

# 1. End of Transcendence.

Love is not unlimited.

Ethics of Liberty and Freedom.

Empiric-Ethical Action-Logics, And Psychological Science-Theory.

*Terms:* phenomenology, critical science, individual-centered psychology, humanistic psychology, social-psychology, cultural psychology, mass-psychology, psychoanalysis and learning theory, medical-psychology, deductive phenomenology and „pragmatical structuralism“, empirical ethics, humanistic ethics, ethics of liberty and freedom, personal ethics, strukturalism- and immanency-critics, methodological-problems, psychologic-philosophical basic research.

*Completely beworked and corrected text and translations into English language by the author of a former ISBN 3-9804360-0-4*

*„Liebe ist nicht grenzenlos“ of the author*

Author and Copyright: Kurt-Wilhelm Laufs © 1995, after dictations from 1991/93. first edition of 1995. New revision and free translative interpretation from German into English language by the author Kurt-Wilhelm Laufs, ©, update 2016-02-18, ©

*„Death is no event of life, and the death you can't survive.“*

(Ludwig Wittgenstein).

General Naught-Hypothesis, (also sensu C. R. Popper, 1934) :

*„Der Sinn ist Unsinn“- „The sense is nonsense“,* (Ludwig Wittgenstein),

or author's question, here: what is the sense of naught or zero hypothesis, when naught times hypothesis maketh 0 at least;  $0 \times \text{Hyp.} =$

$H_0 = 0 ?$

Ergo:

To be given, or "give a sense to the life" (Antoine de Saint-Éxuperie) were up to everyone and each reader, the author here will not give any final answers.

Death is *„End of Transcendence“* (K.-W. Laufs, 1995), not only of aquinian... And if it served sense making order, to discuss sense of sense of sense, Immanuel Kant's „thesis“ (critics of pure reason, 1783, c.p.r.) could serve as a kind of C.R. Popper's „naught-hypothesis“, (Logik der Forschung, Wien, 1934) naughty anyway, anyhow, never mind, followed after Kant's „antithesis“ (c.p.r.) alike Popper's „alternative-hypothesis“ (AH) and thus to be found a way towards Popper after those post Kant developed and elaborated modern mathematical probability calculations, and up to Popper's falsification-theory of deny of  $H_0$  instead of proof and to support AH by probabilities, what to Kant's „syntheses“ appear senseless, today, and rather would remind aristotelian syllogisms, when just after Kant probability calculations had been perfectionized.

During the discussion here, almost evidently appears, insisting on alpha errors is not only accompanied by lack of reason, yet also by definitoric power.

### 1.1. *Kant and consequences*

„Pragma“ (πραγμα) means action in Greek language. New philosophy starts with positivism, lexically.

Aquinian transcendence ends with Immanuel Kant, who makes a difference between aprioric-categorical transcendental, (of infinite past), and ex posteriori transcendent, (of infinite future).

Book title here „love is not without frontiers“ may be provocative (yet why Kant never had left Kaliningrad, former Prussian Königsberg ?), and to begin with ethics may appear strange to philosophers, when not psychologists, who begin their studies with ethics, when they already had learned mathematics and its logics at school before university studies. Rather there were to associate „Prolegomena“ (Proleg., published first at Riga with

French revolution cocarde) by Immanuel Kant with ego-theory (Prolegomena § 46) and his polemics on his left behind mentor Johann Jakob Brückner, count in Königsberg, calvinist reformed philosopher, who had put the “bridge problem” Kant feared not having to resolve and never left Kaliningrad, and went to Prussian minister Baron v. Zedlitz, also with second edition of rather psychological “critics of pure reason” (c.p.r., K.d.r.V.), it appears rather impossible to associate to Aquinian transcendence that Kantian difference between past times as transcendental, aprioric, and transcendence ex posteriori in future. Nevertheless Kant had written under Zedlitz’ auspices his ethics (in: critics on practical reason, K.d.pr.V., c.pr.r.), and a kind of early mass psychology as a “pragmatical anthropology”. Kant’s deny (“falsification” in

modern Popper's sense) of „proof“ of „God“ appear absurdities: super sensual, super natural not to be real, excepting as term, which had to be invented, if not existing. Positivists say „God“ to be irrelevantly, while differently Kant speaks of impossibility to proof „God“. „G...d“, thus neither the transcendental nor transcendent, at least, were irrelevant, yet mass-psychologics learned by people's central nervous systems as so by learning processes conditioned a “word” (Kant's “Begriff” as “term”, “word”), a chiffre, a sign (c.f. chap. 8). It may be a centering sign to personality as formation conditioned individually by formation structures in groups and cultural formations, with motives, motivations and aims, formations vice versa conditioned by personality and personalities themselves,

centered around an axiomatic “God” whose existence is not clear, and oftenly appears interpreted as a kind of a parapsychological emotional “superstition”, or “super-sensual reality”. Putting reality next, there were to ask after reality of reality of reality...

Why and how to do otherwise philosophy and psychology, or any science, when you knew all knowledge already before? Were here to find an excentric between old accustomed discussions of “idealism” versus “materialism”, or towards a discussion of transcendent versus empirical reality of immanence, a formation problem and that naughty question after “élan vital” (security and needs) after Henri Bergson ?

Why should one rather discuss Bergson's, which never would match life-practical motivational actions sensu Abraham Maslow,

when A. Maslow's humanistic psychological theory of human motivation differentiates by a ranking of (1) security, (2) satisfying needs, (3) recognition, (4) love, and (5) self-actualization, instead of Bergson's two motives ?

Rather a question of empirical wisdom and experience, one can prefer Maslow's conception of human individuation of motivation, self actualization also comparable to humanism at Marx and Engels, versus a general biologicistic alike Henri Bergson's conception of that vitalism ("élan vital") of a French kind of formational sociologicistic or mass psychological deny of development of humanity, human language, as of cultural conditions. Within an ethical formative frame of respect of human life, self actualization becometh possible, yet not after vitalist's view.

Empirical experienced human aims postulate, here, in this composition, consequently to go on in direction of respect of human life, and this as epistemic theoretical necessity, practically actional, and pragmatistical.

Immanuel Kant had predefined in „Kritik der praktischen Vernunft“ (K.d.p.V., critics on practical reason, c.p.r.) a „categorical imperative“, to act the way, maxime of individual will always to serve a common legislation generally, after having defined before the terms, as “category”, “categorical” (in: Kritik der reinen Vernunft. K.d.r.V., critics on pure reason, c.p.r.), etc. *Categories* appear according to I. Kant as *aprioric transcendental*, *sensu convergency to infinites*, which to be considered *in the known and unknown historical past* versus *exposterioric transcendent*, as *convergency towards infinites in future*, and *implicitly maximes*.

Kant appears to correct that (by c.p.r.) aquinian transcendence hypothesis in differences between (aquinian assumed synonyms of) transcendental and transcendence.

Nevertheless, Kant's „categoric imperative“ appears absurdly, or paradoxically, if „categoric“ ment historically past conditions or reasons, whilst that within and into situation spoken “imperative” leads from western grammatical present form (instead by past tense for present and continuous forms, as in oriental grammars present is expressed instead as past tense, thus imperfectum) towards future, when Kant's term „maxime“ were to understand learned in past and actionally approaching as aim in future, thus both: transcendent and transcendental categoric within and into “one” situation alike a frame of motivation and motives. Here appear, in modern

empirical and post kantian psychology, partly different branches of psychology, within a context of motivation: as developmental, learning theoretical, person, biological, physical, etc., corresponding psycho-physiological substrat as substance according to Kant's postulate of unity of body and soul (*“I think thus I am as biological being soul, substance, conscious”, c.p.r.*).

[Substance-term of unity of body and soul by Kant: „Ich denke, also bin ich als denkendes (biologisches) Wesen (Seele), Substanz, Bewusstsein,“ (K.d.r.V.)], also concerning para-psychological intelligence problem, as if there were intelligence outside biological beings.

As I. Kant's traditions historically appear to be linked up to Aristotele, Leibniz, Newton, Comte, Descartes, Spinoza and followed by Lotze, Herbarth, Fechner, Wundt, Helmholtz, etc., there follow philosophical adversaries as for example

Hegel, Husserl, Heidegger, Sartre, etc., who deny Kant's term of substance, and who turn upside down that Kant "substance" definition (of body and soul unity) into as if all substance had a soul (thus even dusts and gases) and there were no unconscious, as „inconscious“ in English or French languages has etymologically with Latin syllable „in“ an also "against conscious" meaning.

A discussion on „conscious“ with Germans made thus no sense, if translations for „Unbewusstes“ made no sense, if not comparing "inconscious" to "in-conscious", as „Unbewusstes“, and to current language uncommon „Gegen-Bewusstes“.

Polemical composition „dreams of a ghost visionary“ by I. Kant shows also a critical approach in direction towards empirical-realistic, and critical rational modern and humanistic

psychology, also with considerations on psychological relevance of metabolism, when Kant's derision considered the difference, how visionary thoughts were effected by "winds rumbling in stomach, ... if the winds" of reverend Schwedenburg's "...took upward, they caused inspirations, if downwards f..." (I. Kant: Träume eines Geister-Sehers), perhaps not only derision, yet an early psycho-medical analysis too, concerning metabolism.

Son of a saddler and philosophical dialecticus, Immanuel Kant, cannot be compared to Kung-Tse (Konfutius), as in konfutian China workers' children did not achieve professors' faculties like in old Prussia.

*Self responsibility of an individual, as for example after I. Kant's „Prolegomena“, § 46, or after ethics by categoric*



*imperative is still revolutionary, and not to compare to „Pflicht-Ethik“ (duty ethics), surely if terms of responsibility (self responsibility) were turned and contaminated to an upside down in turning around responsibility („Verantwortung“) and duty („Pflicht“). Kant's postulate of self responsibility in ethics by categorical imperative to any citizen appears revolutionarily.*

*By Immanuel Kant's actional-pragmatic Structuralism (K.d.r.V.) modern psychology had learned to develop Kant's terms since Lotze, Herbart, Wundt, Weber, Fechner, Helmholtz, etc: as for example by experimental research after Kant's terms in publications as: conscious(ness) (c.p.r.), unity of body and soul (c.p.r.), sensation (c.p.r.), apperception (c.p.r.), actional paralogisms of personality (structuring personality theory) in*

*space/locations & in time (c.p.r.), „ideality“ as cognition (c.p.r.), „simplicity“ as appropriateness, (c.p.r.), „quantity“(c.p.r.), „quality“ (c.p.r.), motivation and ethics (c.p.r.), study of dreams (“Träume eines Geistersehers”, T.e.G.), interpretation of dreams, (“Prolegomena”, Proleg.; T.e.G.).*

Thus, Immanuel Kant appears an integrator and stimulator to science after him, when not only empirical psychology, mass-psychology, and sociology, and anthropology, had developed in own faculties and sub faculties, also influencing modern theology, medicine, metabolism, physiology, veterinary medicine, biology and zoology, and as other environmental approaches had dealt with I. Kant.

Dreams as actional aims („Träume als Handlungsziele“), as Sigmund Freud puts (GW II/

III, 74) under reference to Kant's "pragmatic anthropology" ("Pragmatische Anthropologie", a kind of mass psychology), were thus according to Kant rather collective dreams as wishes in context of categorical imperative, and not single individual desires, which also pre-implicate Freud's ethics of liberty and freedom about Kant and French revolution times of desire for collective freedom and liberty. Just in his late works Freud (GW XVII) begins to agree with Kant's understanding of dreams as madness.

Aquinian „transcendence“ is out since Kant's differentiations between “transcendental” and “transcendent” in space and time, and also in times of Leonhard Euler's objectivational development of the transcendent cipher “e” of infinite rows: and practically the real maxime as respect of life is going on.

Thus in practical ethics, a practical program of culture inherent ethics, can be seen with ethical sources (past) and aims (future).

Paradoxically in Kant's categoric imperativ, and as the hippocraticus S. Freud says, („Es gibt keine Ethik“ c.f. interactive ethics GW XIV, 502-504), there *is* no ethics..., one could add compleating sentence, ... yet *ethics had been made, are made, and can be made*. So respect of human life can be a maxime of cultural and empirical sources and aims in our everyday's actions. (look for: I. Kant: „Zu einem ewigen Frieden“. Towards an eternal peace. Or: Albert Schweitzer: “Kultur und Ethik”.), and not to step into a game theoretical trap without ethics and into catastrophies.

With the end of aquinian trancendency, there also begins

with I. Kant, and A. Schweitzer ("Leben Jesu Forschung", research on real life of Jesus Christ) a different view of, and critics on history. The question is no more historical materialism, yet rather historical realism, reflecting human cognitions, if by "sky", "heaven", and "space" as terms were meant reflecting human terms, considerations and research on history.

As Josef Ratzinger (1970), as theologian at Bonn, British Rhine, Roman catholic congregation for dogmatics, later pope Benedictus XVI, had formulated them atheist to be, who takes the nazarenean Jesus for a human being and no "God", all others in different religious confessions, apart Roman-world- catholicism, were atheists.

Roman catholic church repeats antique Greek and Roman believes of human gods and goddesses (like animistic idols)

as, psychoanalytically said, "projective figures", (idols, c.f. philosophical qu. 80 Heidelberg-catechism, also touching the roman catholic and lutheran "transsubstantiation" term, a kind of "anthropo-morphism" or animism; c.f. Charlotte Bühler, or Martha Muchow, 1920), also when „God“ as "heavenly sky", or "space of universe", when contrasting before "monotheism" to antique "gods" of personal phantasms and by considering relations of power. How did and do clerics and priests steadily invent, and how to find justifications and keeping upright, too, structures of power, in referencies to transcendence and sin of all in front of one "God", and relativationings of human actions regarding respect of life (s. „God“ as term, chap. 8) ?

They bless weapons and cars, which harm our environment etc.

Did't one need a new environmental consciousness, related to respect of human life? Does one not need to be conscious of our environment, what we are influenced by, and vice versa, what we ourselves are influencing? One is not only product of environment, yet environment is also product by human actions. Towards respect of human life in direction to self-actualization, one can see: cultural-historic existence is influenced and influencing consciousness, and in future direction, consciousness will be influencing existence.

To find here in this composition also existence (being) – psychological, existence (being) – philosophical considerations and exist (the being) and „the nothing“, and exist and truth (“veritas”) and truth and liberty (freedom), leading to above postulated kantian axiomatics,

and affirm the empirical truth of respect of life as ethical axiomatic and aims in education as the sense of common educational maxims and toward consciousness also regarding global problems as:

Shelter, nutrition, clear water, over-population, earth climate, waste of resources, spreading deserts o.a. by deforesting, without reforestation programs, etc., devastations by war...

Transcendence in greed and devastating concurrence apparently in historical inferences leads toward catastrophes, when game theory applied, not in a sense of tragedies, for there is no more fatum, fate, destiny, since (1500 p.C.n.) modern times and “lost” of about 43 years by gregorian calendar. The believe in the supernatural, or a supernatural transcendence, stops ethical individual human actions, and to

act socially, there is no need to get paralyzed by aquinian transcendence.

Yet need in social interactions and actionally democratically controlled formations, forwards in direction of the axiomatics and aim of respect of life, within grammatical structures, for words influence people, also in social context...

This composition here tries to consider individual psychological and structural potentialities of human actions.

As well as individual activities as social activities interact within a mass psychological context, counter balancingly centered on ethical axiomatic and it's maxims, according to Immanuel Kant.

*The reader of this composition could reflect him- or herself the problem of a kind of divorce of, and between philosophy and theology not only in Germany.*

*This kind of faculty separation to many common scientific subjects leads toward: academical double- and triple- installments of chairs as in antique sciences in ancient languages, history and culture and in philosophy and in psychology by faculty differentiations between even philosophy and theology; au contraire in fact, there is improved in republican France since French revolution the ensemble of those classical sciences together in „Faculté ès lettres“ (also the French word for faculty of philosophy), when students of theology study together with students of philosophy, psychology, history, Latin, Greek, etc., with their sub-faculty centered interests.*

*1.2. From totalitarian  
transcendence toward ethics of  
freedom and liberty (empirical  
ethics)*

*When one uses in following texts  
that „term“ transcendene, let  
keep in mind the Latin word  
“transcendere” also as “exceed”.*

One claims furtherly, there is no  
transcendence in that sense  
there were a life after (individual)  
death. There is no exceed after  
this life.

That may be provocative for  
some people of religious  
superstitions, waiting for a better  
life after dead, who do not live in  
the “here and now” of present  
time, yet take seriously those  
speculatings after past and for  
future, who do not live after the  
Latin motto “carpe diem”, yet wait  
when enjoy will come, and prefer  
lethargically, not to not to behave  
actively in the „here and now“,

and watching divastate nature,  
watching extinction of animals,  
watching genocides and  
extermination of people,  
watching people die of hunger,  
and wait for a better life after  
death.

Aquinian transcendence  
supports that kind of lethargy.  
There is no need in that kind of  
soft tyrant transcendence.

*A problem occurs, to the „term“  
of “transcendence” when not  
clearly to determinate, and  
taketh away scientific arguments.  
Who thinks it over how to abolish  
a problematic “term” alike that of  
“trans-cendence” instead of  
“G...d”?*

*To use the expression of  
„transcendence“ in mathematics<sup>1</sup>*

---

<sup>1</sup> Leonhard Euler's cipher "e" represents a  
transcendent cipher, by formulating an infinite row.  
This mathematic transcendence is not  
philosophical scholastic neither theological  
transcendence, yet an exceed of algebraic  
potenciality, as during I. Kant's times L. Euler had  
defined (e, "...quid transcendit potestatem  
algebrae").

*rather differently meaneth here to use transcendent ciphers and non algebraic structures, and does not appear idem to encyclopedic definitions of supernatural or another world for transcendence after scholastic traditions.*

One cannot prove existence neither non existence of that scholastic kind of transcendence, which appears rather irrelevantly alike to prove “G...d”.

Believing in living after dead leads to an escape alike negation of reality and reason, and a flight from demands of reality.

There are differences between lifes individually and generally.

So this composition here is concerned with human abilities and achievements, human actions, human misachievements and hopes, and anxieties and

fears, or generally after common definitions of empirical psychology as science, regarding human actions (πραγμα, behaviour) and interactions of ideal (cognitive), instrumental (practical works and constructions) and social kind of individuals, and interacting with other individuals, inter-individual groups (formations), and cultures (formations) in time(s) and space(s) or at location(s).

Transcendence is just a word, and it's meaning is super abstract, and if one said there were transcendence, it were never concretely to reach nor to touch, neither to experience by those five human senses. And if one said there were no transcendence, the super abstract negation were not to proof either.

Thus: unknown transcendental “beginning” (excepting to start with

Euler's "e", which transcendently is based on the beginnings of mathematical axiomatics etc.), and towards unknown transcendent "end".

What were the sense to quarrel around abstract words which do not exist concretely?

What could that mean, to center a composition like this at an obviously indeterminable term of „transcendence“? At least, well, to stimulate reflection on an in dictionaries and encyclopedia “really” existing word, for “god” really exists in your dictionary, and C.G. Jung called „god“... „a psychic reality“.

Do not dialectical discourses on „transcendence“ etc., necessarily with diverging and opposite meanings, belong to democratic understanding of peace, liberty and tolerance?

Must it not be possible to deny „eternal living after death“, to deny “transcendence”, to deny

„god“ without being prosecuted by numb and extreme contrary exorcistic fanatics in democracy?

„Transcendence“ as life after death, as eternal being, as proceeding exceed of frontiers of real existence always had been up to philosophical questions, not at least in the works of Immanuel Kant.

Kant had ment, possibly frontiers of knowledge to exceed, and after having passed a frontiere one could recognize the sense and, what had been behind. An early experimental attempt in cognitive psychology.

Author here would not recommend anybody to commit suicide, if that „anybody“ believed in eternal live to prove, what were behind the frontier between life and death.

There are preachers and structures, which keep people „captives“ of believe to survive death.



Similarly, old Germanics had believed souls of deaths living in sea, in the ancient “element” of water. Soul is thus etymologically associated to sea, ocean.

This superstition as believe in life after death as „reincarnation“ is to find in many cultures, when in ancient times of evolution those super primates (German biologically “Oberprimaten” for menkind) in formations had developed their mythologies from a low level of developing science. And: christian belief in “resurrection” (Latin: a kind of rebellion) of ancient Roman slaves traditionally in the name of Jesus Christ is never “reincarnation”.

Nevertheless, ongoing existence can mean, discourse on, or delivering of creations, collections, distructions, by materialization of written, printed, painted etc. Of actions, works and deeds of a death person still

„live“ in mind and reminding people of the traditions about an author, composer, painter, architect etc., yet that is not individual ongoing of biological life of just one person, the dead person presently vivid.

Traditions of creations might be senseful for those living after, yet captives of and in formative conventions by power and money in greedy vitalist circumstances make “escape” or “flyght” senseless, emotionally and really, when there is no way back.

What does that mean, „immortal soul“? Were there a difference between “soul” and “psyche”, when “soul” were related to “sea” and “ψυχη” were a “butterfly” in Greek language?

Rather remind above definition (also lexically) of empiric scientific psychology.

*The „soul“ that church*

*propagates in aquinian tradition is not, excepting printed words. What paradoxical absurdly would consider „soul“ as material? How about Latin „animus“ and „anima“, even not seen as material after Aquino, yet in Armenian language as „dschun“ and „dschuna“ (also as address for “mister” and “mistress”)? Had Aquino forgotten early christian philosopher Tertullianus, who had seen „animus“ and „anima“ in connective relation to biological corpus of each person?*

*Structuring after the word „soul“ or „psyche“ absurdely appears rather like an element of unity as in mathematical group theories a zero. Zero, naught, etc. Is “notnot” existent behalves as words or symbols in languages, like a point of origin in geometrical more dimensional Cartesian coordinate-systems,*

*which origin does not exist, just in “mind”. To draw a point of origin is no point, yet already a surface of ink on a paper for example, as “starting point”, “end point”, etc.*

And what says the old testamentum in it's 2<sup>nd</sup> commandment, when not allowed to imagine „G...d“? (2M, 20, 4).

Yet Roman catholic church proclaims this Jesus of Nazareth a „god“, in tradition of Roman psycho-imperialism, when after concilium of Nicée (today's Iskender) emperor Constantinus agreed to put christian idols in place of the old Roman gods and goddesses, what had left to Jesus the function of Roman Mercury (Mercurius), etc. While the function of chief of gods, Jove (Jupiter), had been left to the Roman emperor.

According to J.W. Goethe (in: “Aus meinem Leben”) a mentor

to I. Kant, J.J. Brücker (historia philosophiae) had thought and thought Jesus rather having been a kind of Socrates and never Mercury, for Jesus had evacuated merchants, traders and money exchange bankers out of Jerusalem temple (Mk 11, 15; Joh 2, 14, 15).

If brevity were „the soul of wit“ (W. Shakespeare), one could remark “God” as etymological for “Goth”. Didn’t it appear strange, to name Jesus from Nazareth of gothical germanic tribe as Goth’s son, even as his genealogy is reported by the apostles as Israelian, levitic from house of king David, even when in the near Orient also Goths had settled and done service to Romans?

When Immanuel Kant had written in c.p.r. on transcendental esthetics, as a transcendental<sup>2</sup>

<sup>2</sup> Yet since I. Kant, differing from scholastic

and paralogistic research on potentiality of sensual perception („Sinneserkenntnis“), epistemically, and according to Kant’s analysis, senses to provide “Anschauungen” (observations, points of view, impressions, ideas) which lead directly to immediate imaginations („Vorstellungen“, also as ideas, expectations) of single subjects (single things). For example to imagine a rose will cause a cognitive decision of a single idea of a rose. The senses lead to “Empfindungen” (sensations, or, today rather to translate as perceptions), what analytically seen be not the endpoint. According to Kant there were still something regulating orders or structures to those „Empfindungen“ (sensations, perceptions) in

---

tradition, one should remark "transcendental" and "transcendent" not to use equally nor synchronically. The transcendental to Kant is apriorical infinite, past tense, historically, and according with I. Kant, transcendence to converge

space and time, what can lead from transcendental to transcendent.

Today one rather assumes, with human five senses in connection with central nervous system interactively and by sympathetical and parasympathetical functions regulate body and "soul". Thus, body and soul of an individual itself are neither super-sensual ghosts nor reincarnations.

Kant's frame of reference to realization of sensational invention to experience are the by Kant so called „paralogisms“ of „space“ and „time“:

“space” appears “para-logically” (or absurdly or paradoxally), if “space” as “empiric reality” had objective validity, yet were to be considered also as “transcendental ideality”, and were not existent without

---

to an exposteriorical infinite in future.

condition of possibility of experience.

Is „space“ reality, if it were neither real nor transcendental, yet appears infinitely (also related to „paralogistic quantity“ of real ciphers) and reality about „space“ were human given signs and setted scales in axiomatic (aprioric categorial) signs and rules in mathematics and words with grammars.

Analogously „time“ appears as „paralogism“, discussed by Kant, if had empirical reality and coincidentally transcendental ideality. As space and time appear infinite, men have structured „reality“ of time by setting measure and measurement.

As Kant had structured „sensations“ (developed science today would claim the term „perception“ for) by individuals in space and time, Kant's essay to remind categorial

“transcendentality” of space and time seems irrelevantly, as individual life ends, means limited and not super-naturally living in a next world, when there did not exist a former world or space, for also according to Kant, realization a priori seemeth impossibly, what concerns „the“ Kant-Laplace-theory, (arising of the world by dust and gases) too, a later put together ensemble Kant’s speculations on developing arise of stars and planets by mass circulations of dusts with Laplace’s idea of gases.

### *1.3. „Allsurrounding“, sensual experience, consciousness*

Kant’s paradoxa concerning space and time, also „antinomies“ of „last unconceiveability“ Carl Jaspers finds incomprehensible. Jaspers ment, the all, the hole („das

Ganze“) were as less determinable as human existence.

As scientists always approach frontiers of knowledge, they should try to exercise in radical readiness to new experience („radikale Bereitschaft zu neuer Erfahrung versuchen“) according to Jaspers, and: All in world existing and the world are surroundet by an absolute last surrounding calls Jaspers transcendence, “the surrounding ea ipsa, the surrounding of all surroundings” (“das Umgreifende schlechthin, das Umgreifende aller Umgreifenden”).

Here seems Jaspers to find a god of mysticians.

Scientists steadily claim one „big bang“ afore human existence...

Were that the „surrounding“?

What, if there had been instead of one big-bang lots of more big-bangs; not only a son big-bang, a father big-bang, a grand-father

big-bang, an over-grand-father big-bang etc., alike some biologists proclaim for understanding of procreation in comparison to creation?

Would that justify scientific speculations?

Transcendence is according to Jaspers not real, yet all existing and the world, all at all, can be cipher, symbol of transcendence. Later than Kant's critics of reason because of antinomies, paralogisms, Jaspers' mysticism from out all ciphers shiningly arises transcendence, appears irrelevantly, when leaving Kant's differentiation between categorical aprioric "transcendental" and exposterioric "transcendent".

Ciphers as symbols of supernatural of a next world do not exist, rather as symbols of symbols of symbols..., also considering real bio-physiological

regulations from individuals related to biotopic interactions and to development and evolution, also in semantics and semiotics.

After Jaspers' logics, „G...d“ were a cipher, which seems to lead back to Aquinian all-transcendence, while Kant already had distinguished between transcendental and transcendent about 150 years ago.

As the word „transcendence“ even is cipher and symbol, sign, appears „G...d“ irrelevantly as cipher of transcendence.

Group dynamically, social-, cultur- and mass-psychologically people seem to need something like a minimal multifold common word as „G...d“, in formations' contexts.

If one said there were no G...d existing in reality, may be ment a

kind of crude concrete materialist reality, neither dialectic nor with liberty or tolerance to paradoxies in a mathematical sence of operating with symbols on a relatively abstract level, also as a question of intelligence. How is that concrete reality related to sensual perception optically, haptically, tastingly, olfactorically, accoustically? And how is “abstract“ reality and how related to that „G...d“ or origin points in coordinata systems?

Imagine a flowerpot on windowsill in front of a window!  
An original not only imagined flowerpot on windowsill in front of a window with flower(s) in it appears to very most people objective reality, yet this flowerpot is coincidentally also a projection by retina and signalized by nerve axons, dendrites, synapses, crossing over at nervous optical chiasma

towards cortex, just an image-picture, and just a word symbolizing “flowerpot”.

Didn't you imagine accoustically, if someone said, “flowerpot”?

Accoustically soundwaves of a spoken word as “flowerpot” evoke via eardrum, labyrinth, cochlea and nerve directions to brain and cortex. Could you imagine a flowerpot? Is it a concrete flowerpot you can describe? Would others it describe the same?

Wouldn'd you agree: analogously similar would you get your concrete impressions and also abstract imaginations, by each other of the five senses, when the flower in the flowerpot may be an ognion which you can touch, you can smell, you can taste? That distinction between concreta and abstracta by I. Kant appears with that substance term turning epigone G.F. Hegel as about a thing as it is (“Ding an

sich”) and a thing what it means (“Ding für sich”), leading (an- und für sich) to denotation and connotation in semantics and to generative grammar (F. De Saussure; N. Chomski).

Signs of language *are* not the signed as structuralists claim.

Psychological descriptions of a human being *are* not it's psyche. *Aristoteles had claimed, the only valid were the real, what our five senses could experience.* Scientists love to find laws in their science, to structure orderly.

Well, there are not only natural sciences' laws, and differences in relation to what kind of „determination“, for there are not only laws in natural science, yet also democratical laws with rules in justice to „determinate“ human interactions.

The modern idea and realization of democracy starts in antique Greece and meaneth

gouvernement from people by people and for people. Today's peoples' gouvernement in representative democracy of free world is worthy to be human right. Democracy as human right implies a state in which opposition is not only possible, yet recognized as necessity by state's inhabitants, in a state where contradictions and differences<sup>3</sup> in peace and liberty were possible, in democratic distribution also sensu Montesquieu de la Brède with executively, legislatively and judicatively different functions and interactive control also by free elections.

Democracy, even as idea in the brains of people in totalitarian systems is not super-sensual, is not another world.

After German unification which

---

<sup>3</sup> Otto von Bismarck had claimed in his polit-theory, opposition to be necessary and political extremes to keep small at few numbers, what confirms also necessity of extremes, even if Bismarck in those times had found socialdemocrats extremes during his socialist prosecution.



was foreseen in the preamble of German federal law before unification, there is still missing that article on national fraternity („völkische Verbundenheit“), what should be exchanged by issue or commandment of „international friendship“. 2 + 4 peace treaty had also shown the sovjet red army allied to three western allies had been one army and no „fractioning“, when contributed to liberation from national socialism.

#### *1.4. Empirical ideality, ethics of freedom and culture.*

Must not human ethics be oriented to and involved with lifes, human lifes?

Do not “ethics”, “transcendent”, “G...d” etc. Share with language, with human languages.

What to expect by a supersensual G...d, who be as

well goddess of war as goddess of peace?

*If ethical norms were oriented toward respect of the human life, were that an ideal norm? What could that mean? Were there no difference between ideal norm and average norm?*

An average norm is oriented to a mathematical mean of representing all people's behaviour. An ideal norm is oriented towards real ethical imperatives. And that is no idealistical conception at all, yet empirical-real ideality, as lesson in ideas as cognitions with practical relevance.

An ideal norm were: all your teeth are o.k. An average norm were: you have dental caries like a mathematical mean of a population.

One could ask, What is normal? What to be normal?

If a cariesly average were defined as „normal“, sane teeth

were not normal.

If a mean as average parameter showed military service as normal average, consciousness objectors of war were deviant and not "normal".

Yet rather pazifism appears ethically the normal eo ipso, an empiric ideality in times of peace and liberty.

*Pacifism and militarism appear to differ as between intelligence and economics and power and violence.*

What does that mean, Kant trying to interprete with his „singularity in plurality and coincidently plurality in singularity“, („die Einheit in der Vielheit“ and „die Vielheit in der Einheit zu sehen“)? There does not seem any solution to kinds of interactive paradoxes or para logisms.

*According to C.R. Popper, no induction, only deduction were allowed:*

If democratic common sense were generally positive actional input deductively, singularity were democratical, too.

If singularity inductively gave a worse input , the generally common of plurality needn't be worse at all.

*War is not any fact of providential determinism!*

#### *1.5. Environment, ethics and self-actualisation*

Didn't one agree to keep, what is found well? How to take own decisions for conserving and preserving the best, at least for the kitchen, dinners, etc., and hardly or not in a political sense? If one were for conservation and conservative values needn't it coincidentally occur in party - political sense, already demonstrated by Albert Schweitzer („Kultur und Ethik“,

culture and ethics) and by his difference of "Weltanschauung" (global world view, philosophically abstract theoretical) to difference of „Lebensauffassung“ (life view, philosophically concrete practical), even if “weltanschauung” may influence “Lebensauffassung”, and vice vers, alike Baruch de Spinoza: „natura naturans, natura naturata“.

Sigmund Freud claims in ethical context learned norms of super-ego influenced by father figures. Yet it appears not only a single father figure to normalizing super-ego and it's ethics, yet rather environment, too, socio-economical contexts and social communication between other people in regard to mankind.

Doesn't ethical behaviour appear thus a not determined result by chance and accidentally indetermined interactional processes,

potentially differently valued and by different value experiences?

Doesn't oppression and suppression in children's educations let them become oppressors and suppressors themselves?

Education, pedagogical psychology, development, need no canings nor corporal punishments, if one would like to achieve democratic aims.

*Education in love and by positive reinforcements, rather would allow, to set limits, too, and to use words instead of corporal punishments, also to learn self-responsability and towards duties on the way toward self actualization.*

*Responsabilities, as in self-responsability accepted duties, are not responsibilities and duties themselves or to be commanded by others.*

### 1.6. *Myths, critical empirics and culture*

Religious myths, as „Ascension“, (German: „Himmelfahrt“ ~ journey to heaven) from Latin „ascendere“, to climb or ride on top of mountains, describe oftenly rather strange and inexplicable events, not able to reflect nor to repeat.

As Simon Petrus, adopte child to midwife Petronella (c.f. Hubertus Mynarek, 1995: „Jesus und die Frauen“. Eichborn. Ffm.) had been mistaken a double (probably one egg twin) of Jesus about prosecution night (Mt 26, 34-75; Mk 14, 30-72, Luc 22, 61), he had denied to know Jesus. Mistaken as a double to Jesus crucified, also by Maria Magdalena and Emmaus brothers (H. Mynarek writes of “hallucinations” or folie of Maria Magdalena, when having “seen” Jesus after his dead (Joh 20,

18), yet how to explain mass hallucinations at Emmaus (1 Mk 3, 40-57; 4 Mk 3, 9-50) when psychologically rather folie à deux exists?

A cause of danger to be mistaken that by Roman imperial sentence crucified Jesus, „double twin“ Simon Petrus (with Roman citizenship by Petronella) speedily hurried to get out of Jerusalem to coast over the mountains (ascension; in antique Greek and Roman mythology gods lived on mountains above the clouds) to ship for Rome, and became as Petrus first bishop in Rome.

One could consider differences in transcendental, transcendence and super-natural related to mythos Mythos and it's ethical aims, while mesusa claims to love g...d and your next as you yourself, (Luc 10, 29-36).

### 1.7. Reality and transcendence

If spoken about the „ego“ were real and not transcendent, there were set a difference between transcendental (possibly “id”, reality “ego”, and transcendence “super ego”), about reality were all material, and transcendence all non material. Against this kind of common sense, Jean Paul Sartre had published about “Transcendence de l’Ego”, also concerning his “Psychanalyse Existentielle”.

It would be a contamination of levels of abstract and concrete to equalize or synchronize a difference between transcendence and reality with a difference between idealism and materialism. Anyhow one could and should ask today, for what idealism and what materialism.

Thus, an ego-conception concerns ideas, *and* it is real in sense of above difference, as it

is linked with psycho-physiologic and biologic processes of a human individual, related to reflex-learning of language.

As reality appears an abstract term, one can see oneself engaged with the question after reality of reality of reality... Realities appear rather not statically, yet mere dynamically.

*The real “ego”, personality, is not statical, yet dynamical and grammatical.*

Languages develop and change in environment during processes of adaptations and accommodations between development of learning and teaching, also as results of historical developments of human voices with sounds and noises as chirp-cheeps or roaring toward grammars, even if they were boring.

Really not boring appears a look after „god“ up to „A Grammar Of English Words“ by Harold E.

Palmer (1938, ed. 1969). The word „god“ appears thus even in grammars.

Were heaven not existent with all it's colours and clouds? Were heaven zero, nothing? Nothing is what is not, yet the word really exists and a heaven with all it's (spectral) colours and clouds exists.

Were that foolish, psychotical?

Psychosis does not appear to objectivate as translated the word „psychosis“ as „soul-less“, and the above discussed problem, now adopted to the word „soul“.

Sigmund Freud (GW XVII, „Abriss der Psychoanalyse“, „outline of psychanalysis“ /“Abriss“ can also mean „pull down“, in German language) claims “thus, the dream is a psychosis”, and “psychosis to be the effect of individuals in conflict with environment”. The dilemma appears, when dreams are seen

actional aims and located at the individual, even if Freud had cited I. Kant's “pragmatic anthropology”, where “dreams” appear as a kind of collective aims or visions as the “dream” of the French revolution.

How ever to objectivate „soul-less“ or „psychosis“? Thomas Szasz speaks of "myth of psychosis" and of „fabrication of madness“.

Psychosis as myth is correlated to christianism, according to Szasz.

Today, there appear no more cremations of heretics and witches, whatfor instead they use diagnosis of psychosis.

Power of clerus and psychiatrists seem to complete an alliance of counter-ratio with rationalizing ratio.

Bibel, full of plenty of psychotic stories records, for example in psalm 69, David to cry for help, as he fears to sink in a boggy

swamp. Was that anxiety or fear, to fear to sink in a swampy bog? Was that a total psychotic over flooding, or rather a phobia with derealizations?

### 1.8. Is „heaven“ a nothing?

Was „nothing“ now „transcendent“, “super-natural” or “transcendental”? Can’t „nothing“ coincidentally be defined or inferred by „being“, “existence” as “non-existence”?

If there was no existence, the „nothing“ could not be a theme and one could not speak of non-existence, and with no existence even existence was no theme.

„Nothing“ appears absurdly, nor transcendental, neither transcendent, neither real: it be absurde, paradoxal, L. Wittgenstein’s silence (“Tractatus logico-philosophicus”), or Sören Kierkegaard’s despair (as

“desease toward death”).

As existentialists claimed anxiety a basic fact of human life, anxiety was to consider relatively and not absolutely, nor statically, neither dynamically.

To affirm an idea by S. Freud according also to common sense, concerning human psychological sanity: the psychological sane human being lives and works.

Concerning self actualization there could oppositely appear the problem of alienation.

Simple structured menkind could rather find self actualization in peaceful social communication, nearly a kind of “élan vital” and dependent on social and democratic structural inputs in formations and society.

Peaceful democratic communication together can stabilize and help individuals to live stably without anxieties, as human beings have language,

music and possibilities to learning and education, etc.

Thus, potential self-actualization appears in individual's activities, within formations, also as Πολιτεια, (Platon, "the state").

How to do actional inputs to distribute functions of educators to ameliorate learning, learning anew and to structuring experiencing wellness?

*Didn' that imply educating educators?.*

*Modern education had already learned and teaching teachers how to teach (didactics) and learning how to learn methods of reinforcements.*

That „educating mankind“ (G.E. Lessing: „Erziehung des Menschen-Geschlechts“) had not only been actual in times of Lessing or J.J. Rousseau, it's actuality is still going on, also in ongoing problems of learning languages.

Depending on relations to

languages, be it Sezuan Chinese, Hawaiian, Turk, or hebrew, the word for „heaven“ would be translated as „God“ and „God“ als „heaven“ (haw. „Äloha“, „elua“). Those „Älohim“ (hebr. „heavens“ in plural) have also their different colours of spectrum.

### *1.9. transcendence, signs, structures*

As hole be more and different as some of parts, one could imagine, yet how to ever analyze holistics?

Even it could take still times, when science reached it's end, and still going on.

Trying to find solutions and effects to aims, scientists use signs, symbols, ciphers and stucture with words, and try to approach „reality“. Those approaches never reach the



hole, yet progresses in sciences obviously had ameliorated comfort and prosperity and enjoyment, also toward love and self actualization.

*Concerning militarism Germans have had to learn and still have to, after two world wars to go on basing of democratic fundamentals in constitution and it's axiomatics toward ethics of respect of human life implicitly in constitutional articles, which also can be taken aims in sense of maximes.*

#### *1.10. Love is not unlimited*

Jesuites, Jews, and Hugnots had found refuge in Prussia during edict of tolerance by F. II R.

Outside Prussia's frontiers, they hardly understood „tolerance“, and when rather as tolerances in technical construction measurement.

Uprising with French revolution „liberté aux actions“ would rather ma(t)ch Prussian idea of tolerance.

Philosophical understanding, liberty, freedom, tolerance, and love had had, have had and still have limits.

*Table: Popper took Kant an indeterminist („Metaphysik und Kritisierbarkeit“, 1958) who did not match to any of Popper's five directions in philosophy:*

1. *Determinism*
2. *Idealism*
3. *Irrationalism*
4. *Voluntarism*
5. *Nihilism* .

*Popper (1995) keeps indeterministic consense of critical science with Kant.*

Determinism would lead to loss of liberty and also to abolish reciprocal ideas in sciences.

Alike “end of transcendence” by

deadly termination or fatum of individual human life, there would not rest any time, to utilize the terms of “time”, neither of “transcendence”, neither of “existence” neither “fatum” neither any individual human verbalization, neither Heideggers phantasm, time would tanscend existence, neither Teilhard de Chardin’s “man in cosmos”, neither Begson’s “élan vital”.

As “love is not unlimited”, there would result a cultural an ethical problem in reciprocal “unlimited”.

As long as science goes on, “last word” never would be spoken.

Thus, calvinist John Jack Brucker (Johann Jakob Brücker) had well been able, to stand Immanuel Kant’s rather personal polemics in “Prolegomena”, for a “last word” never would touch scientific developement, alike Kant’s unity in time reciproke to I. Newton’s time in unity, when

$$1/t \times t/1 = 1.$$

Author and copyright:

DP Kurt-Wilhelm Laufs, Dipl.-Psych. (phil. & min. med. Fak.), ev. KiR i.R., Privatgelehrter, cum facultate docendi, © 1993/95: Rev. 2009-02-05, 2009-11-03, 2009-11-05, 2009-11-05, 2009-11-16, 2010-05-18, 2010-07-29, 2010-08-01, 2010-09-22, 2011-01-31, 2011-02-03, 2012-02-29, 2012-03-07, 2013-01-10, 2013-04-29; shortened English revision 2014-09-02, update 2015-04-01, 2015-04-22, 2016-02-20, ©