unity in the world; and my position towards Mr. von *Hartmann* is that I will combat the building further of this All-One Will with all intellectual power I possess.

My main charge will focus itself at the change which Mr. von *Hartmann* made in the genius system of *Schopenhauer* whereby its groundwork is destroyed, *Schopenhauer* says very rightly:

>The fundamental truth of my doctrine, which places that doctrine in opposition with all others that have ever existed, is the *complete separation of the will from intellect*, which all philosophers before me had looked upon as inseparable; or rather, I ought to say that they had regarded the will as conditioned by, nay, mostly even as a mere function of the intellect. (On the Will in Nature, Physiology)

Mr. von *Hartmann* now has nothing better to do than destroying this magnificent, important distinction: that which has for the true philosophy been a rock on its path, and making the will again to a *psychical* principle. Why? Because Mr. von *Hartmann* is a romantic philosopher.

The only thing that is captivating in the philosophy of Mr. von *Hartmann* is the *unconscious*. But has he fathomed it more deeply than *Schopenhauer*? In no way. *Schopenhauer* has found the unconscious *everywhere*, where it can be found at all: in the human mind, in human urges, in the instinct of animals, in plants, in the inorganic kingdom, partially merely touched upon, partially painted and illuminated in an unsurpassable manner. Mr. von *Hartmann* seized the *Schopenhauer*ian thoughts and dressed them in new clothes: they are however products like those of a jobbing tailor. One could also say: That, which *Schopenhauer* gives in concentrated solution is watered down by Mr. von *Hartmann*. The reasonable one, who desires to get to know the unconscious, may leave the insipid lemonade of Mr. von *Hartmann* without worries and refresh himself with the exquisite, sweet droplets of the great mind *Schopenhauer*. Hereby he gains time and has an incomparably more intensive pleasure.

User ShitpostMafia:

Wow, massive thanks for the translation! I found his book in spanish but I'm really not very good at it. Mainlander really is underrated.

Do you plan on making a PDF with all of these translations to make a sort of accessible PDF for Die Philosophie Der Erlösung?

The translations are not of such a quality yet that I would dare to do that, because there are always small errors which I overlook and more fundamental ones which I discover after a while: now I can immediately edit them, with a pdf I couldn't.

I have a question, if you don't mind this effort. I would be interested to know how one short sentence is translated in your Spanish edition: the one of *Analytic of the Cognition*, § 4, the sentence after "1".

I'm happy to hear of someone who also appreciates this great philosopher so much!

I'm the one happy to hear someone could translate this philosopher into english. I'm afraid I can't find that essay in my edition though, both on the spanish and the german one. If you can you tell me in what chapter of Die Philosophie Der Erlösung, i'd be more than happy to translate it.

Of Volume 1, [Chapter 1, section 4](<https://archive.org/stream/PhilippMainInderSmtlicheWerke/Philipp%20MainI%20C3%A4nder%20-%20S%20C3%A4mtliche%20Werke#page/n7/mode/2up>), it's almost immediately after the preface.

The sentence of which I'd like to know how they translated in Spanish is:

>1) die anschauliche Vorstellung oder kurz die Anschauung;

La representación gráfica o, brevemente, la percepción visual.

1. Introduction

https://old.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/6o6xqy/critique_of_the_philosophy_of_hartmann_1/

You begin, Mr. von Hartmann, your work: "The Philosophy of the Unconscious" (Berlin 1871, 3th edition) with the words of *Kant*:

>Having representations *and not being conscious of them*, there seems to lie a contradiction in that; for how could we know, that we have them, if we are not conscious of them? – Nevertheless we can become mediately conscious of it, that we have a representation, although we are not immediately conscious of it.

Kant expresses here a truth that is undeniable. However, it is only a truth *in relation* with the complete § 5 of Anthropology. What kind of unconscious representations is *Kant* thinking of?

>When I am conscious of seeing a human, although I am not conscious of seeing his eyes, nose, mouth etc., then I am actually only *concluding*, that this thing is a human; for if I would therefore want to assert, because I am not conscious of it, that I do not perceive this part of the head (and therefore also the other parts of this human), then I could also not say, that I see a human, for he (the human or his head) is composed of such partial-representations.

Kant calls such representations unclear, dark representations and says,

>that the amount of *dark* representations in humans (and therefore also in animals) is uncountable, the *clear* ones on the other hand only infinitely little points of our sense perception and sensation that lie openly in the consciousness.

Was it, Mr. von *Hartmann*, philosophical *honesty* to only superficially touch upon this statement of Kant?

What is an “*unconscious representation*” at all? In the artificial language of philosophers these words express a *contradictio in adjecto* ; but normal people would say: an unconscious representation is the same as what *gold of silver* is. With one word: we stand before an expression which could *perhaps* be the *finishing stone* of a pyramid, but may never be its *groundwork*. But you seem to be very spirited. Supported by this sentence of Kant ripped out of its context you say already on the fourth page of your book:

>I designate the united unconscious will and the *unconscious representation* the expression: “the Unconscious.”

Was this philosophical honesty, Mr. von Hartmann? Please do not misunderstand me. I strictly distinguish philosophical honesty from civic honesty. I am firmly convinced that you are not capable of disadvantaging your fellow men for one mark, or a million mark. I hold you to be good and just in civic matters: already because you are a pessimist, i.e. a disciple of *Zoroaster*, the ancient *Brahmins*, *Buddha*, *Christ*, *Salomon*, *Schopenhauer*, whose ethics rely on pessimism; but in philosophical matters a bandage lies before your eyes and

you cannot distinguish between what is honest from what is dishonest. In your defense I want to assume that an “unconscious will” (not an “unconscious representation”, which I unconditionally have to reject) has produced your manner of action, although it has been hard for me to assume this, for *Christ* says very rightly:

>If I had not come and spoken to you, you wouldn't be guilty of sin; but now, you have no excuse for your sin. (John 15:22.)

But what *Christ* was for the Jews, *Kant* and *Schopenhauer* were for you, Mr. von Hartmann. You know the *Critique of Pure Reason* and have also certainly read Schopenhauer's utterance multiple times that it is *dishonest*, to *begin* a philosophical system *without* a research of the cognition. You have been *warned* by praiseworthy mouths; two great men have preceded you and they shouted to you: “If you begin your work with the world taken to be *real*, then you are a dishonest philosopher, whom we can and will *not* accept in our honest community.”

You can therefore have no excuse for your sin.

Nevertheless I am ready, as I said, to assume that you have sinned “unconsciously”. –

You know that *Herbart*'s Psychology (his best work) is in essence the execution of the by you cited remark of *Kant*. *Herbart* separated as it were the human mind in a small illuminated cabinet in a great dark vestibule. The illuminated cabinet is the consciousness, the dark vestibule the unconscious. Our representations, thoughts etc. continuously stream from the cabinet into the vestibule and from the vestibule to the cabinet. Tumult and struggle always reign on the *doorstep* of consciousness (*Herbart* has beautifully painted this struggle). Whenever a representation steps over the doorstep and flies into the cabinet, it becomes a conscious representation, and in the other case, a dark invisible representation.

I may stop here with this reference to *Herbart*. However, I will not do this because due to *Schopenhauer* the unconscious will has become a much deeper problem. In the current situation of critical philosophy it is no longer about representations that are generated in the *consciousness* and then absorbed in the flood of the mind, where they are sometimes here or there, but mainly about such products of the intellectual activity that suddenly stand in the light of consciousness without knowing how they emerged: they are for the consciousness completely new representations, thoughts, feelings.

I will therefore not make a small psychological excursion with you, and continue with the *middle* of your book, where you have dealt with the cognition, *after* you have already put your readers under narcosis with an abundance of scientific results. That too, Mr. von Hartmann, was not honest; but here too, do not reproach me, that I have to accuse you, on the fourth page of your book, already of a *third* “unconscious” dishonesty.

According to the *Schopenhauer*ian teaching, man is a composition of a metaphysical *unconscious* will with a secondary *conscious* intellect. I have already emphasized that the separation of the mind, resp. the consciousness of the will from the primary, the primordial principle, has been an immortal deed of *Schopenhauer*, which you, Mr. von Hartmann can certainly not banish from the world with your sophisms and confusions. The will is since *Schopenhauer* no longer a physical principle*, and for every reasonable one the issue,

whether the will is a function of the mind or not, is solved for all times. You have nevertheless had the courage to assert:

>Will and representation are the sole *psychical* basic functions.

but you have also the sad honor, to stand at the same level as those who have misunderstood *Copernicus* and still confidently believe that the sun turns around the earth. Like how the critical philosophy has made for once and for all the world into appearance, which is not *identical* with the ground of appearance, in the same way the by *Schopenhauer* founded true thing-in-itself-philosophy has made the *will* the *sole* principle in the world, and indeed a *non*-physical principle. You and a whole legion of similar will never succeed in snatching this invaluable achievement on the domain of thing-in-itself of us, true disciples of the great master.

The human brain is an organ of this will, which is purely objectified in *blood alone*, in this "very *special liquid*".

The blood galvanizes the brain and this galvanization brings forth consciousness. Consciousness is merely an appearance, that accompanies the functions of the *brain*: representing, thinking and feeling, and indeed on a single moment only one action of it occurs in the *center* of the consciousness. Consciousness is as little separable from *these* activities of the brain as scent from an aromatic flower, heat from fire, and *Locke* was *absolutely* right, when he said:

>Having ideas [representations], and perception, being the same thing.

>If they say the man thinks always, but is not always conscious of it, they may as well say his body is extended without having parts. For it is altogether as intelligible to say that a body is extended without parts, as that anything thinks without being conscious of it, or perceiving that it does so. They who talk thus may, with as much reason, if it be necessary to their hypothesis, say that a man is always hungry, but that he does not always feel it ;

>(An Essay Concerning Human Understanding, II. Chapter I. §. 9 & 19)

which are completely right assertions of the great thinker which you criticize in the most shallow manner.

So how do *you*, Mr. von Hartmann, let consciousness arise?

In order to answer this question I have to move a few fundamentals of your system in the spotlights.

As I have shown, you initially distinguish:

>1) an unconscious will;

>2) an unconscious representation.

Naturally, they are joined by

>3) a conscious will (will-power);

>4) a conscious representation.

These principles are joined by

>5) the human body, i.e. *matter*.

You also dissolve matter in unconscious will and unconscious representation; meanwhile, matter emerges independently from the psyche.

It is not for you, Mr. von Hartmann, that *Kant* has lived, it is not for that that *Schopenhauer* has studied. You bold romantic want to bring us back to the infertile ground of the pre-Kantian rational psychology. We thank you for your “stagnant cabbage”. (David Strauß.)

After having accomplished in an unbelievable blindness this masterwork, making matter again the *opposite* of mind, thinking substance, psyche, you make consciousness arise in humans in the following spirited manner:

>We adhere to “will and representation” as that which is common to unconscious and conscious representation, and posit the form of the Unconscious as the original, but that of consciousness *as a product of the unconscious mind and the material action on the same.* (402)

>We had previously found that consciousness must be a predicate which the will imparts to the representation ; we can now also assign the content of this predicate : *it is the stupefaction of the will at the existence of the representation not willed and yet sensibly felt by it.* (404)

>Then suddenly the organized matter disturbs this peace with itself and grants the astonished individual spirit a representation, which falls upon it as from the skies, for he finds no will in himself for this representation: for the first time the “content of the perception is given from outside”. The great revolution has come to pass, the first (??) step to the world’s redemption has been made, the representation has been torn (!!) from the will, to confront it in future as an independent power (!!), in order to subject it (!!) whose slave he was until now. *This amazement of the will at the rebellion against its previously acknowledged sway, this sensation which the interloping representation produces in the unconscious, this is Consciousness.* (405)

It has been assured to me from reliable sources, that you, just like *Schiller* with his “The Robbers”, consider your “Philosophy of the Unconscious” to be a great sin of your youth. You would perhaps give you right hand, no, both hands for it, if your work had not yet appeared. Obviously, if you would still have to write your work, you would use a lot of what can be found in your book: these three passages, however, would certainly *not* be part of it.

A very great merit of *Schopenhauer* is that he made the body identical with the will. The body is only the will gone through the subjective forms of perception. *Schopenhauer* nevertheless did not prove this in a sufficient manner, because he did not made matter completely *ideal* (lying in the human head only). His explanation: the body is appearance of the will, is therefore a veritably true judgement without stating grounds. I have established the

pure ideality of matter in my main work, and have thereby nullified the dichotomy between thinking and extended substance, which had tormented philosophy before *Kant* so much.

Although I have followed the correct path of *Kant* and *Schopenhauer* thus far, I nevertheless absolutely have to reject the other path of *Schopenhauer*, where he made the *intellect* the *opposite* of *will*.

I have proven that the intellect can never come in an antagonistic relation towards the *individual* will, which is lord and master and the sole principle of the world. The intellect is the function of an out of the will forward coming organ. Just like how the stomach cannot become *hostile* towards the will, the brain cannot rebel against the will. Whether the will struggles with the intellect, or the intellect which reproaches the will etc., it is always the *will* that struggles *with itself*, reproaches *itself*.

On the other hand you continue forward on the false path of *Schopenhauer*, because you, as romantic, have a **sympathie de cœur** (sympathy of the heart) with everything metaphysical, hyperphysical, transcendent, extrasensory and nonsensical, so also with the errors of *Schopenhauer*, whereas only a **sympathie d'épiderme** (sympathy of the epidermis) exists between you with everything immanent, rational, natural, so the achievements of the *Schopenhauer*ian philosophy. On this false course you came to the abyss, have fallen into it, and have broken your spine and talent. You have become an intellectual invalid. Do not think, that I experience malicious joy. This devilish feeling is unknown to me at all. I say this much more with melancholy; for nature has put a good pound in your cradle, with which you could have achieved great things. You have however followed the cockiness of the youth.

And now I will specially explain for you, how consciousness arises and will show you, what is to be understood under unconscious representation, and indeed in a manner, which a child can understand.

The human *individual will to live* (so not the [conscious] will-power), the *demon*, or expressed in objectified manner: the *blood*, is *unconscious*. The *mind*, the psyche, or expressed in objectified manner: the *brain*, is *conscious*. The brain is, like the stomach, the genitals, the hands, the feet etc. *organ* of this unconscious demon. Just like how the gastric juice has a completely determined nature, like how the grabbing of an object with the hand has a completely determined manner, a way and manner which are inseparable as hardness is from granite, this intimately consciousness is connected with the activities of the brain, which we call thinking, feeling, representing.

Consciousness arises at the same time as thinking, representing, feeling, due to the contact of blood with the brain, just like how digesting arises through the secretion of the gastric juices due contact of the blood with the stomach.

The brain is galvanized by the blood and simultaneously with this contact consciousness is given.

Like how sparks arise, if one hits steel on flint, consciousness arises when the demon galvanizes the mind. And if the blood falls more or less backwards, then the consciousness becomes fainter, weaker.

Not against an intruder, as you say, against *matter*, does the unconscious stand up, the demon *wants* to know, think, represent, feel, and therefore it has “sent his only-begotten Son”, the mind, and therefore it thinks, represents, feels in his organ. Of an antagonism, a struggle, a liberation of the intellect from the will, of the intellect as an independent power can only be spoken in a madhouse, not among reasonable people.

The function of the brain is not unitary but manifold. The mind thinks, perceives, feels, and the brain does as such indeed not rest: also in sleep, blackouts and anesthesia it is active. *But the center of consciousness is always one*, and man can only be only *clearly* conscious of that, which stands in the light of this one center.

I still want to specify this relation more precisely.

Consciousness simply arises due to contact of the blood with the brain. We may however not represent it to ourselves as the image of a point, but must think of it as having extension, and it is indeed best comparable to the retina. Like how the retina, as extended organ, sees a the whole figure of a before me standing tree, but nevertheless sees only that *part* of the tree *clearly*, which falls in its *center*, I can *simultaneously* represent, think and feel, but can exercise only *one* of these functions *clearly* in a given moment. In the case: you look at the street, prick at the same time a needle in your hand, and simultaneously think of a friend. The people, buildings, horses etc. which you *see*, the pain you *feel*, what you *think* about, these are products of three completely different functions of the brain and you have them in your consciousness *simultaneously*. But do you have *all* these products in *clear* consciousness? Certainly not. If you make an attempt to do so, you will find that your mind always drives these products as it were through the center of your consciousness and is only clearly conscious of that what stands at this moment in the bright center.

This relation presents itself clearly, when a thought or a feeling or a representation is very powerful: then a feeling *continues* to *stand* in this point, and we cannot clearly think nor clearly represent.

This center of the consciousness is now the *I*, which is in animals the *felt* I, in humans the *thought* I or *self-consciousness*. Its form is the present, an *aprioric* form. The self-consciousness stands and falls with *thinking*, the self-feeling of animals with *feeling* and the I is always necessarily contained in these functions even though sometimes shrouded. Therefore feeling and thinking are *immediately* given with consciousness, whereas this is not the case with representing. The representation in itself is an unconscious work of the mind and we become only *mediately* conscious of it, namely when we connect it with the I. But since we do in this connection actually what we call *representing*, these functions of the mind stand nevertheless on the same height.

The *unconscious* function of our mind is fundamentally different from clearly representing and representing unclearly etc.

For example, when we are sunk in the deepest aesthetic contemplation, then in this moment, *only* the perceived image, the statue, the landscape, the point of consciousness. The *other* activities of the mind, which we call in the light of consciousness thinking and feeling, are meanwhile not in rest, but we may not call them: *unconscious feeling and thinking*, because thinking, feeling and representing are inseparably connected with the consciousness, like heat with fire. What these functions are *in themselves*, independently from consciousness,* that I

leave undiscussed for now. I only note that this is not about a word game, not about the separation of identical concepts. The problem is exactly the same as the difference between object and thing-in-itself, appearance and ground of appearance: both problems cover each other. For now I merely note that there is only a *conscious* thinking, feeling and representing, but that the mind also functions *without* consciousness.

When we wake up, or if the contemplation stops due to a disturbance, then suddenly thoughts which we did not have at that moment can suddenly fill the point of consciousness, i.e. we suddenly become conscious of the product of an unconscious function of the brain, since our thinking power was not partying at that moment, but their products could not be pushed to the point of consciousness, *where they would become thoughts*, because the point was occupied by a more powerful representation.

Even *Schopenhauer* mixed the unconscious functions of the brain with the conscious functions (thinking, feeling, representing) and the unconscious products with the conscious products (thoughts, feelings, representations), which must most strictly be separated, if we do not want hopeless confusion, as his whole philosophy aptly proves. *Schopenhauer* says:

>Let us compare our consciousness to a sheet of water of some depth. Then the distinctly conscious thoughts are merely the surface ; while, on the other hand, the indistinct thoughts, the feelings, the after sensation of perceptions and of experience generally, mingled with the special disposition of our own will, which is the kernel of our being, is the mass of the water. The whole process of our thought and purpose seldom lies on the surface, that is, consists in a combination of distinctly thought judgments ; although we strive against this in order that we may be able to explain our thought to ourselves and others. But ordinarily it is in the obscure depths of the mind that the rumination of the materials received from without takes place, through which they are worked up into thoughts (?) ; and it goes on almost as unconsciously as the conversion of nourishment into the humours and substance of the body. (*WWR* V2, On the Association of Thoughts)

During sleep, sleep, blackouts, intoxication, anesthesia, ecstasy, consciousness is always present, for blood can leave the brain only with the death of the individual. The blood galvanizes the brain as long as the human lives in general, but the way and manner of galvanizing are differences and consciousness has therefore *grades*.

In all mentioned states of man the sensory activity is more or less completely hamstrung. The outer world does therefore not occupy the point of consciousness, and now the self-consciousness mirrors the inner state with exceeding clarity (this is the case with anesthesia) or it is filled with wandering dream-images. Human always dreams during sleep, because no organ of the body can ever be absolutely inactive (the outer motion, changing places, is a total side-matter; for example when the arms are motionless during sleep; then they are not motionless *internally*). Consciousness can *never* dissolve during life, only in death. But when we are *awake* we are only seldomly conscious of the activity of the brain in *numbed* states. That we also have consciousness in numbed states follows already from the fact that we can remember ourselves of many dreams. Can we remember a moment in us, where we were during its course not conscious of something?

You see, Mr. von Hartmann, the *demon* is and remains always lord and master, a rebellion of the organs cannot take place. During cramps or diseases the demon merely wants to

maintain power in his own house against *strange* disturbances: in *his* state there are only absolutely obedient slaves in which the mere thought or insurgency is a pure impossibility.

In humans there are thus:

1. unconscious functions of the brain, which one may not call *unconscious* thinking, *unconscious* feeling, *unconscious* representing;
2. unconscious products of these activities, which one may not call *unconscious* thoughts, *unconscious* feelings, *unconscious* representations,
3. conscious functions of the brain, called simply: representing, feeling, thinking;
4. conscious products of these conscious functions, called simply: representations, feelings, thoughts.

Furthermore: the conscious functions and their products stand and fall with the *brain*, because it is with them that consciously is inseparably tied. But also the *unconscious* activities of the mind and its products stand and fall with the *brain*. If one assumes, as you have recklessly and thoughtlessly done, that the ganglia, the plants, yes, even the inorganic bodies have representations, then one may just as well teach: the ganglia, the hands, the brain, the eyes etc. digest. Only the brain showed you the activity of representing. *You generalize however the activity of a single organ. i.e. you detached representing from the brain* and passed it on not only to *all* organs of the body, but also onto everything in nature, *also onto trees and bricks.* Such a treatment certainly demands no characterization: it judges itself.

Self-consciousness – I repeat it – is the spark of the demon with the mind, the blood with the brain, the heart with the head, as *Buddha* already rightly taught: He says:

>*The heart is the seat of thought.* The heart may be said to feel the thought, to bear or support it, and to throw it out and cast it off. It is the cause of mano-winyána, or *mind-consciousness*. (Manual of Buddhism, [page 402](<https://archive.org/stream/manualofbuddhism00hard#page/402/mode/2up>))

So already 2500 years ago it was taught, what you experience now through me. But *Buddha* was of course *Buddha* and you are – Mr. von Hartmann.

You have not recognized the unconscious better than the master, the immortal genius *Schopenhauer*, who was the first to take a *scientific* and earnest close look at the unconscious, but have made it into something, upon which the Truth will not stamp her seal. You have watered down everything what *Schopenhauer* has said about it, and have dumped the dull foam of your thoughtlessness on it. Before I will closely investigate this dull foam, I want to show in what manner I have established the unconscious, which *Schopenhauer* bequeathed his successors, further.

I have proven, that not consciousness, but motion alone, is *essential* to the *individual* will, the *single* principle in the world. *This is its sole true predicate.* The first blind unconscious motion, which the individual had, happened with the break-up of an unfathomable, pre-worldly basic unity. In its motion *urge* to goal and *goal* lied connected inseparably. There can be no talk of a *representation of the goal* in the first individuals. Its *first impulse* was everything. This impulse lives forth today (albeit modified by everything, which has flown into individuals since the beginning of the world until this moment) in the *unconscious demon* of

every human. Therefore the infallibility, the certainty of the *pure* demon, resp. the *pure* instinct in animal, the plant urges and the urge towards an ideal center of towards all sides in the inorganic kingdom. Everything in the consciousness of man works *together* with this infallible blind urge. The demon has merely created itself a brain, a thinking, feeling or perceiving organ, has born it from himself, because he wanted a faster, better movement to the goal, which he wanted *without a representation* lying in him. The human movement is always and always, from the standpoint of single moments and the whole life course, a *resulting* one and always the *best* one for the individual as well as for the universe, even if a human must wander because of his deeds in prison. There is, Mr. von Hartmann – please note this – no antagonism but always only *cooperation*, even if a deed is preceded by a conflict of *motives* in the mind.

In the Metaphysics I eventually revealed this demon as *will to death*. *Will to death* is in the light of consciousness *the being of the unconscious* and indeed of the *individual* unconscious, not your dreamed, imaginary *All-Unitary unconscious*. The unconscious individual demon and the conscious mind *strive* after absolute death, they cooperate in this striving, support and help each other, and will also reach in every human, quickly or slowly, their *goal*. I furthermore showed, why man is on the surface will to live, by showing that the will wants life as *method* to die (continuous weakening of the force).

This is the true unconscious, the veritable harmony in the universe, despite the noise of battle, the complaining and whimpering, despite the conflicts in one and the same breast, despite the hungriness and thirst for life, from which the struggle for existence arises. In the world there are *only individuals*. Their *origin* from a *basic unity* encompasses them however like a bond (dynamic interconnection of the things). This unity *wanted* non-existence and this is why everything *in* the world and the individual colludes towards non-existence. In the world antagonism reigns with the *general* goal because it can only be reached through struggle, weakening of force and attrition; *in* the individual reigns however no antagonism, but harmonic cooperation.

2. Psychology

https://old.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/6o6xxc/critique_of_the_philosophy_of_hartman_n_2/

Two of your heroic feats on psychological domain have I already mentioned: you made will a physical principle again and explained consciousness as

>the amazement of the will at the rebellion against its previously acknowledged sway, the sensation which the interloping representation produces in the unconscious.

You add another success to this immortal explanation with the remark that:

>Consciousness as such is, consequently, according to its own notion, free from conscious reference to the *subject*, in that in and for itself it refers only to the *object* and only becomes *self-consciousness* by the representation of the subject becoming *accidentally* object to it.

I reckon, Mr. von Hartmann, that this passage too belongs to those you deeply, deeply regret. It could not be otherwise. If *I* would have unconsciously written this passage, like by the way your whole philosophy, I would rush to seas and shame myself to the most desolated tropes of Brazil.

Have you not thought, for a brief moment, about a human, whose senses are all dead, who can therefore no longer have fresh representations, but who would nevertheless mirror his inner and bodily state in his self-consciousness? He would feel pleasure and displeasure (states of the demon), pain and lust (states of the organs) and be completely conscious of it. Is the inside of man an *object* for you? In the self-consciousness subject and object indeed collude, and we grasp ourselves *immediately* as *feeling*: only in the most abstract thought this feeling becomes an *object* for us.

Mr. von Hartmann! I *hope*, that I can end this Critique with philosophical rest. I *hope* so. I cannot guarantee this, so I ask you here to forgive me, if sometimes I lose all patience, no, become angered.

So how do you initially let the outer world arise in a knowing subject?

In your essay “The thing in itself”, on whose cover, after having read it, I wrote the Goethean expression:

>“Das Knabenvolk ist Herr der Bahn”

>(The common man is Lord of the course)

You come to a transcendent *causality* which should be identical with the aprioric *category* of causality (page 77). You say:

>The consciousness discursively thinks in its *subjective* category the cause *after* it was intuitively thought *before* in the unconscious *ideal-real causal process.*

After this identification you maintain with other words: without *subject* the things of this world would nevertheless stand in a real *causal* nexus.

Here too, Mr. von Hartmann – as you will come to see, in case you did not already know it “consciously” or “unconsciously” – here, at your *first* step in philosophy, you talk as if *Kant* and *Schopenhauer* have never been on this planet, or better: You believe that you are able to blow down with one breath from your “divine” mouth the on rocks built thought-systems of our philosophical heroes, as if they are cart houses. You will not succeed in doing so.

The aprioric causal law, i.e. the transition of the change in the *sense organ* to its cause, is, as *Schopenhauer* has found with the highest human prudence, the exclusive function of the Understanding.

As a groundbreaking genius he was allowed, in astonishment about his splendid deed, to lose the prudence again. The prudence was allowed to go under in the euphoria about an authentic, great achievement, for *Schopenhauer* was a human, no God. So he kept standing

here; yes, he declared: the cause of the change in the sense organ is, like the change itself, subjective. (As we know later on he revoked this intentional (?) mix-up of activity and cause.)

Kant established causality, i.e. the relation between cause and effect, through which *all* objects, *all* appearances stand always in pairs to each other – (please, distinguish between this causality and the Schopenhauerian causal law) – as aprioric function or form of thought, and added that the empirical affinity of the things is the mere *consequence* of the ideal affinity or with other words: If we take away the ideal causal nexus, then the things stand in *no affinity at all* to each other.

So both great thinkers have in common:

1. that *without* subject we cannot speak about *causality*, that without subject no *causal* nexus exists, that *cause* and *effect* are words that stand and fall with the *subject*;
2. that causality can*not* lead us to the thing-in-itself.

As you know, *Kant* has nevertheless subrepted with ideal causality the thing-in-itself; as you know as well, we must condemn his action, and therefore we are left with what I said under 2.

Regarding the sentence of 1, *no one* will ever succeed in overturning it; it is absolutely certain, that the words *cause* and *effect* stand and fall with the *subject*. A *causal* nexus exists *only* for a knowing subject: independently from a subject no change in a thing-in-itself is the effect of a cause.

Meanwhile I have shown that even the *Schopenhauer*ian causal law gives the indication of a from the subject independent *force*, of an activity of things-in-themselves, which is on the *real*, i.e. from subject independent domain is only force or activity, *not cause*.

It will be clear to you, that this is not about a poor game of words or about one and the same issue with two different words, but about a completely necessary separation of two fundamentally different concepts in philosophy, which, if they are mixed up, will obstruct the way to the truth forever.

On the *real* domain there is initially a relation between two things-in-themselves, i.e. the force of one of them brings forth a change in the other; furthermore all things in the world stand in a real affinity. The first relation is *not* the relation of cause to effect and the latter is *not a causal nexus*. The real affinity is the dynamic interconnection of the world, which would be present too *without* a perceiving subject, and the real relation in which two things-in-themselves stand, is the *real consequence*, which would be equally present if no perceiving subject would be present. Only when a perceiving subject is added to both interconnections, the real consequence is brought into an *ideal* relation of *cause to effect* [by the subject] and *all* appearances in a *causal nexus*, or better: it *recognizes* with support of *ideal* causality a *real* consequence and with support of *ideal* community (reciprocity) the *real* dynamic interconnection of the things.

There is thus, Mr von Hartmann, certainly no transcendent causality, but only an *ideal* one, in the head of the subject.

The ideal causal nexus is not juxtaposed on the real domain by a “*real causal process*”, as you dare to say despite *Kant* and *Schopenhauer*, but an entangled activity of things-in-themselves, which know with support of the purely *ideal* causality and purely *ideal* community.

I have furthermore shown in my psychology (Analytic of the Cognition), that only *Schopenhauer*’s causal law is *aprioric*. The *Kant*ian categories of relation: causality and reciprocity, are compositions a posteriori of the reason based on this aprioric law. They are therefore no primordial concepts, concepts a priori, categories, as *Kant* taught, but they are, as he very correctly determined for all times, *purely subjective, purely ideal*, exist *only* in our head, are prerequisites for the possibility of experience in general and have only sense and meaning on their application on experience. In and for themselves, without outside material, they are dead and really nothing.

You however come with staunch forehead in the world and say gruffly: “*Kant* was a foolish dreamer. Also without a perceiving subject there are cause and effect in the world.” You have furthermore the audacity to say “*reciprocity does not exist*.” And why do you say this? Because *Schopenhauer* has said so based on a misunderstanding (as I assume to his honor). I confidently assert that the relation which *Kant* wanted to designate with the category is reciprocity or community, so the third Analogy of Experience, the most valuable pearl of his Transcendental Analytic. You declare community to be

>“an in itself defective conception.” (T.i.i., 81)

You intellectual giant, for whom even the great man of Königsberg should bow!

From the *Kant*ian categories you let, extremely merciful and patronizing, only the following ones exist:

Quantity | *Quality* | *Relation* | *Modality*

---| --- | ---| ---

Unity | Reality | Substance | Existence

Plurality | Causality | Necessity

i.e. you continue philosophizing, as if *Schopenhauer*, whose errors you nevertheless have appropriated yourself with so much dexterity, has never lived.

How someone call still earnestly talk about concepts a priori, after *Schopenhauer*’s flawed, but still brilliant, magnificent Critique of the *Kant*ian philosophy, is really beyond me. It is truly sad to see, how slowly the Truth comes forward, whereas the lie gets free play.

So you let the above mentioned forms of thinking exist and coldly declare

>that these are as much forms of *existence* for being in itself, as forms of *thinking* for thoughts. (T.i.i., 89)

or with other words: you mix up again the forms of thing-in-itself with the subjective forms, just like with causality, i.e. you

>pour everything, which rare minds like *Locke* and *Kant* separated with an incredible effort of sharpness and reflection, in the porridge of an absolute Identity. (Schopenhauer, Parerga I)

No, Mr. von Hartmann! The Truth still has loyal Knight Templars who are ready, when it is necessary, to give their life for the sublime Goddess, and these Knights of the Grail will not allow that immature lads play with the few achievements of the rarest minds like beans and peas, smashing them or throwing them into fire.

The categories which you left in the *Kant*ian table are neither forms of *thinking*, nor forms of the *thing-in-itself*. Meanwhile we have now – as you will remember – *two* ideal *connections*, which we can bring under the categories of relation, namely:

1. causality, called *general causality* by me;
2. community.

Both are however not primordial concepts a priori, but – as I cannot tell you often enough – connections a posteriori of the reason based on the aprioric causal law (transition of the effect in the *sense organ* to its cause).

Now we want to go further.

Are space and time ideal, only in our head, in accordance with Kant's teaching, or these forms ideal *and real*?

You assert the latter and you aristocratically look with a face of a superior genius down on the intellectually as well as bodily small man, who is called *Kant*. Who is *Kant*? What this blockhead has written

>must finally be treated with fitting disregard. (T.i.i., 97)

You say:

Space and time are just as well *forms of existence as forms of thinking*. (290)

>The *thing-in-itself* is in its existence temporal. (90)

On page 114 (T.i.i.) you speak about a “*real* space” and on page 602 one can read:

>In my view space and time are just as well forms of the *external* reality as *subjective* brain perception.

Would this be so, Mr. von Hartmann, then *Kant* would certainly be nothing else than a cheeky fellow and at most a talented mind, but not a groundbreaking genius; because if you deny that *Kant*'s philosophy on the human intellect has any worth, then what valuable remains in his work? Something from his ethics, which ended with *moral theology*? Something from his aesthetics, which except for a few good ideas, contains nothing positive, only critical-negative ones? His assault on God, which ended with the *postulate of a God*?

This clear fact, Mr. von Hartmann, should have made you very, very suspicious; for whoever reads, it is but a single page, the *Critique of Pure Reason*, has immediately the intuition that

a superior mind is talking. This dark feeling transmutes itself in him, who studies *Kant*, into the clear judgement, that

> *Kant* might be the most original mind, which nature has ever produced. (*Schopenhauer*)

You too, Mr. von Hartmann, must have felt this, for your mortal enemy will have to admit, that you are very talented. And nevertheless you have dared it do bring *Kant* down to the level where you are standing, by declaring the Transcendental Aesthetic and the Transcendental Analytic, the most miraculous blossoms of human profundity, to be idle, conceived fairytales.

Oh, Mr. von Hartmann! Not for the treasures of both India's, as the saying goes, not for the *Cakrawarti*-crown, i.e. the Caeserean rule of the whole world, would I have passed your judgement on the "all-crusher". And if I would possess no more uplifting consciousness than this: having understood *Kant*, then still I would not switch places with anyone in the world. I would hold myself, like Hamlet, to be a King, although I merely sit in a nutshell.

Nevertheless I cannot completely condemn you regarding time and space, and you may take just from that, that I criticize your works *sine ira et studio* (without anger and fondness). What has been told about you to me, namely that you regret having published your work so early, just as well as your pessimism, has caused, though I do not know you personally, a certain sympathy in me for you, so that I am reminded by my reason of justice and justice only. I am determined to take pleasure in the good pages of your works and only there, where you shroud the already discovered good in philosophy, or where the mind is led to false ways, as fighter for the truth, give the lie in your *works* – not you as person – a cuirassier blow.

The problem of the true nature of space and time is a so exceedingly difficult one, that it can really not be solved by a single thinker alone, *Scotus Erigena* broke a part of the bowl of the hard nut; *Spinoza* broke himself a tooth on it; *Locke* unified his whole thinking power in order to reveal its kernel; *Berkeley* broke another part of the bowl and finally Kant exposed one *half* of the kernel. *Schopenhauer* is not to be mentioned, since he incorporated without any ado the results of *Kant*'s Transcendental Aesthetic in his "world as representation".

You too, Mr. von Hartmann, have carefully investigated the problem and I consider your research: "The thing in itself and its nature" despite the through and through incorrect results of it for the best what you have written.

In the mentioned work you try in a honest manner to solve the problem for all times. But what you achieved? In the end you started to lime the parts of the bowl which were broken off by *Scotus Erigena*, *Berkeley* and *Kant*, into one piece and closed the opened halve kernel back. You declared: space and time are subjective *and thing-in-itself-forms*. You poured all achievements, like your great role model *Schelling* "in the porridge of absolute Indentity." (*Schopenhauer.*)

And you were so close to the truth! – so close that I can really not understand, that you did not shout out in joy, like *Archimedes*: εὕρηκα! I have found it! Your good genius had led you to the polemic of *Kant* with the little yapper *Eberhard*, and you had already, like *Kant* himself, precisely distinguished *form* of perception from *pure perception*. Only a small step was to be made and the other half of the bowl would have sprung by itself in a thousand pieces.

You left it to me, to finish the last labor, and I thank you for this "unconscious" generosity.

I have verified, that the *aprioric* form of time is the *present*, the aprioric form of space the *point-space*. Time and space are compositions a posteriori of the reason, but nevertheless purely *ideal*, as *Kant* rightly taught: they are only not *aprioric*, which is a great difference. Or with other words: *outside the mind* there is space nor time, nor is there outside my head causality or a causal affinity of the things.

What does however correspond on the real domain with the *ideal* forms space and time? The point of the *present* corresponds with the real point of *motion*; *time* with the real *motion*, the flow of becoming; the *point*-space with the *extension* of an individual, its sphere of force, its individuality; and mathematical space (the pure perception a posteriori, not a priori, as *Kant* taught) with – *absolute nothingness*.

All these aprioric and aposterioric (but purely ideal) forms are merely given to *know* the outer world, i.e. the things-in-themselves and their motion (development). The point-space does not furnish the object extension, as little as time furnishes them motion, but point-space *knows* only the extension, time *knows* only the motion, the development of the things.

It will be completely clear to you, Mr. von Hartmann, that this is not about petty nitpicking or separating identical concepts by force, but about fundamentally different concepts. To the common man, i.e. the philosophical rogue, it may all sound the same, whether I say: every thing is spatial or every thing is extended; every thing is temporal or every thing has inner motion, is living, develops itself; but you have thought about space and time, for a very long time and earnestly, and you know exactly, what immense consequences arise from this necessary separation of ideal and real on philosophical terrain. I will therefore no longer remain here, but in order to conclude, move your attention to the only consequence which follows from our investigation up till now with logical necessity:

>That *infinity* can be found only in the head of man, not on the real domain. Only subjective forms can possess the predicate “*infinite*” because the synthetical activity of the reason, and its ideal products, the ideal forms, must necessarily be unbounded, if they want to be useful for knowledge at all. Therefore this predicate “*infinite*” may not unjustifiably be carried onto the force itself, resp. on a composition of individual forces.

Will you keep this in mind, Mr. von Hartmann? If you do so, our coming investigation will proceed very smoothly.

Space and time do therefore belong on the Kantian table of categories under the categories of Quantity and Quality, and I kindly ask you, to throw away the “primordial thoughts a priori”, which you conserved, unity and plurality. At the same time I would like to remark that space and time are however not categories nor pure perceptions a priori, but visualizable compositions a posteriori.

Since the categories of Modality, as you know very well, contribute really nothing to experience (*Critique of Pure Reason*; A219, B266), the category of Reality, left by you under the rubric “Quality”, demands a discussion.

Here too, Mr. von Hartmann, I stand bewildered and can really not grasp it, that you did *not* recognize the truth. You were so close in this direction, that you, to speak figuratively, could

put the nail of your forefinger on it. And here I thank you again for your “unconscious” friendliness, of leaving it to me, to harvest a sweet fruit.

You have researched very precisely, what in normal life is called *material* and found like *Locke*, that everything which we can tell about the qualities of an object, so about the *material*, *matter*, is a *subjective* sensation, reaction in our organs: like color, smoothness, taste, firmness, temperature, hardness etc.; brief, that our familiarity is limited to the qualities of the objects which *Locke* summarized under the concept “secondary qualities”, qualities which verifiably arise *in us, in our head*. *Locke* did equally verify that these secondary properties are begotten in us by from us independent *forces*.

But like him, you did not how to put the egg on the table. Like him, you assumed despite all of this, *next* to the force, a *matter* that is independent from the subject.

It is really unbelievable, that so many thinkers had to say to themselves: “Everything, which we know about matter, is the subjective processing of a from the subject independent activity of a force”, and did nevertheless, which would we so easy, not come to the evident conclusion: “Accordingly, the force *alone* is *real* and what we call matter is *purely ideal*.”

So this is what I have done. I have proven that matter is entirely ideal, the force entirely real:

>*through the wedding of both, in the senses of the subject arises that, which we call materialized object, matter.*

The important consequences which follow from the ideality of matter, resp. the a posteriori obtained connection *substance*, based on the aprioric matter, will be, as I hope, known to you through my main work, which is why I will terminate the research here.

The results up till now are that space and time are not pure perceptions a priori, that there are no *Kant*ian categories. But if one uses the table of categories as simple scheme, we have the following ideal compositions and connections:

Quantity	*Quality*	*Reality*
Space|Substance| General causality
Time| |Reciprocity

and with their support we know the whole external world.

These compositions are an unconscious work of the mind, like how the stomach secretes its juice unconsciously for us. We become conscious of them however when we think about it and let them arise in the clear point of the consciousness, like how the anatomist becomes with a vivisection conscious of the functions of the organs.

Kant, you will understand this by now, was therefore not a cheeky fellow, but is the deepest thinker of the Germans: a groundbreaking genius.

One should not take too great umbrage at the categories, how *Kant* defined and developed them. The *issue* which they are about alone must be kept in mind, and if one does so, then one will bow humbly yet proudly before the great man of Königsberg: humbly, because the

eminent heads stand exactly before *Kant*, as he lives in his works, like Saint Cecilia before the choir of angels [on the painting of *Raphael*](https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/a/a5/Raphael_St_Cecilia.jpg); proud, because all those who absorb the light of his wisdom, take part in his spirit and are pulled by him on the elevated place he takes. *Kant* belongs to humanity, or as the minnesingers would have said: a “sweet, clear feast for the eyes”; but we Germans will say till the end of our nation, that he was a German, which is a second source of proud for he, who senses Kantian wisdom in his blood.

One should not blame a past philosopher that he did not find the absolute truth fully and completely. Like everything in the world, the general human mind had and still has a development. The *last* philosopher will certainly reach the truth and take it completely in his hand, but only because he stands on so many stacked giants as the last one.

Thus neither could *Kant* find everything. Namely, he left the thing-in-itself completely undetermined, no, he *had* to leave it undetermined, since it is, as a result of his teaching, even less than x: a pure zero.

All mentioned ideal compositions and connections, as I have shown in my work, are juxtaposed by true forms of the thing-in-itself, but not by the by you positioned *identical* forms, but instead forms which are *toto genere* (in every aspect) different:

on the subjective side|*on the real side*

--|--

Time|Motion

Substance|The universe as collective-unity

General causality |The dynamic interconnection of the things

Mathematical space is juxtaposed by the empty nothingness, the *nihil negativum*, which is certainly no form of the thing-in-itself, nor complies with any form of cognition, because it does not help for the knowledge of the things: it does not belong to the *formal* net through which we perceive the world.

I do not want to finish this treatment without making a remark for you.

If you assume a transcendent (!) causality, a real space and a real time, then for your philosophy the *Kant*ian antinomies still have full validity, although you treat them with

> with fitting disregard ... and have learnt to be *lenient* towards this part of the *Kant*ian philosophy. (T.i.i., 97)

You can turn and twist it in whatever way you want – this plait of antinomies will hang on you and will make you into an unwilling comical figure; because you realize very well, what I am saying to say: *Infinity* is *essential* to causality, space and time, i.e. the motion of the subject is in these forms *unbounded*.

Of course, with great audacity, which is as *essential* for the unripe as infinity is for space, you get over this numbing dust of philosophical unclearness and declare *ex tripode* (from the pulpit):

I do not want it to be left unsaid, that even this *subjective-potential infinity is valid only for the subjective representation-space*, where the unboundedness of the spatial extension can certainly be stopped by nothing but the early death of the individual. *Unlike with the real space*, which possess indeed also potential infiniteness as the unboundedness of possible real movement, which I can however not extend according the subjective will-choice through the motion of the thoughts, by which I am compelled (as transcendent correlate, on which I relate my subjective representation-space transcendentally), to assume it conceptually as finite at every moment, since it does not reach beyond the material things-in-themselves, whose existence-form it is, and that the material world must necessarily be finite. (T.i.i., 114)

Mr. von Hartmann! Did you regret this passage as well? Certainly! I am sorry for you with all my heart and I suffer with you.

You say very rightly, that the world is finite, but could you prove this finity? The finity of the world can only be proved from the assumption of *real individuals*, an assumption which you deny. Given however that you could have proven the finity of the world, which you have not done, would we then not have, according to your philosophy,

>a finite world in a *real infinite* space?

For – I tell you this one more time, and you will *never, never* be able to disprove it – *infinity*, regardless of whether it is *real* or *ideal* space, is *essential* to space. Ask it to the first person you encounter, the most brilliant or the stupidest – always he will tell you: “space is infinite.” There is no escape here: every way out is closed.

“3. Physics” is listed but unlinked as of 6/25/2019

4. Metaphysics (Excerpts)

https://old.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/6omo0w/critique_of_the_philosophy_of_hartmann_excerpts/

The *will*, it is the *will* , Mr. von Hartmann, as *Schopenhauer* has unsurpassably demonstrated, which forges the judgement. Are you married? I have no idea. In any case you wanted to marry when you wrote the artistic passage above. *Humboldt*'s “*crime of procreation*” had to be whitewashed. The truth shrouded your face, when you wrote the shameful passage.

Also: is the *coitus* a *sacrifice* the individual makes? You must be – I repeat it – a very uniquely shaped being.

--

What are *you* thinking of with this commitment to the common good? You are thinking of that, which you have already prettily painted and without disguise above, in the following manner: choose somewhere a job, learn to work with your hands, obtain money, goods, fame, power, honor etc., *marry and beget children*; or with other words: you destroy with your own hand the *only* meritorious in your work: the dissection of the illusion. You commend to him,

who has seen through all illusions: “chase after illusions”, *as if a dissected illusion is still an illusion and can still activate him*. The great genius *Heraclitus* exclaimed: “Woe unto you unhappy ones, who measure happiness by stomach and private parts!” and you say: Conquer your disgust, copulate, create children for the general redemption of the world, measure “by stomach and private parts” your *sacrifice* for the world’s redemption!

Mr. von Hartmann! I am seized by melancholy again.

The by you demanded dedication to the common good, which has been praised as the noblest core of your philosophy, is not noble at all: it is a concession of talent for the spirit of his age, not the bold, free, courageous truth, which a genius, feeling himself citizen of the future, puts forward to his contemporaries *as law*. The noble commitment to the common good, is the one taught by the obscure *Heraclitus* and myself, i.e. the *renouncing* human steps out of his outer peace (he cannot be pushed out of the *inner* peace) and bleeds for humanity, he lets blind people, whom he wants to save, from the *lowest* social classes up to the *highest*, beat him, spit him, nail him to the cross.

You however assert that every cobbler and cutter, who founds himself a family, every jobber who dances around the Golden Calf, brief, that everyone, who lives like almost all humans live right now, is *a wise hero*, a wise hero who commits himself to the world process. You virtually place an award on procreation and *immortality*; for everyone who intensifies the struggle in the world is, according to your teaching, the most meritorious one there can be.

Third speech: The divine and the human law

https://old.reddit.com/r/Mainlander/comments/c0zef6/third_speech_the_divine_and_the_human_law/

This is the third and last of the three addresses which Mainländer wrote for the workers of the German Empire. It is part of the 9th essay “Practical socialism” in the second volume of *The Philosophy of Salvation*.

--

--

^1 The German concept *Bildung* (noun) knows no equivalent term in English. It means something like cultural and intellectual cultivation. If someone is *gebildet* (adjective), he or

--

German workers!

Long have I hesitated, whether or not I should hold this lecture on the divine and human law. It pierced through my ears: only a madman puts fire in the hands of children.

But finally I have decided to give this speech which will, just like how **Lassalle** presented the deepest results of historical research in its most comprehensible form with his “Working’s Man Programme”, inform you on the most serious results of philosophy.

Prove yourself worthy of this trust, German workers.

(...)

You may, German workers, take a look at nature wherever you want, and you will always and always find the individual, the single being. In the inorganic kingdom no chemist has succeeded to make gold from silver, iron from copper, and in the organic kingdom you find plants, animals, humans: always and always you encounter individuals.

You may also take a look at nature, and find everywhere, that these single beings are not independent, but stand in an intimate interconnection. We cannot exist without air, light, plants and to some extent without weaker animals; the plants can’t without air, light and earth; and every chemical substance impacts and experiences the impact of all other substances: the world is a firm whole of single beings.

Finally, you can’t take a look at nature without finding, that every single being, as well as the cosmos, is in a steady, continual, never-ending movement. Wherever you look, you find the flow of becoming.

Therefore a witty man once said, that in the world only change is enduring, and nothing else.

We hold onto this.

We of course only deal with humanity now.

The first thing, which we have to say about humanity, is:

1. that it is the sum of all individual humans;
2. that it steadily flows. There is no standstill in this flow of humanity: it flows continually.

As I have explained to you in my second speech, the movement of humanity emerges from the movement of **all** humans. I emphasize “all humans”, for there can be absolutely no exception. Those who rule the great nations, as well as those, who have locked themselves behind monastery walls, exert through their mere existence a determined influence on the course of humanity. I have furthermore set out, how on the whole the course of humanity follows from the cooperation and rivalry of the powerful states, and finally, I determined this course itself, as a necessary, unchangeable, iron path to the empire of the future, the ideal state.

Can this course, even if it leads to an excellent good, even if it flows into a good of the highest degree, be a moral one?

In no way, German workers! How is this course generated? Look around. You see wise and clowns, murderers and righteous, sadists and empathes, tyrants and philanthropists, rogues and cultivated, austere people and gluttons, voluptuaries and saints, liars and the truthful, with one word: good and evil. From all these collaborative and counteractive elements a result emerges, a diagonal. This diagonal is, precisely because it's created through the efforts of the good as well as the bad, totally without quality: it has no determined character at all, it is simply a course like the course of a river.

Above this course of humanity, which is bloodstained, covered with corpses, full of tears, screams and violence, – and yet contains also men such as **Winkelried**, **Wilhelm Tell**, **Huß**, **Luther**, – there is also as it were at the canopy of the sky, a golden line, or a string of starflowers, and the golden, luminous, radiant, unchanging street covers the streets below of the dark earth completely. The course of humanity, the result of all single efforts of everyone, has exactly the same direction as this simple golden street: the latter is as it were the model, to which the thorny, bloody street of humanity conforms.

This splendid, unchanging, golden line high above at the panoply of stars is – German workers, – **the divine law**.

As far as this divine law can interest you – and the practical philosopher may as practical man tell you not more, than you can understand and absorb in your blood, nor may he offer you intellectual food, which you cannot digest, – as far as this unchanging divine law can interest you, it consists of three pearls, that always string themselves together into a necklace, which makes the eye of the noble drunk, namely of **patriotism**, **righteousness** and **love of the neighbor**.

The course of humanity, German works, bears, as I told and explained you, no moral imprint; and this little does the ideal golden line above the course of humanity bear a moral imprint; it is simply a law, an unchanging law. It is the guideline for morality, not morality itself. Morality is something totally different. What it is?

>Teaching as their doctrines the precepts of men.

>(Matthew 15: 9)

then we may expect only a very meagre and bleak answer. But we must not forget, that *Christ* was the ardent preacher of the pure, unchangeable, divine law, that he carried therefore in his thoughts always the divine law, compared to which every precept of men, also the holiest and most honorable, is a candle compared to the sun. If we want to correctly answer the question, we must temporarily lose sight of the unchangeable divine law.

What is a precept of men, or simpler: what is a law?

This question has *Lassalle* answered to you in an incomparable manner in his speech on the constitution. A law is the expression of factually existing *power structures*.

The most beautiful and magnificent law would be nothing more than a string of letters, when factual powers would not give every letter the power of a thousand cannons. Take away this power *behind* the law, and it is less than a shadow, it is nothing whatsoever.

This explanation so irrefutably correct, that it applies even to the divine law. The divine law is merely a law, because the pearls of which it consists, are pervaded by the invincible, all-powerful breath of God. Only God's breath, the Holy Spirit, the all-powerful iron destiny, makes the law a law.

So every precept of men, German workers, is the expression of factually existing *power structures*, which you want to remember.

However, you also know, that humanity is nothing firm, unchangeable, but something quite liquid. Humanity is part of an incessantly flowing stream, a part of the becoming of nature, and from this sentence alone, without needing any other as support, it can be concluded, that the power structures within humanity are subjected to change.

If we take recourse to history, which has been very aptly been called the self-consciousness of humanity by a very great German philosopher, then we discover how this general truth is affirmed up till the smallest. Not only do we see a mass of perished empires, which were once very powerful and whose laws seemed to be valid for all times, or popularly expressed, seemed valid for eternity, but we also see a continual change of laws, an incessant remodeling of the foundations of all laws, of constitutions.

Why? Because the power structures within a state always shift. Sometimes the epicenter of the power falls in the crown, sometimes in the nobility, sometimes in the clergy, sometimes in the citizenry, sometimes in the lower classes, sometimes in the complete people.

(...)

I want to make the state of affairs clear to you, German workers, with an image. You have undoubtedly all seen at a river mouth, where the water at the shore flows more slowly and is filthier than in the middle, on a whitish, turbid stroke some bubbles. These bubbles are the image of the flowing and they look like stable forms. But sometimes such a bubble bursts, sometimes a new one appears. Neither the bursting or emerging happens randomly, although that may seem to be the case: it is rather the last member of a complete row of causes, and I ask you to remember this, for it cannot be repeated often enough, that in nature, and therefore also in humanity, an abrupt [*sprunghafte*] development is totally impossible. The only correct image for life and the entire nature is flowing. It is a continual welling up, incessant merging, a restless becoming without breaks, even without the smallest break imaginable.

(...)

But just like all streams and rivers have at every moment a completely determined bed and a totally determined direction, likewise, every part of humanity moves in the totally determined form of the *state*, generally expressed, the determined direction towards *liberty*.

We are coming closer again to the divine law.

The state and the direction of the by it encompassed stream of people, can from this standpoint be seen as the *unchanging part* of the flowing, or with other words: the state and the direction of its society are the reflection of the divine law on earth. It can also be nothing else; for the course of humanity does not deviate more than the width of a hair from the golden street there above in the stars, which is clearly seen by all those, with an “unsealed eye”. The path of humanity is the afterimage of the divine paragon, and therefore service of God, holy, flowing and exclusive service of God, is the same as full dedication to the state. All service of God and this full dedication coincide.

Everyone who wants to realize the divine law, has thus to abide to the state; for I repeat: the state is the distant echo of the divine law, its reflection on earth, its unchangeable form, with which humanity stands and falls.

Now, whereupon relies the state?

Notice my answer very well, German workers. As simple as it may sound, this important it is because of its consequences, which flow from it.

The state relies on the *state contract*.

Who has concluded this contract?

The citizens with each other, and its complete content is: We *oblige* ourselves, to not murder, to not steal, and to maintain the state; in exchange we have the right to protection from murder, theft and invasion by a foreign power.

We are born with the *rights* and *obligations* of this treaty, German workers. These rights and obligations stand and fall with the state contract, and in general – notice this well, – only in relation to a treaty the words *obligation* and *right* have a meaning. In the true morality there is no obligation nor right, there, there is only devotion to the divine law and *payment* for it: peace of heart.

The laws against murder and theft are *original laws*, not mere laws, nor constitutional laws. Both of these *alone* are the original laws, and because the state stands and falls with them, they are the only laws which are *holy*. The divine law sanctifies them, just like the state itself.

Without the lawfully guaranteed life of every individual, the state is unthinkable. But also without lawfully protected property a state would be unthinkable. About the form of property can be fought, not about property itself; for it is impossible to remove it from the world, it exists as embodied activity, together with the humans themselves, just as the sun, the planet, the air exist. If we assume, that today absolute communism, i.e. the complete concentration of all property in the hands of the state, would appear, then the laws against theft would continue like before in full power; because only through this law the property in the hands of the state would be protected.

Unchangeable is the divine law, on one hand, and the state and its original laws, and the development of humanity, on the other hand.

What, however, always changes, and is therefore not divine, and bears at its forehead the stigma of transience, are the drops of the stream of people, the single individuals, and the bubbles on the stream, the laws.

Notice precisely, German workers, what I tell you: Holy on earth is the *state* alone, its *original* laws and the direction of its popular spirit; holy is however neither a human law nor a fundamental law, i.e. a *constitution*.

But what characteristics do laws and constitutions then have? They have a very solid property, a property which can smash your arms and legs into pieces and cut off your head, they have the *power* of the existing power structures in a state.

You see, German workers, all at once the issue is clear. Holy is the divine law and its reflection on earth: the state, whose original laws and the direction of the popular spirit, because they possess, besides the power, the immortality and natural necessity; the laws and constitutions in a state are on the other hand not holy, but merely powerful. You may follow them, you may fight them, you may try to remodel them. The permission for this, German

property, or more precisely: the juridical category property is not a divine institution, but a precept of men, and therefore it may be assaulted and attacked; but private property may, as long as it exists, not be stolen from another individual. You will therefore, German workers, not steal, not murder, even not steal, when you're starving: You solemnly vow this.

Let us continue. I ask you, German workers, to be very attentive.

What is a revolution, a genuine revolution?

Lassalle may speak again for me:

>A revolution can **never** be **made** ; all that can ever be done is to add **external moral recognition** to a revolution which has already entered into the actual relations of a society, **and to carry it out accordingly**. ([The Working Man's Programme, p. 22](<https://archive.org/details/workingmansprogr00lassiala/page/22>))

It is just like with the bubbles on the water, which I told you about. They emerge and burst not suddenly, but their emergence and bursting are the final links of a long chain of causes and effects. When the power structures of a state have moved in such a way, that the old forms become too tight, then the old form breaks and a new one emerges. This breakage can happen even as noiseless as the decay into ashes of a conserved corpse, which comes into contact with fresh air after a hundred years, or it can take place with thunder and lightning. *Lassalle* expressed this in the following splendid sentences:

>A revolution either takes place in full legality and with all blessings of peace, or else it will irrupt with all violent convulsions, **mit wildwehendem Lockenhaar, erzene Sandalen an ihren Sohlen.** (Indirect Taxation)

We learn two truths from this: first, that thunder and lightning do **not** belong to the essence of a revolution, secondly, that only that revolution can succeed, which relies on a factually existing **supremacy**.

Realize this, German workers, in case some unscrupulous men seduce you to organize a coup. A revolution cannot be **made**.

Let us take another small step.

Is a revolution ethical or unethical?

The answer is: it is neither ethical or unethical, for it belongs to the course of humanity, which knows no other predicate than necessity.

Only the individual man can, during in a revolution, act ethically or unethically with regard to the divine law.

Imagine a citizen during the time of the Great French Revolution. This revolution relied on the divine law, for its purpose was the acknowledgement of the Third Estate, which meant at that time as much as freedom for all. Now, let us imagine that our independent citizen would have fought against the revolution. How did he act? He acted unethically; for he was hostile towards the divine law. Now we want to assume, that he took part in the great movement and enthusiastically supported its course. How did he act? He acted ethically in the highest degree, for his personal will complied with the divine will.

Did he *murder*, if he killed in this battle another man? In no way, because he merely protected the divine law against those who had violated it. He murdered as little as the French or German soldiers in the war of 1870; for both parties fought for their state, which is holy, because it is the reflection of the divine law.

If the by us imagined citizen would, however, have used the turmoil of the revolution, to get rid of a personal enemy out of hatred and revenge, then he would have murdered; for he would have violated the divine law, which dictates absolute love of the neighbor, and also love of the enemy.

These subtle moral differences, which are ascertained by the reason of men, find their internal echo in our human emotions. If I kill for example a man in the state – then furies immediately savage my heart, even when I'm certain, that I won't be discovered. But when I kill during a war another man, my conscience remains calm.

Christ knew very well, that his teaching would stir people up amongst each other and would cause a stream of human blood. He said:

>I have come to bring fire on the earth,

>Do you think I came to bring peace on earth?

>No, I tell you: but division.

>(Luke 12:49-51)

He was of such a meekness, that it made it impossible for him to bend but a hair of a fellow human. He also knew, that if he would have remained silent, no blood would have been shed in his name – and nevertheless he has preached the divine law. Do you believe, German workers, that but the smallest drop of blood, which his mournful mind saw in the future, troubled his conscience? Not a single one!

Arnold of Brescia, *Savonarola*, *Wycliffe*, *Huß*, *Luther*, *Zwingli*, *Calvin* – all these men knew, that the apple of discord, which they threw among the people, would lead to the bloodiest wars. Yes, the moaning and whimpering reached the ears of most of them and ripped their heart. But do you think, that their *conscience* troubled them? In no way this was the case, for they acted in accordance with the divine law.

Montesquieu, *Rousseau*, *Helvétius*, *Holbach*, *Danton*, *Robespierre*, the *Girondins* – they all knew, that terribly much blood would flow, when they preached the truth. Have they dithered, to speak salvific words? No! They exclaimed the feelings, which the powerful divine breath evoked in their breast. Do you believe, that the by nature soft, gentle *Robespierre* lightheartedly signed the death sentences? It is a historical fact, that he was full of mercy and lovingness, and nevertheless he signed. Believe me: his heart wanted to break, but his conscience was silent. Only the blood, which is shed in opposition to the divine law, screams to God and finds its enhancement in the form of unruly, excruciating remorse.

Now, from all these investigations, we have to build the principle, guideline, according to which you have act in possible future battles.

I have told you in my second speech, that Germany, during a historical period which is undeterminable, is called, to stand at the top of the European nations. I have furthermore explained based on this fact, that not the French will offer *you* the solution the social question, but *you* will offer it to the French. I have also indicated you the path, according to which you can reach the goal through practical agitation. Finally, I have also given the achievement of the goal, so a very important revolution, the apposition “*peaceful*”, for a thousand reasons.

If during this agitation, Germany would wage another war against France, i.e. would need to win a new religious war, then your stance would be self-evident. You have to heat up in moral enthusiasm and with tenfold increased power take part in this holy war; for it is about the destruction of the papal lies and priestcraft, about the annihilation of a dangerous cancer in the bodies of the nations.

Now I propose however, that the extremely unlikely, but nevertheless possible, takes place. It is actually in France, despite everything, where the social question is solved, and that the French people, with this solution on their flag, march towards Germany.

What do you have to do in this case? Should you flee from your flag or be loyal to the country?

There's only one possible answer: you have to be *loyal to the country*; for the homeland may *never, never* be betrayed; that would be opposition to the divine law, which dictates patriotism, and would at the same time be *breach of contract*.

But now you can object: in this case the divine law would be in contradiction to itself: on one hand it dictates patriotism, and righteousness and love of the neighbor on the other side. I am pulled by one virtue to the German homeland, by the other virtues to the French, and righteousness is a greater virtue than patriotism.

This contradiction is nevertheless only an apparent one.

He who has sworn to the divine law, must abide to its earthly reflection, the *state*. Dedication to the state and dedication to the divine law coincide. And be comforted, if this is the case, then the higher virtue cannot be defeated. I remind you, that the course of humanity emerges from all endeavors of all single humans and is totally necessary, i.e. complies with the golden unchangeable line in the sky.

If you would, as German social-democrats, fight against France, which represents in this imagined war, the interests of the social-democrats of all nations, what would it look like in your breast? You would be sad and depressed. What would it look like in the breast of the French? It would be fired up, roar and whirl; blazes of enthusiasm would break through all pores, their power would be increased tenfold, whereas yours would be halved due to your sadness and depression. Could a good outcome be possible for Germany? Certainly not.

You see, German workers: your interests would still be victorious, although you would not oppose the divine law nor breach the state contract.

In a similar way must the conduct be, of those of you who would be soldiers during, which we will assume *per impossibile*, a social revolution. Are you allowed to ignore the order to shoot your father, brothers and friends? You *must* open fire. Why? First, because love of your parents, children, siblings etc. belong as such not to the divine law; they belong only there, as far as they fall under love of the neighbor. Because you're guardians of the state, to which you're indebted since your birth, by its mere appearance, and which you've sworn unconditional allegiance to when you entered the army. If you, defenders of the state contract, breach the contract, then you'd be denounced twice, as a criminal and as traitor, a stigma, which will never vanish from your forehead. However – and this is the focal point of the question – you would be *lukewarm*; for how could you be enthusiastic? Enthusiasm can be commanded by no King or Emperor; it can only be evoked by a higher goal, which must necessarily root in the divine law, which the true statesman has to note before everything and may never lose sight of. True politics follows the unchangeable course of the development of humanity, or with other words, true politics is politics of the people. And because your comrades in the defense of the empire would be lukewarm, you would in your enthusiasm be victorious; provided that, of course, you would have popular supremacy on your side; for the success of a revolution is synonymous with establishment on the *sur*face, of what was already present in the *depth* behind it.

Generally expressed, the irrefutable principle, the unshakeable guideline for your way of conduct is:

All actions of the state towards the *outside* must be flawless fulfillment of duty, flawless loyalty to the contract.

In the *inside* of the state, the most glowing dedication to the divine law must be practiced, so that it finds thereby its complete realization in society. Whoever stands under the flag, must be flawlessly loyal. Whoever does not stand under the flag, has to put the divine law above the human law, and may not shrink back for any conflict, which it may cause. "We must obey God rather than men." [Acts 5:29]

At the same time I want to point out, that the laws against murder and theft are *original laws*, which are as products of natural necessity as holy as the divine law itself.

May this, what I tell you, be engraved deep into your souls.

At this moment, I still have to specify my relation to your party, as I promised at the beginning of these speeches.

I repeat before everything, that I have spoken to you as a free and independent man: this you will have seen and felt; for if I had *wanted* something from you, for if I had served others, then I would have pandered to you, and I would've done everything but reopening your wounds.

My position towards you follows from the following:

Everything which the social movement can accomplish, this I already have. I desire nothing from the world.

I am detached from persons and affairs.

I accept no honor from men.

Ambition and thirst for fame have evaporated in me: no motive, which can move a human breast, can move me.

Only one thing do I still desire: the consciousness, to have served the people. I have achieved it.

I can never belong to your party, because the social question is for me not a question of *classes*, but a question of *Bildung*⁽¹⁾, which encompasses all of humanity. I can therefore belong to no party at all: I stand above the parties. But as far as your issue belongs to the issue of *humanity*, I belong completely to you, although I can be no member of your party.

I am your *William Tell*, who was also not a party man, and went his own lonely way.

You have, German workers, no more loyal friend than me.