

Between Individual and Mass. As English summary to: *Achilles and the turtle. What does that mean? The "Structuralism? Is Structuralism Theory Of Immanence? Towards A "Post-Structuralism" / "A Theory of Quanta in Psychology*

On reflecting structural psychology: Oftenly discussed, "the" structuralism is "a" structuralism, yet not "one" structuralism and "sign" is not "signed", and the "term" is not the "termed", neither in history, nor in present, nor in future. What could be closer to ask for, if structuralism were theory of immanence?

Is structuralism theory of immanence? The author could answer, "I do not know", and hardly begun, the book had already come to an end. If the author were sure he did not know he could stop with discussion. He could stop with if he agreed to naught hypothesis the sense were nonsense. If there were no transcendental and no transcendence sensu Immanuel Kant, structuralism were immanence theory. Quite obviously structuralism is no theory of transcendence sensu Aquin. With Philippe Nemo and other post-structuralist modern philosophers there appears again the transcendence postulation at Paris mode, since 1977. A reaction appears a turn back to Aquinian transcendence by those thinkers, who seemed to have had a source in French structuralism. Like Jean-Marie Benoist among those new philosophers some call logics a "tyranny of logos". In common those leaving structuralism they seem inspired by a kind of new romantics and idealizing critics of understanding, close to despair of present times. The risen amount of French publications on "vitalism" (discussing after e.g. "élan vital", Henri Bergson, ou Teilhard de Chardin) among new philosophy in France (obviously after look on French publications in internet about 2007), 30 years after 1977, shows that new romantic wave. Never the less, structuralism has not yet come to an end. It will still be possible to act with terms within structures and to elaborate new structures by terms and inventions of symbols, signs, terms, to different or new structures. Use of the word "action" (πράγμα) by the author can facilitate that always appearing language and understanding problem, when thinking in German, Dutch, French and English as current languages of science. That important term "behaviour" appears as translated term "Verhalten" in German, as "gedrag" in Dutch and twofold als "comportement" and "conduite" in French language. To use the word "act" (to act, action) after old philosophical tradition (το πράγμα, ποειν, πράττειν, Latin: action, agere), there might be a further range of integrative and not eccentric understanding of current languages of western science, especially with the French language. There might be no need for determinism neither for transcendence in structuralism, when creative intelligence in freedom and liberty leads itself to cognition and consciousness about those infinites. To act with, or structure with, or discover scientific "laws" appears individual psychologically aside creative thinking of individual persons and related to living persons and/or material subjects and different to legislation or juridical laws in relation with rules for masses, and quite different from those angels in heaven romantic transcendental phantasies, who discuss "seriously" whether the colour of angels' wings were silver or golden, not yet really conscious what an angel were... (c.f. "Ars Vivendi", Balthazar Garcian y Morales, S.J.). That discussion on determinism would lead to power questions, to questions after obedience and authoritarianism versus democratic freedom and liberty, would lead after the question whether logics were tyranny and after what circumstances, and after circumstances of transcendence theories and what "logical" deductions by those theories, and analogously it could also be spoken of "tyrannies of transcendences", as the word "transcendence" is not transcendence.

That urges even value free sciences towards ethics and discussion of determination. Scientists of today could "shoot" atomic cores by accelerating electrons with accelerations up to velocity of light and had further postulated some quarks and top quarks etc. "inside", yet considering that Heisenberg relation of "Unschärfe" (out of focus; comme flow), the quanta of work (effect) to be smaller or equal the product of impulse times location, one could find a lack of postulate of determination, and that insecurity in microscopical "dimensions" transferred to macroscopical dimensions or events could falsify that naught hypothesis of "determinism" in science. Even when discussed what kind of all those postulated determinisms especially in languages, when amoebae in that "earth-soup" after "big bang" evidently did not call themselves "amoeba". Will those "tyrannies" of new verbal and symbolic transcendences lead or do not lead to chaos theory, or a waiting for surprise of an undetermined and undeterminable at random?

The question of immanence "in" structuralism occurs anew. Wilhelm Schuppe, a Greifswald philosopher of immanence about the middle of 19th century poses immanence contrasting transcendence, obviously that Aquinas system, and reminds here that "ontological difference" by M. Heidegger of all real existent. The nonsense occurs, when forgotten those Immanuel Kant differences of transcendental and transcendent, and space and time in relation and no transcending time alone or for it's sake.

Immanence as to perceive and being perceived by those five human senses occurs as and in situation and as and in present time between past and future. Since I. Kant and L. Euler, "transcendence" appears different to Aquin. As structuralism were epistemology, it was also it's methods towards heuristics, and hermeneutics and immanence differed.

Were structuralism really theory of immanence? When those Kant antinomies of space and time made sense, even paradoxically, it turns clear there were paradoxes. The problem of the infinites continues. When meeting the question of infinite and antinomies, there were not only those paradoxes of time and space. In Minoic times on Crete about three an a half thousand years ago they already had had another symbol for the infinite: that discus of Phaistos, a spiral alike, also to be found in wall paintings at Knossos palace. The Pythagoreans at Elea, about a thousand years later had discovered infinite irrationality of radix two, and Zeno ab Elea, southern Italy (J. Piaget mingles Zeno nab Elea with Xenon ab Elis, Sparta) had postulated two infinites by his paradoxes, Achilles (by pure calculating, not in practice, that "quanta jump" in modern physics) not being able to catch up with a turtle, when that turtle had be leading in time and space, when earlier from start and already leading, naught not yet existing. Aristotle had tried to solve this

dilemma by differing between actual and potential infinite. Infinitesimal calculations at Isaac Newton (1643-1727) and Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz (1646-1716) had left antique believes in the infinite and neglected them after commas. Hardly to measure small sizes had been treated as zero. The 3500 years old Knossos symbol of infinite at mediterranean minoic Kreta (κρητη) had used a somehow connected double spiral to symbolize infinities from past to future, as connected different from and comparable to Chinese Yin and Yang symbolic, nevertheless: that antique Tao mantra shows already a systematic in combinatorics, an eight-field matrix alike, when yin yang symbolic interpreted as plus and minus to the combinations in those eight fields, not considering the problem of infinite. For example: A row of natural algebraic terms, 1, 2, 3, ...∞ is considered as infinite (the "∞" for infinite symbolized by inquisition victim Giordano Bruno and means not yin yang, rather in form, yet culturally in mind Knossos symbol behind and it's kantian interpretation of transcendental and transcendent of unknown "begin" and "end" of Knossos spiraloid), and there are infinite possible fractions or decimal fractions with fractional infinities between "all" terms ad infinitum as between one and two, two and three etc. Tremendously different to Aristotle's view on the infinities appears the work of Georg Cantor (1845-1918), who posed there were no set in set theory and especially no infinite set that consists of as much sets as it's components, (G. Cantor. Letters with B. Russell is reported by B. Russell, biography that Saxon authorities in Germany had taken him for one crazy among all of those the Saxon lunatics). In Cantor's view hypothesis of continua leads to paradoxes or antinomies. How at all to use the term of transcendence together with of dubious not precisely and not to precise infinite?

As structuralism looks towards heuristics, what does that mean to psychology? Since structural psychology from it's beginning about Wilhelm Wundt's Leipzig psychological laboratory with analogous attempts in chemistry to heuristically formulate elements and laws of psychology, there had been after I. Kant first elements of experimentations about stimuli, feelings and introspection of the scientist. Fechner had found about those times a logarithmic correlation between stimulus, (feeling), and haptic (or tactile) perception. Over S. Freud still to our days, introspection has continued as one of the first methods of scientific psychology. Today, psychology has formulated a range of "elements" like learning, thinking, perception, motivation, emotion, conflict, all related to fundamental psychological "laws", a range over specialized mathematical psychology, developmental psychology, social psychology, clinical psychology etc.

A contemporary definition of psychology as an empirical science of high consistency is the psychological concern with the individual and his/her cognitive or ideal, social and instrumental actions with regard to other individuals, groups and culture(s) in space (in German language also: room) and time, at locations and situations. Obviously a lot of definition's elements to be found already at Immanuel Kant (K.d. r.V., K.d. p.V.), and after his fellows Lotze, Herbarth, Wundt and Fechner until today. Already in a 1908 publication, "Neo-Kantian" ("back to Kant!") Wilhelm Windelband (rather interested in Wundt than in Fechner) calls psychology a science on it's own ("eigenständige Wissenschaft"), differentiating between "idiographic" and "nomothetic" and putting as a since Kant grown problem, the difference (gap) between individual and mass, after having read Wundt's "Völker-Psychologie" (mass psychology of populations). A product Newton with Kant could be explained as one, when second in unity (Newton, $t : 1$) times unity in second (Kant, $1 : t$). The problem of empiric psychology since, how to dimensionate 1, thus in kantian time-schema ($\sim 1 : t$).

The problem between heuristics and hermeneutics does not fit to the difference between nomothetic and ideographic, yet rather to methods in psychology to find "laws", whether by experimentation, whether behind phenomenological descriptions or both.

Quanta theory in psychology shows via Wundt, Fechner, Kant its roots in Isaac Newtons mechanical Second and up to Aristotle.

Terms://critical science/ quanta theory in psychology/ infinitesimal problem/ transcendental/ transcendent/ humanistic psychology

Schlüssel-Wörter: kritische Wissenschaft, Quantentheorie in der Psychologie, Infinitesimal-Problem, transzendental, transcendent, humanistische Psychologie

Für eine Neuauflage durchgesehen, geändert und verbessert und erweitert, © Kurt-Wilhelm Laufs, Dipl.-Psych. (phil. Fac., min. med. Fac.) Zum Resthof 2, D 23996 Bobitz,

2009-01-08, 2009-02-04, 2009-11-04, 2009-11-10, 2009-11-16,

English Version by the author, 2010-03-23, 2010-04-03, rev. 2010-05-19, 2010-07-31

Kurt-Wilhelm Laufs ©, 15.06.1995, Revision 2009-01-07 ©, durchgesehener geänderter und verbesserter Text; 2009-02-04;

2. völlig neu bearbeitete und umgestaltete Neu-Auflage nach der 1. Auflage von 1995 („Achilles und die Schildkröte“ nach Tonband-Transkripten,

2009-11-09, 2009-11-11. (Formale Konsistenz der interkorrelierten Seitenzahlen-Prozente 1995, für sämtliche Kapitel, r tet ~. 94)

summary version in English by the author, 2010-03-22, 2010-04-03, 2010-07-31, 2010-08-02, 2010-08-13, 2013-09-29, 2013-09-30, 2013-10-01,

rev. update 2014-09-17 ©