

Attachment zu "Zwischen Individuum und Masse I"/Between Individual and Mass I

## *Between Individual and Mass, I.*

*As an English summary to author's text in German language:*

### *"End of transcendence".*

*By Kurt-Wilhelm Laufs*



*Update 2015-03-26, ©*

#### *Contents:*

Kant and after/

From totalitarian transcendence towards ethics  
of liberty/

Universality, consciousness, liberty/

Love is not unlimited.

*Avant propos: Kant and after. „Πραγμα“ in the Greek language means Action, and could be understood as a trinity in a cognitive, behavioural and biological way according to body and soul unity, a conception differing since Kant versus Aquin. Aquinian transcendence ends with Immanuel Kant, who*

differs further between apriorically categorically as transcendental, (like infinite past), and ex posteriori as transcendent, (like infinite future). This book considers finally, love nor to be without frontiers neither unlimited, rather provocatively and strange to those who believe in unlimited love or love without frontiers. The author tries here to postulate „end of transcendence“. Thomas Aquin's universal transcendence which takes transcendental and transcendent the same is finished with Immanuel Kant. Super naturality or super sensation is not real. God is not real in that sense, yet “god” appears really in written or printed papers or dictionaries. Super sensational is as superstition alike personifications of that old phantasmagoria of “god” and it's projectivations of human phantasies in times and spaces, well of psychological relevance, as phantasies are subjects of psychological interest as well as ever lasting life of individuals. Individual life after death is not real in biological sense. Most metaphysics cumulate in Aquin or derive from, still in opposition to Immanuel Kant's

“meta-physics”, whose “Ideen-Lehre” (in critics of pure reason: K.d.r.V.) is described as mostly “idealism”, yet could also be translated as “lesson on ideas/terms”, when a beginning of cognitive psychology. Since Kant had “falsified” historical proofs of “god” and spoken of that impossibility of those proofs, positivists consider “god” as irrelevant. Yet “god” had to be “invented” after Kant. Infinite unknowns (not yet known) in the past in direction of transcendental categorical apriority or axiomatic differs from the future unknown in the future in direction of transcendent. The already at I. Kant discussed problem of “Begriff” (idea, term), which appears in modern general semantics, shows like modern structuralism’s phrase “the sign is not the signed” that everlasting scientifically problem with the infinite. At least, “God” as transcendental and transcendent does not appear irrelevantly in a sense of mass or cultural psychology: a word within a human second reflex-system (I. P. Pavlov) socialized in companion to signs, signals, to language adoption and in cultures, with environmental

and climatic conditions in times, and linked with relations to human reflex-systems and social and cultural realities. Here, the author tries, to formulate a different view on that old nasty discussion of materialism versus idealism towards a more kantian and differing view of transcendence versus empirical reality. That leads to modern psychological concepts in theory, with Lotze, Herbarth, Wundt and Fechner starting in kantian empiricism and leading to modern humanistic psychology, when Kant's postulate of unity of body and soul had begun to influence psychology seriously. That non deterministic input by Kant, stimulating modern psychology, asks for how to find scientific laws moving psychological activities, laws alike how to calculate astronomically the time of a next eclipse, a structural analogy alike the attempt of homologous descriptions in modern structuralism. Modern psychological and humanistic theorists (Abraham Maslow among) tend to show a suite in motivation of man kind of shelter, satisfaction of needs, love and recognition towards self-actualization.

Human culture will respect of human life, also as an epistemological need. I. Kant had formulated the unity of human body and soul in K.d.r.V. [“Kritik der reinen Vernunft”], and after he had left his Socratic mentor John Jack Brücker count of Königsberg, (author of a history of philosophy in Latin) when Kant became frightened to leave Königsberg, (today Kaliningrad), as he could not solve the “bridge-problem” of logics, not to step twice over each bridge in that old city, without passing any bridge twice, (and Kant might have answered to Brücker to swim through that river Pregel and Brücker had told to Kant that he had to get a rope first, or he never would leave Königsberg: Kant never had left Königsberg a live long, yet he had had just to use an offered rope to climb down and up the steep shores of river Pregel, not to step twice over a bridge): thus, Kant had dedicated 2<sup>nd</sup> edition of K.d.r.V., to knight-baron von Zedlitz “allerunterthänigst”, (probably a bow afore an Aquinas). A possible solution to the bridge-problem can be looked for, outside the given structure of postulate. After K.d.r.V.

appears Kant's "critics of practical reason" (Kritik der praktischen Vernunft, K.d.p.V.) with that "categorical imperative", so to act that maximum-direction of individual's will always could serve a common legislation. If this ethic were categorical, it were apriorically in direction of transcendental, thus the past and the imperative shows forwards, exposteriorically and in direction to transcendent, thus the future. Thus, the categorical imperative in K.d.p.V. at Kant appears absurde or contrary to K.d.r.V. with regard to the Aquin transcendence problem, yet as attempt to leave a given structure and look outside for solutions, that obvious paradox does no more appear absurde, when psychology asks for motivation, which could show in the case of categorical imperative to ask for motives in the past, own tradition, history, socialization of the individual in times and at locations. Thus, motivation has two directions, causing as possible questions the "why" (in the past) and the "what for" (in the future). Within the field of motivation, modern empirical general psychology stresses, starting



since Kant with the individual as unit, developmental, personality, as well as social psychological interests, and psycho-biological and psycho physiological learning theories around learning, thought, perception, emotion and conflict. Kant's postulate of unity of body and soul had already begun earlier with Aristotle and to be found also with Baruch de Spinoza, and leading via Lotze, Herbarth, Fechner and Wilhelm Wundt's first psychological laboratory to modern psychology with a common definition as science of the individual and its experiencing and behaviour (cognitive or ideal actions and social and instrumental actions) related to other individuals, groups, culture in space and time. While I. Kant utters (in: K.d.r.V.), "I think, thus I am as a thinking (biological) being conscious and substance (soul)". Later philosophers like Hegel, Husserl, and Heidegger turn that substance "Begriff" (idea, term) by Kant towards Aquin, when they proclaim, all substance to be animated opposing that direction of thinking individuality and his substantial self

reflection; in short: a thinking human being is conscious, is soul, after Kant. Yet after Hegel even pabbles have a soul. I. Kant's polemics on pietistic reverend Schwedenborg in „Träume eines Geistersehers“, (“dreams of a ghost visionary”), show already the direction of Kant's realism in his concern with human ideas and their metaphysics, which stimulated modern psychology, also as cognitive psychology. *Immanuel Kant's empirical pragmatics (K.d.r.V.) can show the start to modern psychological ideas and terms, and conceptions as the short (kantian synonyms') glossary shows: Anschauungen (K.d.r.V.), (perceptions)/ Apperzeption (K.d.r.V.), (apperception)/ Begriff (K.d.r.V.), (term, figure, signal)/ Bewusstsein (K.d.r.V.), (consciousness)/ Einheit (unit, singularity, individuality, and as „Einfalt“ simplicity)/ Empfindung (perception linked with connotations, sensation, yet not sensu feeling)/ Kategorischer Imperativ (K.d.p.V.): ethische Selbstbestimmung mit sozialem Bezug, (self actualizing ethics with social relation)/ Kategorien (K.d.r.V.), (categories, apriorical*



*dimensions and axiomatics)/ Leib-Seele  
 Einheit (K.d.r.V.), (body and soul unity)/  
 Motivationslehre (K.d.p.V.), (motivation-  
 theory)/ Paralogismen (K.d.r.V.),  
 (paralogisms as contradictions in meeting  
 infinitesimal directions, Cartesian  
 functionality)/ Personalität (K.d.r.V.)  
 (Personality)/ „Träume eines Geistersehers“  
 (T.e.G.), (dreams, dream interpretation)/  
 Vielheit (variety, plurality, mass). - Aktionale  
 Paralogismen der Persönlichkeit in Raum und  
 Zeit (K.d.r.V.), (Kant's personality theory): >  
 „Idealität“ als Kognition, (terms, figures,  
 signals, ideas, ciphers as cognitions); >  
 „Simplizität“, „Einfalt“ sensu „Einheit“ als  
 Angemessenheit (K.d.r.V.), (simplicity as  
 unity and appropriateness); > „Quantität“,  
 (quantity); > „Qualität“, (quality). Aquin's  
 transcendence is out and a real transcendental  
 axiomatic scale is respect of human life,  
 reasonably in spaces and times between  
 transcendental and transcendence  
 “paralogisms” of here and now.*

*From totalitarian transcendence towards ethics of liberty:* When in the following the term transcendence is used by the author, the meaning is based on the Latin word "transcendere" - to transit or to do transition/exceed, even in Immanuel Kant's differentiation between transcendental and transcendent, contrasting holistic Aquinian "transcendence". The author holds the position that there is no life after dead. There is no transcendental regression to a former world. There is no transcendence to a next world. The here and now has other dimensions, motivational dimensions of real world problems for individuals on earth in our days of shelter, need, love, recognizing and self-actualisation. We find to the infinite problem of that term "transcendence", and not objectively to precise. To use this term "transcendence" seems useless. The term „transcendence“, used in mathematics<sup>1</sup> according transcendent ciphers and non

<sup>1</sup> That Euler figure (cipher) "e" marks e.g. a transcendent figure of an infinite row, yet that mathematical transcendence is not philosophical neither theological transcendence, yet ("quid transcendit potestatem algebrae") an exceed of possibilities of algebra according to Leonhard Euler.

algebraic structures, does not appear identical to dictionaries' definitions of supernatural about philosophical scholastics. Tyranny of "transcendence" appears rather the problem than "tyranny of logos", when transcendence of sign is seen as signed or the term replaces the fact. There is no proof about life after death. Yet there is differed between individual life and common life in general. Psychology in time and space is thus rather concerned with individuals, groups and cultures and their ideal, social, and instrumental actions and interactions. To use a term which cannot be used as the term "transcendence" shows there really to exist the term, which does not exist in reality. If "eternal life" were "transcendent", there were to differentiate between individual life simplex and plurality multiplex of varieties of life in spaces, locations and times. Prognostics to future infinites appear speculatively or with "god" as holistic everything explanation for numb or obsessive cases as a kind of father of the only big bang. Who asks, if there were not or had not been many different big bangs of a kind of

“breathing” universe compressing elsewhere (c.f. compression alike Vega approach in milky-way) and expanding anywhere else at same times and changing chaotically comparing to crystallization processes and eruptive fluidities? A mass psychological need for “god” were comparingly to a really non-existent point of zero, yet existing by definition within in a coordinate system, if there didn’t appear Kant’s paralogisms, spacely, and timely as a different name for “god” as the “Eternal”.

What’s on with the expression “psyche“, or synonymously „animus et anima“, or even “soul”? As ψυχη in Greek means “soul” and “butterfly” and medieval people still did not differ between birds and flying insects (in Germany “bird” ~ “Vogel”, in medieval German “bird” ~ “Vagel” ~ all flying insects), there could have been ment etymologically the “soul bird”, a kind of “ef roach” (“*af ric*”, also spirit or zero smell, or zero smoke) since ancient Egyptian times. As Latin “animus et anima” ~ male and female soul and spirit mark “psyche” by difference of the sexes, the

Germanic word “soul”, German “Seele”, would remind that ancient superstitious believe, souls as spirits and ghosts of died Germanics to rest or survive in sea (See). The word “soul”, the term “psyche” really exist in today’s language, without ancient connotations, rather preconscious, and just tyrants who can’t stand those varieties of “transcendence” try to describe other tyrants their view of transcendence as real and the only truth. Did you ever see a soul? Thus, obviously, “soul” or “psyche” (excepting butterflies) do not exist. Yet the word for is real. What ever has soul to be? Social communication appears different from ordered definitions of the not to be defined. Is it the fun question versus starvation? Individual and mass appear in Immanuel Kant’s work already long before that alienation hypothesis of mass societies. Individual psychology depends also on environmental relations as dialectically mass psychology depends on individuals. As modern scientific psychology starts centred at the individual, what could be nearer, as Kant had formulated paralogisms of personality, to

use “psyche” within a frame of personality within possible cartesian systems with Kant’s infinite terms of transcendental and transcendence? Americans of today find Kant a phenomenologist, yet his structuring having followed, this kind of empiricism, might be empirical phenomenology is quite different to just descriptive methods of superstitious. The “critics of pure reason” (K.d.r.V.) form a structure for more objective observation of human ideas’ actions and cognitions, rather analytic philosophically axiomatics about 6 generations before Rudolph Carnap. The term “reason” about Kant’s times rather differs from our days’. The origin of a coordinate system does not really exist, does it? Yet, an idea like a point. That since Pythagoreans’ problem is that of paralogisms of infinites. The senses are which provide us perceptions (“Anschauungen”), according to Immanuel Kant’s analysis. When senses provide perceptions („Anschauungen“) sensu direct impressions (as „Vorstellungen“ ~ images ~ ideas) about singular things as judgement of singular impression (e.g. “a rose”), the senses



deliver perceptions (Empfindungen) linked with connotations, yet not at least: for transcendental and transcendent paralogisms there must be something that puts those “Empfindungen” into an order of space and time. Scientific development up to date shows our senses in connection to nerve receptors and axons with axons within the regulative brain and central nerve system together with environmental developmental interactions and processes and concerning bio physiological processes and interactions. The human bio physical reflex system of primary and secondary reflexes is not at all super natural, yet real and appears within relatively stable structures immanently and at the same time paralogistically that immanence within structures of space and time from transcendental direction towards transcendent direction. That paradox or paralogism of space, discussed at Kant (in K.d.r.V.) is attributing to “space”, (“Raum”), “empirical reality“, (“empirische Realität”), of objective validity, and at the same time attributed by “transcendental ideality”, (“transzendente

Idealität"), thus appearing a nothing under condition of leaving out that human possibility of empirical reflective experience. Is that "space" real, if it were qualitatively whether real nor transcendental, yet of infinite appearance, and with regard of quantity of terms and numbers, and that "real" about "space" as by human putting and rulers' or schedules' and terms' ? Even paradoxical or paralogistic appears to Kant, as time has empirical reality and in the same time transcendental ideality. As space and time appear infinitely, there will rest to us human beings that "reality" by already human structured measurement, and transcendental and transcendent infinities would appear irrelevantly. Reflecting axiomatics could possibly avoid a tyranny of transcendence. To ask rather in a modernist way as "new" French "philosophers" after "tyranny of logos" (c.f. J. Benoist), the author here poses from out his view rather a tyranny of transcendence. G. Lacan had spoken before of a twittering of logos. A lack of differentiation to transcendence rather seems to lead towards

tyranny than behaviourally and objectively reflected logics. A lack of objectivity in logics leads towards “fuzzy logics”, and “fuzzy logics” without understanding of wit and humour rather could lead to that French described “tyranny of logos”, if authoritarianism of fuzzy logics of authoritarian obedience ruled, at least a problem of cultural conditionings of language, education and aims; (for example: if you asked in the French language in Germany for a soup, potage with parsley or “soupe avec persil”, you should have considered and made sure not to get that washing powder soap called “Persil” instead of parsley into your soup; if you asked in Cologne in the Dutch language for “halve han”, half a chicken, you would get a small bread with butter and cheese: they call their small breads with butter and cheese so. And if you wonder why Dutch call a big fried pork filet “biefstuk van de haas”, literally as “beefsteak from hare”, you needn’t wonder, it’s just called so). Behind that “term” problem of objectivity and normativity in relation to transcendence

should be to be found that conscious reflective discussion on not only axiomatics, yet standards, standardization and comparability of “norms”: whether an average norm for statistical inferences and probabilities, whether an ideal norm projectively and it’s acclamation by democratic meaning. Everybody would agree that caries is worse to teeth and should be avoided, as ideal norm. Since spread of fluorides, those formerly average norm gaps and holes by caries have gone off rapidly and that average has approached ideal.

*”Universality“, consciousness, liberty:*

Those Kant paradoxes in paralogisms are as antinomies taken in a holistically attempt at Carl Jaspers at least incomprehensible and the hole could not be explained by science as like the human existence. Scientists meet their limits (“Genzen” ~ limits, frontiers), and gone so far, they have to try a radical readiness towards new experience, according to Carl Jaspers. That universal or holistic view at C. Jaspers postulates a transcendence of world

and all existence within as to be “umgriffen” (seized, taken, surrounded) by a last absolute seizing. (“Transcendence“ is, sensu C. Jaspers, "das Umgreifende schlechthin, das Umgreifende aller Umgreifenden"). At that point of view, Jaspers appears in a mystical god believe. Oftenly, scientists suggest our world existence structured by and after a big bang. Was that the all seizing or transcendence according to Jaspers? How about that idea of not only one, yet continuously changing and interactively within “breathing” alike universe? Those “one reason” ideas would consequently postulate big bang, father big bang, and grand father big bang, and over grand father big bang, etc., obviously childish. To Jaspers’ transcendence is not real, yet all existing in the world. Everything can be term, cipher, and symbol of transcendence. “God” were a cipher (“Chiffre”) to Jaspers’ speculative mystical logics that lead back to Aquin, about two hundred and fifty years after Immanuel Kant, who had already differed between transcendental and transcendent. Never the less, “God” appears after Jaspers as

irrelevantly, as “God” like “transcendence” appearing both “Chiffre”. With realism, and to differentiate relative immanence from relative transcendental and transcendent within structures, there appears obviously an immanence problem of about infinite abstracts, objectivity and standards. To put transcendent ciphers into every day’s life makes uncomfortable and getting fuzzy-logics. Those in western science relatively immanent structural axioms alike standards of perception by 5 senses physiologically related to the nerve and reflex systems and related to human actions and interactions in space and time need no mystifications of mal adopted conditionings, nor appropriate to science, nor to western culture. The problem of language differences with peculiar grammars, semantics with denotations and connotations appears also related to perception of reality. Already Aristotle had postulated just to take as valid, what can be perceived by our 5 senses, and became the first metaphysician. Our 5 senses cannot perceive a numinous “god”, yet experience the real existing term by acoustical



perception, written by visual perception and by social learning. Thus “god” appears social and mass psychologically of peculiar relevance and is not irrelevant to society, rather may be to individuals with very different and variations at work and fields of research in times and spaces. “Experience” of that “god” (acoustical and visual) perception is accompanied by social conditionings since childhood: pro versus contra, reinforced versus punished, and with group (society, culture) dynamical aims and effects. It appears less beneficent to philosophers to discuss that cultural chimera than to priests in western culture(s) and world wide, and priests and “theologians” earn very respectably by ritualistic stupid stultifying the people towards shrewish and peacockish unconsciousness. Instead of teaching their rather all-round knowledge, priests recur to train ritualistic formulas calling their crowd guilty and put themselves by those rites in state of judge-like forgiving divine grace, where human consciousness appears sinful; and that by tyranny of that divine transcendence postulate

that calls thoughts, words and practices even sinful and produce masses of alienated hypocrites who prosecute dissidents. As religion (in Latin “religio” ~ “Rückbesinnung” in German) means “consciousness of the past” it is concerned with the transcendental and not at all with the transcendent! To mingle democratic constitutional laws with canonical and “religion” in a transcendent sense with “confession” does not only trouble scientists and democrats, yet every democrat. Those confessionalist crazy transcendence fanatics have often shown in history not to respect life. Respect of life, respect of nature and our world and not that indefinable next world beyond is human concern, and not waiting for a numinous salvator, yet acting and *giving sense oneself* (A. de Saint-Éxupérie). A problem to liberty can appear in democratically uncontrolled transcendence faith-behaviour and helpers’ syndrome. Respect of life asks carefully to handle, asks to consider the uniqueness of life with respect to the end (sensu Aesop). Structural actualisation is thus concerned with the real,

with the actual “immanent” and here scientists can work with terms in freedom and consciousness, even when they reflect about really not existing transcendence, just to reflect their conditionings. Discoveries and realizations of scientific work and realization of democracy need contradictions and freedom of thoughts in opposite directions. The self actualizing human being knows about the lost of this kind of “next world beyond” transcendence phantasies and acts self determined, not waiting for salvation by any phantasmagoria, not waiting to be filled up with a sense, yet makes the sense him or herself. *That Prussian “ethics of duty” can be understood since Immanuel Kant in a self responsible way for duties, not to mingle responsibility with duty. Self responsibly done duties can be denied or left, when duties ignore that self responsibility, trying to urge cadaver mentality of obedience. There is no oath to a tyrant to be kept.*

*Love is not unlimited:*

Philosophical tolerance and love had had and

have their limits and frontiers, even internationally. To differ a kind of transcendent tolerance towards a realistic view, tolerances in engineering are concerned with measurement tolerances, as one percent tolerance for example on a meter, there might be accepted a tolerance of ten millimetres, (e.g. in carpenter work). *“Measurement” tolerances in modern psychology are pre defined* at three stages with one star at results about 5 %, (0,05), with two stars at 1 %, (0,01), and with three stars at 0,1 %, (0,001), *of error probability after statistics and psychometrical data* empirics after input-output regulations. Carl R. Popper (“Logik der Forschung”, 1934) is not so very distant from Immanuel Kant, who bases on ancient Greek logics with “thesis” and “antithesis” (the two λόγοι after that sophist’s school) and postulates “synthesis”. To structure scientific argumentation, at Popper we can find that Kant “thesis” as *“naught-hypothesis”*, that “antithesis” as *“alternative hypothesis”*, and instead of “synthesis” (in times, when statistical probability and inference methods

still had been unknown and just started about with Pascal, Euler, Gauss, Fraunhofer, Maxwell), Popper had introduced that postulate of probability in decision making, still according to Kant with that *interdiction of induction* logics, and leaving the only possibility of deductions. *There is no proof or verification* (different semantic misunderstanding Dutch “steun” as “verificatie”) *according to Popper, yet one could only deny, “falsify” whether an alternative-hypothesis whether naught-hypothesis by facts and their probabilities.* Popper (“Metaphysik und Kritisierbarkeit”, 1958) calls Kant an „indeterminist“, whom he does not list in his systematic of philosophical directions: „*Determinismus*“ (*determinism*)/ „*Idealismus*“ (*idealism*)/ „*Irrationalismus*“ (*irrationalism*)/ „*Voluntarismus*“ (*voluntarism*)/ „*Nihilismus*“ (*nihilism*). Popper keeps a consensus of critical science with Kant, and looking forward with probabilities, looking back to Socrates and Heraklith (“*παν τα ρει*”).

*Ethic test:*

paper-pencil procedure with 18 questions. Ethics may lead from Kant to Albert Schweitzer on dimensions of (perceptive) understanding of life (“Lebens-Auffassung”), truth toward principles (maximes), (perceptively) individuals view on the world (“Welt-Anschauung”), which had lead to author’s structuralistic test in ethics of 8 theoretical factors. Coefficient of consistency  $r_{tet} \sim .86$ ; ( $\alpha < 0,001$ ) and with high selectivities,  $r_{tet} > .90$ , after a German sample of 20 individuals, validation by factor analysis shows 2 main components: one of a kind of democratic life-style (empirical ethics), clearing 74%, and one of a kind of authoritarianism, clearing 25 %, All clearing 99%, Cronbach  $\alpha \sim .999$ . Following classical testing theory of objective, reliable and logically validation procedures: at a small sample rather high tendencies. Scaling problem by naught is discussed.

*Terms://* critical science/ transcendental/ transcendent / scaling problem/ cipher theory/ infinitesimal problem/ empirical ethics/ humanistic psychology. *Schlüssel-Wörter:* kritische Wissenschaft, transzendental, transzendent, Skalierungs-Problem, Zahlen-Theorie, Infinitesimal-Problem, empirische Ethik, humanistische Psychologie.

No e-mails, please! Bitte keine e-mails.

Kurt-Wilhelm Laufs, Dipl.-Psych. (phil. & min. med. fac.), ev. KiR i.R., Zum Resthof 2, D-23996 Bobitz;  
© English 2010-03-18, 2010-03-19, 2010-04-03, 2010-07-31, 2010-08-02. 2013-09-29, korr. 2014-09-01, update 2015-03-26, ©