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Table III-0-1. Rationalism versus Empiricism
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rationalism /Idealism</th>
<th>Empiricism /Realism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rationalism is a theory based on the claim that reason is the source of knowledge.</td>
<td>Empiricism is a theory based on the claim that experience is the source of knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationalists believe in intuition.</td>
<td>Empiricists do not believe in intuition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claim that individuals have innate knowledge or concepts.</td>
<td>Claim that individuals have no innate knowledge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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“The major figures in philosophy of mind, epistemology, and metaphysics during the 17th and 18th centuries are roughly divided into two main groups. The Rationalists, mostly in France and Germany, argued all knowledge must begin from certain innate ideas in the mind. Major rationalists were Descartes, Baruch Spinoza, Gottfried Leibniz, and Nicolas Malebranche. The Empiricists, by contrast, held that knowledge must begin with sensory experience. Major figures in this line of thought are John Locke, George Berkeley, and David Hume (These are retrospective categories, for which Kant is largely responsible.) Ethics and political philosophy are usually not subsumed under these categories, though all these philosophers worked in ethics, in their own distinctive styles. Other important figures in political philosophy include Thomas Hobbes and Jean-Jacques Rousseau. In the late eighteenth century Immanuel Kant set forth a groundbreaking philosophical system which claimed to bring unity to rationalism and empiricism. Whether or not he was right, he did not entirely succeed in ending philosophical dispute. Kant sparked a storm of philosophical work in Germany in the early nineteenth century, beginning with German idealism. The characteristic theme of idealism was that the world and the mind equally must be understood according to the same categories; it culminated in the work of Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, who among many other things said that ‘The real is rational; the rational is real.’

Hegel’s work was carried in many directions by his followers and critics. Karl Marx appropriated both Hegel’s philosophy of history and the empirical ethics dominant in Britain, transforming Hegel’s ideas into a strictly materialist form, setting the grounds for the development of a science of society. Søren Kierkegaard, in contrast, dismissed all systematic philosophy as an inadequate guide to life and meaning. For Kierkegaard, life is meant to be lived, not a mystery to be solved. Arthur Schopenhauer took idealism to the conclusion that the world was nothing but the futile endless interplay of images and desires, and advocated atheism and pessimism. Schopenhauer’s ideas were taken up and transformed by Nietzsche, who seized upon their various dismissals of the world to proclaim God is dead and to reject all systematic philosophy and all striving for a fixed truth transcending the individual. Nietzsche found in this not grounds for pessimism, but the possibility of a new kind of freedom.

From the mid-nineteenth to the early twentieth century, British Idealism came increasingly to be dominated by strands of neo-Hegelian thought, led by Thomas H. Green, Francis H. Bradley, and Bernard Bosanquet, but the hold weakened when Bertrand Russell and George Edward Moore turned its direction to analytic philosophy, updating traditional empiricism. (i) American Idealism was influenced by Great Britain: Josiah Royce established himself as one of the most eminent American philosophers at Harvard University during 1882-95, belonging to Post-Kantian Idealism, praising Hegel. This was followed by the rise of various idealism. (ii) Nevertheless, the Pragmatist Movement became dominant in the American universities, on the linking of practice and theory. “It describes a process where theory is extracted from practice and applied back to practice to form what is called intelligent practice. Important positions characteristic of pragmatism include instrumentalism, radical empiricism, verificationism, conceptual relativity, and fallibilism. There is general consensus among pragmatists that philosophy should take the methods and insights of modern science into account. Charles Sanders Peirce deserves most of the credit for pragmatism, along with later twentieth century contributors William James and John Dewey.” (iii) Moreover, the revolt against Idealism more evident in both Great Britain and the United States: John Cook Wilson and Harold Arthur Prichard were the leading members of Oxford Realism, and Bertrand Russell and George Edward Moore were in favor of scientific philosophy as Cambridge professors; and their realist positions were largely accepted by theories and practices.
### Table III-0-2, Modern Philosophy and Philosophers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modern Philosophy</th>
<th>Major Philosophers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rationalism</td>
<td>René Descartes; Baruch Spinoza; Gottfried Leibniz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empiricism</td>
<td>John Locke; George Berkeley; David Hume; Francis Bacon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Philosophy</td>
<td>Thomas Hobbes; John Locke; Montesquieu; Jean-Jacques Rousseau; Karl Marx; Friedrich Engels; John Stuart Mill; Jeremy Bentham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealism</td>
<td>Immanuel Kant; Johann Gottlieb Fichte; Friedrich Schelling; Georg Hegel; Arthur Schopenhauer; Francis Herbert Bradley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pragmatism</td>
<td>Charles Sanders Peirce; William James; John Dewey; Richard Rorty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytic Philosophy</td>
<td>Rudolf Carnap; Gottlob Frege; George Edward Moore; Bertrand Russell; Moritz Schlick; Ludwig Wittgenstein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existentialism</td>
<td>Søren Kierkegaard; Friedrich Nietzsche; Jean-Paul Sartre; Simone de Beauvoir; Karl Jaspers; Gabriel Marcel; Martin Heidegger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phenomenology</td>
<td>Edmund Husserl; Martin Heidegger; Maurice Merleau-Ponty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

French philosophy has been extremely diverse and had influenced Western philosophy as a whole for centuries, “from the medieval scholasticism of Peter Abelard, through the founding of modern philosophy by René Descartes, to 20th century philosophy of science, existentialism, phenomenology, structuralism and Postmodernism.” (iv) Positive Philosophy: Auguste Comte (1978-1857) strongly influenced by the Utopian socialist, Henri de Saint-Simon, developed positivism in an attempt to remedy the social malaise of the French Revolution, proposing three stages of social evolution: the theological, the metaphysical, and the positive. (v) Sociology: Émile Durkheim (1858-1917) devoted to sociology by setting up the first Sociology Department in Europe, and Henry Bergson (1859-1941) elaborated a process philosophy that rejects static values in favor of values of motion, change, and evolution; arguing that “processes of immediate experience and intuition are more significant than abstract rationalism and science for understanding reality.” (vi) Existentialism holds that the starting point of philosophical thinking must be the individual and the experiences of the individual, and existentialists hold that moral thinking and scientific thinking together do not suffice to understand human existence, and, therefore, a further set of categories, governed by the norm of authenticity, is necessary to understand human existence. (vii) Phenomenology was founded by Edmund Husserl, expanded upon by a circle of his followers at the universities of Göttingen and Munich in Germany. The philosophy then spread to France, the United States, and elsewhere. (viii) Sigmund Freud had theorized his psychoanalysis as a science through his publications: The Interpretation of Dreams (1900) and Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality. “Freud's psychoanalytic system came to dominate the field from early in the twentieth century, forming the basis for many later variants. While these systems have adopted different theories and techniques, all have followed Freud by attempting to achieve psychic and behavioral change through having patients talk about their difficulties.”²
In the last section of Chapter III in Book V, we discussed Utilitarianism of Bentham, James Mill, and John Stuart Mill as well as Evolutionism-Positivism-Classical Liberalism of Herbert Spencer; most of which were influential to European intellectuals in the second half of the nineteenth century. In his nine volumes of *A History of Philosophy*, Frederick Copleston divides Modern Philosophy into two parts. Modern Philosophy (I) includes Utilitarianism, Idealism in Britain, Idealism in America, Pragmatism, and Revolt against Idealism, which are as discussed in his Volume VIII. Modern Philosophy (II) includes French philosophy from the Revolution to Sartre, Camus, and Levi-Strauss, which are discussed in his Volume IX. Since Utilitarianism and Idealism in Britain were already discussed in Book V, the remaining part of Modern Philosophy (I) includes (i) Idealism in America, (ii) the Pragmatist Movement, and (iii) Revolt against Idealism - Realism in Britain and America – those which will be discussed in the next three sections. Moreover, Modern Philosophy (II) mentioned above will be followed by additional three sections.

Idealist philosophy believes “that the mind exists, and that our sense of the external world (physical reality) is simply a construction of the mind. Given that all out knowledge is in fact a creation of the mind (imagination), it has been difficult to refute this – to get from our ideas of things to the real things in itself.” “The absolute argument against idealism is Darwinian evolution. It is necessary that the physical reality of the earth and sun existed prior to our evolution, thus prior to our mind’s evolution. There are many common traits of the human mind which confirm that we evolved as animals on the surface of the earth. We sleep, get hungry, seek pleasure, avoid pain, love others and lust for sexual reproduction...Thus matter is a priori to mind.” The central problem of modern philosophy is to connect our incomplete senses of the world with the real world of what exists. The problem is that we do not see the causal connection between things, only the effects which are representations of the mind and thus deceptive. So, what does physically exist, what is Reality, and how can we get from the mind and the representation of Reality to knowing Reality itself? (Or as Kant puts it, from knowing our ideas of things to knowing things in themselves.). Idealists found Reality on One thing, which is necessary to cause and connect the many things, as Leibniz explains: Reality cannot be found except in one single source, because of the interconnection of all things with one another.

“How it is clear that Space is the One and only thing that is common to all things. What they also require is Motion, thus giving rise to the Metaphysics of Space and Motion. “Thus, the error has been the foundation of the Sciences on the Metaphysics of Space and Time, and the further abstract ideas of the Motion of Matter ‘Particles’ and their interconnected Forces (causing changes in motion / acceleration). The Solution is to discard these abstract concepts...by discarding the particle conception of matter in Space and Time and replacing it with the Wave Structure of Matter in Space.” “With respect to our senses, and how we can sense the motion of Matter in the Space about us, it is obvious that the concept of discrete particles causes the fundamental problem of the connection between the subject and the object. This led Berkeley to conclude that it must be God who connects all things...Once we realize that matter is large, that matter and Universe are one and the same thing then we unite the subject and object and thus understand how they can be connected...This then explains how we can sense the motion of matter in the Space around us. In this way we unite the mind, body and universe as all being constructed of One thing, Space and Matter as Spherical Standing Waves the size of the universe. And is this not a most amazing thing, to realize that we are 'God' that we are creatures that encompass the entire universe, and thus we rise above our naive real sense of the world and finally understand our true selves.”
Albert Einstein – Remarks on Bertrand Russell’s Theory of Knowledge: “In the evolution of philosophical thought through the centuries the following question has played a major role: what knowledge is pure thought able to supply independently of sense perception? Is there any such knowledge? If not, what precisely is the relation between our knowledge and the raw material furnished by sense impressions? There has been an increasing skepticism concerning every attempt by means of pure thought to learn something about the objective world, about the world of things in contrast to the world of concepts and ideas.”

“Realism in philosophy about a given object is the view that this object exists in reality independently of our conceptual scheme. In philosophical terms, these objects are ontologically independent of someone's conceptual scheme, perceptions, linguistic practices, beliefs, etc. Realism can be applied to many philosophically interesting objects and phenomena: other minds, the past or the future, universals, mathematical entities, moral categories, the physical world, and thought. Realism can also be a view about the nature of reality in general, where it claims that the world exists independent of the mind, as opposed to anti-realist views (like some forms of skepticism and solipsism, which deny the existence of a mind-independent world). Philosophers who profess realism often claim that truth consists in a correspondence between cognitive representations and reality. Realists tend to believe that whatever we believe now is only an approximation of reality but that the accuracy and fullness of understanding can be improved. In some contexts, realism is contrasted with idealism.”
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1. Idealism in America

The American philosophical tradition began at the time of the European colonization of the New World. The “Puritans arrival in New England set the earliest American philosophy into the religious tradition (Puritan Providentialism), and there was also an emphasis on the relationship between the individual and the community. This is evident by the early colonial documents.” “18th-century American philosophy may be broken into two halves, the first half being marked by the theology of Reformed Puritan Calvinism influenced by the Great Awakening as well as Enlightenment natural philosophy, and the second by the native moral philosophy of the American Enlightenment taught in American colleges. They were used in the tumultuous years of the 1760s and 1770s to forge a new intellectual culture for the United States, which led to the American incarnation of the European Enlightenment that is associated with the political thought of the Founding Fathers. The 18th century saw the introduction of Francis Bacon and the Enlightenment philosophers Descartes, Newton, Locke, Wollaston, and Berkeley to Colonial British America. Two native-born Americans, Samuel Johnson and Jonathan Edwards, were first influenced by these philosophers; they then adapted and extended their Enlightenment ideas to develop their own American theology and philosophy. Both were originally ordained Puritan Congregationalist ministers who embraced much of the new learning of the Enlightenment. Both were Yale educated and Berkeley influenced idealists who became influential college presidents. Both were influential in the development of American political philosophy and the works of the Founding Fathers. But Edwards based his reformed Puritan theology on Calvinist doctrine, while Johnson converted to the Anglican episcopal religion, then based his new American moral philosophy on William Wollaston’s Natural Religion. Late in the century, Scottish Innate or Common-Sense Realism replaced the native schools of these two rivals in the college philosophy curricula of American colleges; it would remain the dominant philosophy in American academia up to the Civil War.”

“While the 17th- and early 18th-century American philosophical tradition was decidedly marked by religious themes and the Reformation reason of Ramus, the 18th century saw more reliance on science and the new learning of the Age of Enlightenment, along with an idealist belief in the perfectibility of human beings through teaching ethics and moral philosophy, laissez-faire economics, and a new focus on political matters.” In the very beginning of American education, then in 1714, “a donation of 800 books from England, collected by Colonial Agent Jeremiah Dummer, arrived at Yale. They contained what became known as The New Learning, including the works of Locke, Descartes, Newton, Boyle, and Shakespeare, and other Enlightenment era authors not known to the tutors and graduates of Puritan Yale and Harvard colleges. They were first opened and studied by an eighteen-year-old graduate student from Guilford, Connecticut, the young American Samuel Johnson, who had also just found and read Lord Francis Bacon’s Advancement of Learning. Johnson wrote in his Autobiography, ‘All this was like a flood of day to his low state of mind’ and that ‘he found himself like one at once emerging out of the glimmer of twilight into the full sunshine of open day.’ He now considered what he had learned at Yale nothing but the scholastic cobwebs of a few little English and Dutch systems that would hardly now be taken up in the street. Johnson was appointed tutor at Yale in 1716. He began to teach the Enlightenment curriculum there, and thus began the American Enlightenment. One of his students for a brief time was a fifteen-year-old Jonathan Edwards. These two brilliant Yale students of those years, each of whom was to become a noted thinker and college president, exposed the fundamental nature of the problem of the incongruities between the old learning and the new. But each had a quite different view on the issues of predestination versus freewill, original sin versus the pursuit of happiness though practicing virtue and the education of children.”
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“Samuel Johnson (1696-1772) has been called The Founder of American Philosophy and the first important philosopher in colonial America and author of the first philosophy textbook published there. He was interested not only in philosophy and theology, but in theories of education, and in knowledge classification schemes, which he used to write encyclopedias, develop college curricula, and create library classification systems. Johnson was a proponent of the view that the essence of true religion is morality and believed that the problem of denominationalism could be solved by teaching a non-denominational common moral philosophy acceptable to all religions. So, he crafted one. Johnson's moral philosophy was influenced by Descartes and Locke, but more directly by William Wollaston's *Religion of Nature Delineated* and the idealist philosopher of George Berkeley, with whom Johnson studied while Berkley was in Rhode Island between 1729 and 1731. He strongly rejected Calvin's doctrine of Predestination and believed that people were autonomous moral agents endowed with freewill and Lockean natural rights. His fusion philosophy of Natural Religion and Idealism, which has been called American Practical Idealism, was developed as a series of college textbooks in seven editions between 1731 and 1754. These works, and his dialogue *Raphael*, or *The Genius of the English America*, written at the time of the Stamp Act crisis, go beyond his Wollaston and Berkeley influences; *Raphael* includes sections on economics, psychology, the teaching of children, and political philosophy. His moral philosophy is defined in his college textbook *Elementa Philosophica* as the Art of pursuing our highest Happiness by the practice of virtue. It was promoted by President Thomas Clap of Yale, Benjamin Franklin and Provost William Smith at The Academy and College of Philadelphia and taught at King's College (now Columbia University), which Johnson founded in 1754. It was influential in its day; it has been estimated that about half of American college students between 1743 and 1776, and over half of the men who contributed to the *Declaration of Independence* or debated it were connected to Johnson's American Practical Idealism.”

Jonathan Edwards (1703-1758) was an American revivalist preacher, philosopher, and Congregationalist Protestant theologian; and is considered to be America’s most important and original philosophical theologian holding reformed Calvinism. “Noted for his energetic sermons, such as 'Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God' (to have begun the First Great Awakening), Edwards emphasized the absolute sovereignty of God and the beauty of God's holiness. Working to unite Christian Platonism with an empiricist epistemology, with the aid of Newtonian physics, Edwards was deeply influenced by George Berkeley, himself an empiricist, and Edwards derived his importance of the immaterial for the creation of human experience from Bishop Berkeley. The non-material mind consists of understanding and will, and it is understanding, interpreted in a Newtonian framework, that leads to Edwards’ fundamental metaphysical category of Resistance. Whatever features an object may have, it has these properties because the object resists. Resistance itself is the exertion of God's power, and it can be seen in Newton's laws of motion, where an object is unwilling to change its current state of motion; an object at rest will remain at rest and an object in motion will remain in motion. Though Edwards reformed Puritan theology using Enlightenment ideas from natural philosophy, and Locke, Newton, and Berkeley, he remained a Calvinist and hard determinist. Jonathan Edwards also rejected the freedom of the will, saying that we can do as we please, but we cannot please as we please. According to Edwards, neither good works nor self-originating faith lead to salvation, but rather it is the unconditional grace of God which stands as the sole arbiter of human fortune.” Edwards is well known for his many books, *The End for Which God Created the World*, *The Life of David Brainerd*, which inspired thousands of missionaries throughout the 19th century, and *Religious Affections*, which many Reformed Evangelicals still read today. Edwards died from a smallpox inoculation shortly after beginning the presidency at the College of New Jersey (Princeton).”
Founder’s Political Philosophy: “About the time of the Stamp Act, interest rose in civil and political philosophy. Many of the Founding Fathers wrote extensively on political issues, including John Adams, John Dickinson, Alexander Hamilton, John Jay, Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin, and James Madison. In continuing with the chief concerns of the Puritans in the 17th century, the Founding Fathers debated the interrelationship between God, the state, and the individual. Resulting from this were the United States Declaration of Independence, passed in 1776, and the United States Constitution, ratified in 1788. The Constitution sets forth a federated republican form of government that is marked by a balance of powers accompanied by a checks and balances system between the three branches of government: a judicial branch, an executive branch led by the President, and a legislative branch composed of a bicameral legislature where the House of Representatives is the lower house and the Senate is the upper house.”

“Although the Declaration of Independence does contain references to the Creator, the God of Nature, Divine Providence, and the Supreme Judge of the World, the Founding Fathers were not exclusively theistic. Some professed personal concepts of deism, as was characteristic of other European Enlightenment thinkers, such as Maximilian Robespierre, François-Marie Arouet (Voltaire), and Rousseau. However, an investigation of 106 contributors to the Declaration of Independence between September 5, 1774 and July 4, 1776 found that only two men (Franklin and Jefferson), both American Practical Idealists in their moral philosophy, might be called quasi-deists or non-denominational Christians; all the others were publicly members of denominational Christian churches. Even Franklin professed the need for a public religion and would attend various churches from time to time. Jefferson was vestryman at the evangelical Calvinistic Reformed Church of Charlottesville, Virginia, a church he himself founded and named in 1777, suggesting that at this time of life he was rather strongly affiliated with a denomination and that the influence of Whitefield and Edwards reached even into Virginia. But the founders who studied or embraced Johnson, Franklin, and Smith’s non-denominational moral philosophy were at least influenced by the deistic tendencies of Wollaston’s Natural Religion, as evidenced by the Laws of Nature, and Nature’s God and the pursuit of Happiness in the Declaration.”

“An alternate moral philosophy to the domestic American Practical Idealism, called variously Scottish Innate Sense moral philosophy (by Jefferson), Scottish Commonsense Philosophy, or Scottish Common-Sense Realism, was introduced into American Colleges in 1768 by John Witherspoon, a Scottish immigrant and educator who was invited to be President of the College of New Jersey (now Princeton University). He was a Presbyterian minister and a delegate who joined the Continental Congress just days before the Declaration was debated. His moral philosophy was based on the work of the Scottish philosopher Francis Hutcheson, who also influenced John Adams. When President Witherspoon arrived at the College of New Jersey in 1768, he expanded its natural philosophy offerings, purged the Berkeley adherents from the faculty, including Jonathan Edwards, Jr., and taught his own Hutcheson-influenced form of Scottish innate sense moral philosophy.” “In summary, in the middle eighteenth century, it was the collegians who studied the ideas of the new learning and moral philosophy taught in the Colonial colleges who created new documents of American nationhood. It was the generation of Founding Grandfathers, men such as President Samuel Johnson, President Jonathan Edwards, President Thomas Clap, Benjamin Franklin, and Provost William Smith, who first created the idealistic moral philosophy of the pursuit of Happiness, and then taught it in American colleges to the generation of men who would become the Founding Fathers.”

Johnson’s American Practical Idealism and Edwards’ Reform Puritan Calvinism were far stronger influences on the men of the Continental Congress and on the Declaration of Independence. For political philosophy of Thomas Paine and Thomas Jefferson, see “Radicalism in America” of Chapter III, Book V.
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19th Century American Philosophy: In the 19th century, Romanticism rose in America. “The American incarnation of Romanticism was transcendentalism and it stands as a major American innovation. The 19th century also saw the rise of the school of pragmatism, along with a smaller, Hegelian philosophical movement led by George Holmes Howison that was focused in St. Louis, though the influence of American pragmatism far outstripped that of the small Hegelian movement. Other reactions to materialism included the Objective idealism of Josiah Royce, and the Personalism, sometimes called Boston personalism, of Borden Parker Bowne.

(a) Transcendentalism: “Transcendentalism in the United States was marked by an emphasis on subjective experience and can be viewed as a reaction against modernism and intellectualism in general and the mechanistic, reductionistic worldview in particular. Transcendentalism is marked by the holistic belief in an ideal spiritual state that ‘transcends’ the physical and empirical, and this perfect state can only be attained by one’s own intuition and personal reflection, as opposed to either industrial progress and scientific advancement or the principles and prescriptions of traditional, organized religion. The most notable transcendentalist writers include Ralph Waldo Emerson, Henry David Thoreau, and Margaret Fuller. The transcendentalist writers all desired a deep return to nature, and believed that real, true knowledge is intuitive and personal and arises out of personal immersion and reflection in nature, as opposed to scientific knowledge that is the result of empirical sense experience.”

(b) Darwinism in America: “The release of Charles Darwin's evolutionary theory in his 1859 publication of On the Origin of Species had a strong impact on American philosophy. John Fiske and Chauncey Wright both wrote about and argued for the re-conceiving of philosophy through an evolutionary lens. They both wanted to understand morality and the mind in Darwinian terms, setting a precedent for evolutionary psychology and evolutionary ethics. Darwin's biological theory was also integrated into the social and political philosophies of English thinker Herbert Spencer and American philosopher William Graham Sumner. Herbert Spencer, who coined the oft-misattributed term survival of the fittest, believed that societies were in a struggle for survival, and that groups within society are where they are because of some level of fitness. This struggle is beneficial to human kind, as in the long run the weak will be weeded out and only the strong will survive. This position is often referred to as Social Darwinism.”

(c) Pragmatism: “Perhaps the most influential school of thought that is uniquely American is pragmatism. It began in the late nineteenth century in the United States with Charles Sanders Peirce, William James, and John Dewey. Pragmatism begins with the idea that belief is that upon which one is willing to act. It holds that a proposition's meaning is the consequent form of conduct or practice that would be implied by accepting the proposition as true.”

20th Century American Philosophy: “Pragmatism, which began in the 19th century in America, by the beginning of the 20th century began to be accompanied by other philosophical schools of thought, and was eventually eclipsed by them, though only temporarily.”

“...The 20th century saw the emergence of process philosophy, itself influenced by the scientific world-view and Einstein's theory of relativity. The middle of the 20th century was witness to the increase in popularity of the philosophy of language and analytic philosophy in America. Existentialism and phenomenology, while very popular in Europe in the 20th century, never achieved the level of popularity in America as they did in continental Europe.”
Josiah Royce (1855-1916): Royce was the leading American proponent of absolute idealism, the metaphysical view that all aspects of reality, “including those we experience as disconnected or contradictory, are ultimately unified in the thought of a single all-encompassing consciousness. Royce also made original contributions in ethics, philosophy of community, philosophy of religion and logic.” “Royce, born in Grass Valley, California, on November 20, 1855. He was the son of Josiah and Sarah Eleanor Royce, whose families were recent English emigrants, and who sought their fortune in the westward movement of the American pioneers in 1849. He received the B.A. from the University of California, Berkeley in 1875 where he later accepted an instructorship teaching English composition, literature, and rhetoric. While at the university, he studied with Joseph LeConte, Professor of Geology and Natural History, and a prominent spokesperson for the compatibility between evolution and religion. In a memorial published shortly after LeConte's death, Royce described the impact of LeConte's teaching on his own development, writing: the wonder thus aroused was, for me, the beginning of philosophy. After some time in Germany, where he studied with Hermann Lotze, the Johns Hopkins University awarded him in 1878 one of its first four doctorates, in philosophy. At Johns Hopkins he taught a course on the history of German thought, which was one of his chief interests because he was able to give consideration to the philosophy of history. After four years at the University of California, Berkeley, he went to Harvard in 1882 as a sabbatical replacement for William James, who was at once Royce's friend and philosophical antagonist. Royce's position at Harvard was made permanent in 1884 and he remained there until his death, on September 14, 1916.”

Royce established himself as one of the most eminent American philosophers during 1882-95.

The Religious Aspect of Philosophy (1885): Royce defines his doctrine in this volume belonging to Post-Kantian Idealism, praising Hegel: “There are in recent philosophical history two Hegels: one the uncompromising idealists, with his general and fruitful insistence upon the great fundamental truths of idealism; the other the technical Hegel of the Logic, whose dialectic method seems destined to remain, not a philosophy, but the idea of a philosophy.” Royce argues that “the impossibility of proving the universal and absolute validity of the moral ideal embraced by any given individual tends to produce moral skepticism and pessimism. Reflection, however, shows that the very search for a universal and absolute ideal reveal in the seeker a moral will which wills the harmonization of all particular ideals and values. And there then arises in the mind of the individual the consciousness that he ought so to live that his life and the lives of other men may form a unity, converging towards a common ideal goal or end. With this idea Royce associates an exaltation of the social order, in particular of the State.”

“Turning to the problem of God, Royce rejects the traditional proofs of God’s existence and develops an argument for the Absolute from the recognition of error. We are accustomed to think that error arises when our thought fails to conform with its intended object. But we obviously
cannot place ourselves in the position of an external spectator outside the subject-object relationship, capable of seeing whether thought conforms with its object or not. And reflection on this fact may lead to skepticism. Yet it is clear that we are capable of recognizing error. We can not only make erroneous judgments but also know that we have made them. And further reflection shows that truth and falsity have meaning only in relations to a complete system of truth, which must be present to absolute thought. In other words, Royce concepts a coherence theory of truth and passes from it to the assertion of absolute thought. As he was later to express it, an individual’s opinions are true or false in relation to a wider insight. And his argument is that we cannot stop until we arrive at the idea of an all-inclusive divine insight which embraces in a comprehensive unity our thinking and its objects and is the ultimate measure of truth and falsity.” The Absolute is described as Thought: All reality must be present to the unity of the Infinite Thought.19

(b) The Concept of God (1895): Royce argues that there is an absolute experience which is related to ours as an organic whole is related to its constituent elements. It is obvious that “the divine being is for him the One, the totality. At the same time God or the Absolute is conceived as self-conscious. And the natural conclusion to draw is that finite selves are thoughts of God in his own act of self-knowledge. It is thus perfectly understandable that Royce drew upon himself the criticism of the personal idealists. In point of fact, however, he had no wish to submerge the Many in the One in such a way as to reduce finite self-consciousness to an inexplicable illusion. Hence he had to develop a theory of the relation between the One and the Many which would neither reduce the Many to illusory appearance nor make the term One altogether inappropriate.”

(c) Studies in Good and Evil (1898), Royce “rejects any attempt to evade the issue by saying that suffering and moral evil are illusions. On the contrary, they are real. We cannot avoid the conclusion, therefore, that God suffers when we suffer. And we must suppose that suffering is necessary for the perfecting of the divine life. As for moral evil, this too is required for the perfection of the universe. For the good will presupposes the evil as something to be overcome. True, from the point of view of the Absolute the world, the object of infinite thought, is a perfect unity in which evil is already overcome and subordinated to the good. But it is none the less a constituent element in the whole. If God is a name for the universe, and if suffering and evil are real, we must obviously locate them in God. If, however, there is an absolute point of view from which evil is eternally overcome and subordinated to the good, God can hardly be simply a name for the universe.” Thus, the problem of the relation between God and the world becomes acute.20

(d) The World and the Individual (1900-1):21 Here discussions include the definition and comparison of four historical concepts of being; the criticism of realism; the parallelism between the realistic and the mystical concepts of being; from the real to the being, which constitutes idealism; the final unity of external and internal meaning of ideas; the concept of individuality, and the reconciliation of the One and the Many.22

(i) Realism: The mere knowledge of any Being by anyone who is not himself the Being know, makes no difference whatever to that known Being. “In other words, if all know-ledge were to disappear from the world, the only difference that this would make to the world would be that the particular fact of knowledge would no longer exist. Truth and falsity consist in the correspondence or non-correspondence of ideas with things; and nothing exists simply in virtue of the fact that it is known. Hence we cannot tell by inspecting the relations between ideas whether the objects referred to exist or not. Hence the what is sundered from the that. And this, Royce remarks, is why the realist has to deny the validity of the ontological argument for God’s existence. Royce criticism of realism is not always very clear. But his general line of thought is as follows: By
realism in this context he evidently means an extreme minimalistic empiricism, according to which the world consists of a plurality of entities that are mutually independent. The disappearance of one would not affect the existence of the rest. Any relations which are superadded to these entities must, therefore, be themselves independent entities. And in this case, Royce argues, the terms of the relations cannot really be related. If we start with entities which are sundered from one another, they remain sundered. Royce then argues that ideas must themselves be entities, and that on realist premises an unbridgeable gulf yawns between them and the objects to which they are thought to refer. In other words, if ideas are entities which are completely independent of other entities, we can never know whether they correspond with objects external to themselves, not indeed whether there are such objects at all. Hence we can never know whether realism, as an idea or set of ideas, is true or false. And in this sense realism, as a theory of reality, is self-defeating: it undermines its own foundations.”

Strictly speaking, realism posit an objective realm that is utterly independent and hence, is utterly meaningless to thought.

(ii) **Mysticism:** As the core of realism consists in defining as real any being which is essentially independent of any idea which refers to it, so he must postulate the existence of at least one idea and one object which is external to it. “Mysticism, however, reject dualism and asserts the existence of a One in which the distinctions between subject and object, idea and the reality to which it refers, vanish. Mysticism, as understood in this sense, is a self-defeating as realism. For if there is only one simple and indivisible Being, the finite subject and its ideas must be accounted illusory. And in this case the Absolute cannot be known. For it could be known only by ideas. In fact, any assertion that there is a One must be illusory. It is true that our fragmentary ideas need completion in a unified system, and that the whole is the truth. But if a philosopher stresses unity to such an extent that ideas have to be accounted illusion, he cannot at the same time consistently maintain that there is a One or Absolute. For it is plain that the Absolute has meaning for us unity in so far as it is conceived by means of ideas. If therefore we wish to maintain that knowledge of reality is possible at all, we cannot take the path of mysticism. We must allow for plurality. At the same time, we cannot return to realism as described above. Hence realism must be modified in such a way that it is no longer self-defeating. And one way of attempting such a modification is to take the path of what Royce calls critical rationalism.”

(iii) **Critical Rationalism:** It undertakes “to define ‘Being’ in terms of validity, to conceive that whoever says, of any object, It is, means only that a certain idea… is valid, has truth, defines an experience that, at least as a s mathematical ideal, and perhaps as an empirical event, is determinately possible. Suppose that I assert that there are human beings on the planet Mars. According to the critical rationalist, I am asserting that in the progress of possible experience a certain idea would be validated or verified. Royce give as examples of critical rationalism Kant’s theory of possible experience and J. S. Mill’s definition of matter as a permanent possibility of sensations. We might add logical positivism, provided that we substitute for idea empirical proposition. In Royce’s view critical rationalism has this advantage over realism that by defining Being in terms of possible experience, the validation of an idea (better, the verification of a proposition), it avoids the objections which arise from realism’s complete sundering of ideas from the reality to which they are assumed to refer. At the same time critical rationalism has this great drawback that it is incapable of answering the question, what is a valid or a determinately possible experience at the moment when it is supposed to be only possible? What is a valid truth at the moment when nobody verifies its validity? If I assert that there are men on Mars, this statement doubtless implies, in a definable sense of this term, that the presence of men on Mars is an object of possible experience. But if the statement happens to be true, their existence is not simply possible existence. Hence we can hardly define Being simply in terms of the possible validation
or verification of an idea. And though critical rationalism does not make knowledge of reality impossible, as is done by both realism and mysticism, it is unable to provide an adequate account of reality. Hence we must turn to another and more adequate philosophical theory, which will subsume in itself the truths contained in the three theories already mentioned but which will at the same time be immune from the objections which can be brought against them."

(iv) External and Internal Meanings of an Idea: Suppose that I have an idea of Mount Everest. "It is natural to think of this idea as referring to and representing an external reality, namely the actual mountain. And this representative function is what Royce understands by the external meaning of an idea. But now let us suppose that I am an artist, and that I have in my mind an idea of the picture which I wish to paint. This idea can be described as the partial fulfilment of a purpose. And this aspect of an idea is what Royce calls its internal meaning. Common sense would doubtless be prepared to admit that the idea in the mind of an artist can reasonably be described as the partial fulfilment of a purpose. And to this extent it recognizes the existence of internal meaning. But, left to itself, common sense would probably regard the representative function of the idea as primary, even though it is a question of representing what does not yet exist, namely the projected work of art. And if we consider an idea such as that of the number of the inhabitants of London, common sense would certainly emphasize the representative character and ask whether or not it correspond with external reality. Royce, however, maintains that it is the internal meaning of an idea which is primary, and that in the long run external meaning turns out to be only an aspect of the completely developed internal meaning."

What is the connection between this theory of the meaning of ideas and the solution of the problem of reality? "The answer is obviously that Royce intends to represent the world as the embodiment of an absolute system of ideas which are, in themselves, the incomplete fulfilment of a purpose. We propose to answer the question: What is to be? By the assertion that: to be means simply to express, to embody the complete internal meaning of a certain absolute system of ideas – a system, moreover, which is genuinely implied in the true internal meaning or purpose of every finite idea, however, fragmentary. Royce admits that this theory is not novel. For example, it is essentially the same as the line of thought which led Hegel to call the world the embodied Idea. But though the theory is not novel, I believe it to be of fundamental and of inexhaustible importance. In other words, Royce first interprets the function of human ideas in the light of an already existing idealist conviction about the primacy of thought. And he then uses this interpretation as the basis for an explicit metaphysics. At the same time, he works dialectically towards the establishment of his own view of the meaning of ‘to be’ by examining in turn different types of philosophy with a view to exhibiting their inadequacy. And though we cannot enter into the details of this discussion, it is appropriate to indicate its general lines."

(v) The Fourth Conception of Being: "Hegel, who was no nominalist, used the term individual to mean the concrete universal, and that in the Hegelian philosophy the ultimate form of being is the individual in this sense of the term, the absolute being the supreme individual, the all-inclusive concrete universal. Hence when Royce asserts that the truth contained in realism is that the only ultimate form of being is the individual, it would be misleading to say simply that he is accepting the nominalist slogan. For he re-interprets the term individual under the inspiration of the idealist tradition. According to his use of the term an individual being is a Life of Experience fulfilling Ideas, in an absolutely final form...The essence of the Real is to be Individual, or permit no other of its own kind, and this character it possesses only as the unique fulfilment of purpose.” “Only the self which is your world is your completely integrated Self, the totality of the life that at this instant you fragmentarily grasp. Your present defect is a matter of the mere form of your consciousness at this instant. Were your eyes at this instant open to your own meaning, your life
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as a whole would be spread before you as a single and unique life, for which no other could be substituted without a less determinate expression of just your individual will. Now this complete life of yours, is. Only such completion can be. Being can possess no other nature than this. And this, in outline, is your Fourth Conception of Being.29

Royce maintains that every finite self tends by its very nature to unite its will ever more closely with the divine will. Obligation bears on us in relation to conduct which would bring us nearer to this end. Though a man who has clear knowledge of what he ought to do will act in accordance with this knowledge, he can voluntarily concentrate his attention elsewhere, so that here and now he no longer has clear knowledge of what he ought to do. But the question arises immediately, how can the agent be properly held responsible for choosing to concentrate his attention in a certain direction if he is in his entirety an expression of the divine will? Royce rather tends to evade the issue by turning to the subject of the overcoming of evil in the totality. But his general line of answer seems to be that the man is himself responsible for the outcome.30

(e) The Philosophy of Loyalty (1908): “This social metaphysics lays the groundwork for Royce’s philosophy of loyalty…The basic ideas were explicit in his writings as early as his history of California. Here Royce set out one of the most original and important moral philosophies in the recent history of philosophy. His notion of loyalty was essentially a universalized and ecumenical interpretation of Christian agapeic love. Broadly speaking, Royce’s is a virtue ethic in which our loyalty to increasingly less immediate ideals becomes the formative moral influence in our personal development. As persons become increasingly able to form loyalties, the practical and ongoing devotion to a cause bigger than themselves, and as these loyalties become unifiable in the higher purposes of groups of persons over many generations, humanity is increasingly better able to recognize that the highest ideal is the creation of a perfected beloved community in which each and every person share. The beloved community as an ideal experienced in our acts of loyal service integrates into Royce’s moral philosophy a Kingdom of Ends but construed as immanent and operative instead of transcendental and regulative.”

“While the philosophical status of this ideal remains hypothetical, the living of it in the fulfillment of our finite purposes concretizes it for each and every individual. Each of us, no matter how morally undeveloped we may be, has fulfilled experiences that point to the reality of experience beyond what is given to us personally. This wider reality is exemplified most commonly by when we fall in love. The spiritual union [of the lovers] also has a personal, a conscious existence, upon a higher than human level. An analogous unity of consciousness, a unity superhuman in grade, but intimately bound up with, and inclusive of, our separate personalities, must exist, if loyalty is well founded, wherever a real cause wins the true devotion of ourselves. Grant such a hypothesis, and then loyalty becomes no pathetic serving of a myth. The good which our causes possesses, then, also becomes a concrete fact for an experience of a higher than human level. This move illustrates what Royce calls his absolute pragmatism, the claim that ideals are thoroughly practical—the more inclusive being more practical. The concretization of ideals cannot therefore be empirically doubted except at the cost of rendering our conscious life inexplicable. If we admit that the concretization of ideals genuinely occurs, Royce argues, then we are not only entitled but compelled to take seriously and regard as real the larger intelligible structures within which those ideals exist, which is the purposive character of the divine Will. The way in which persons sort out higher and lower causes is by examining whether one’s service destroys the loyalty of others, or what is best in them. Ultimately personal character reaches its acme in the recognition that service of lost causes, through which we may learn that our ultimate loyalty is to loyalty itself.”
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(f) The Problem of Christianity (1913): “Royce defines loyalty as the willing and thorough-going devotion of a self to a cause, when the cause is something which unites many selves in one, and which is therefore the interest of a community. And he sees in the Church, the community of the faithful, especially as represented in the Pauline Epistles, the embodiment of the spirit of loyalty, of devotion to a common ideal and of loyalty to the ideal community which should be loved as a person. It does not follow, however, that Royce intended to identify what he calls the Great Community with an historic Church, any more than with an historic State. The Great Community is more like Kant’s kingdom of ends; it is the ideal human community. Yet though it is an ideal to be sought after rather than an actual historic society existing here and now, it nonetheless lies at the basis of the moral order, precisely because it is the goal or telos of moral action. It is true that the individual alone can work out his moral vacation; it cannot be done for him. But because of the very nature of the self-genuine individuality can be realized only through loyalty to the Great Community, to an ideal cause which unites all men together.”

“Largely under the influence of C. S. Peirce, Royce came to emphasize the role of interpretation in human knowledge and life; and he applied this idea in his ethical theory. For example, the individual cannot realize himself and attain true selfhood or personality without a life-goal or life-plan, in relations to which concepts such as right and wrong, higher self and lower self, become concretely meaningful. But a man comes to apprehend his life-plan or idea goal only through a process of interpreting himself to himself. Further, this self-interpretation is achieved only in a social context, through interaction with other people. Others inevitably help me to interpret myself to myself; and I help others to interpret themselves to themselves. In a sense this process tends to division rather than to union, inasmuch as each individual becomes thereby more aware of himself as possessing a unique life-task. But if we bear in mind the social structure of the self, we are led to form the idea of an unlimited community of interpretation, of humanity, that is to say, as engaged throughout time in the common task of interpreting both the physical world and its own purposes, ideals and values. All growth in scientific knowledge and moral insight involves a process of interpretation.”

“The supreme object of loyalty as a moral category is, Royce came to think, this ideal community of interpretation. But towards the close of his life he stressed the importance of limited communities both for moral development and for the achievement of social reform. If we consider, for instance, two individuals who are disputing about, say, the possession of some property, we can see that this potentially dangerous situation is transformed by the intervention of a third party, the judge. A triadic relation is substituted for the potentially dangerous dyadic relation; and a small-scale community of interpretation is set up. Thus, Royce tries to exhibit the mediating or interpretative and morally educative functions of such institutions as the judicial system, always in the light of the idea of interpretation. He applies this idea even to the institution of insurance and develops, as a safeguard against war, a scheme of insurance on an international scale. Some... may have seen in such ideas a peculiarly American fusion of idealism with a rather down-to-earth practicality. But it does not follow, of course, that such a fusion is a bad thing. In any case Royce evidently felt that if substantive proposal were to be put forward in ethical theory, something more was required than exhorting men to be loyal to the ideal community of interpretation.”

The moral task of individual can have no temporal end. There can be no last moral task. “Obviously, this line of argument could not by itself prove immortality. It is true that if we recognize a moral law at all, we have to regard it as bearing upon us as long as we live. But it does not follow from this premise alone that the self-survives bodily death and is able to continue fulfilling a moral vocation. But for Royce as a metaphysician the universe is of such a kind that the finite self, as a unique expression of the Absolute and as representing an irreplaceable value,
must be supposed to continue in existence. The ethical self is always something in the making; and as the divine purpose must be fulfilled, we are justified in believing that after the death of the body the self attains genuine individuality in a higher form. But I know not in the least, I pretend not to guess, by what processes the individuality of our human life is further expressed. I wait until this mortal shall put on – Individuality. Evidently, in Royce’s assertion of immortality what really counts is his general metaphysical vision of reality, coupled with his evaluation of personality."

Royce see that “relational thought is quite incapable of giving a coherent account of how the Many proceed from and are unified in the One, and that the world as presented in such thought belongs to the sphere of appearance as contrasted with that of reality. Royce, however, undertakes to show that the One can express itself in finite series which are well-ordered and involve no contradiction, and that thought is thus capable of giving a coherent account of the relation between the One and the Many… A series of this kind can properly be regarded as a totality. To be sure, it is not a totality in the sense that we can count to the end and complete the series. For it is ex hypothesis infinite or endless… In other words, there is no intrinsic repugnance between the idea of a totality and that of an infinite series… As infinite series of this kind is described by Royce as a self-representative system. And he finds examples in all continuous and discrete mathematical systems of any infinite type… If we apply this idea in metaphysics, the universe appears as an infinite series, and endless whole, which expresses a single purpose or plan… The One, according to Royce, must express itself in the endless series which constitutes its life of creative experience. In other words, it must express itself in the Many. And as the endless series is the progressive expression or fulfilment of a single purpose, the whole of reality is one self-representative system.”

Royce emphasizes personality without abandoning theism altogether and of using the term the Absolute simply as a name for the world considered as an open totality, a series which has no assignable last member. The world is for him the embodiment of the internal meaning of a system of ideas which are themselves the partial fulfilment of a purpose. And the Absolute is a self; it is personal rather than impersonal; it is an eternal and finite consciousness. Hence it can reasonably be described as God. And Royce depicts the infinite series which constitutes the temporal universe as present all at once, total simul, to the divine consciousness… Royce tries to re-interpret theism in the light of absolute idealism. He tries to preserve the idea of a personal God while combining it with the idea of the all-comprehensive Absolute represented as the Universal of universals… If we speak of God as the supreme or ultimate Individual, we naturally tend to think of him as a personal being and of the world as the external expression of his creative will. But for Royce the term individual means a life of experience. And according to this meaning of the term God between the life of absolute and infinite experience, in which all finite things are immanent. Whereas the interpretation of the existence of finite things as the expression of purposeful will suggests creation in a theistic sense, the description of God as absolute experience suggests a rather different relation. No doubt Royce tries to bring the two concepts together through the conception of creative experience; but there seems to be in his philosophy a somewhat unstable marriage between theism and absolute idealism.”

“Some have seen here a fundamental shift in Royce’s thinking, but the evidence is far from conclusive. Royce’s hypothetical ontology, temporalism, personalism, his social metaphysics based on the fourth conception of being remain, along with the operation of agapeic loyalty, and the unity of finite purposes in the ideal of the beloved community. There is no obvious shift in method and no overt move to abandon idealism. Royce himself declared the successive expressions of the philosophy of loyalty form a consistent body of ethical as well as religious opinion and teaching, verifiable, in its main outlines, in terms of human experience, and capable of furnishing a foundation for a defensible form of metaphysical idealism.”
Personal Idealism: (a) **George Holmes Howison** (1834-1916): He was an American philosopher who established the philosophy department at the University of California, Berkeley and held the position of Professor of Philosophy. “Considering evolution in the light of the fatalistic-deterministic materialism which had come to dominate the scientific mindset from the times of Newton, in 1901 he published his magnum opus, *The Limits of Evolution, and Other Essays*, Illustrating the Metaphysical Theory of Personal Idealism.” In his introduction to the book, “Howison draws attention to the existence of a certain measure of basic agreement among the participants in the discussion, particularly in regard to the personality of God and about the close relation between the concepts of God, freedom and immortality.”

This, the mind’s consciousness of its own form of being as self-conscious, is the ultimate and authentic meaning of causality. “In the cause as self-conscious Ideal, the consciousness of its own thinking nature as the ‘measure of all things,’ – as ‘source, motive, path, original, and end,’ – we at length come to causation in the strictest sense, Kant’s Causality with freedom. It might happily be called; in contrast to natural causation, supernatural causation; or, in contradistinction from physical, metaphysical causation. The causality of self-consciousness – the causality that creates and incessantly re-creates in the light of its own Idea, and by the attraction of it as an ideal originating in the self-consciousness purely – is the only complete causality, because it is the only form of being that is unqualifiedly free.”

“This brings us to a final removal of the mistake made in saying that the principle of art's being its own end implies indifference to truth and good. The principle . . . are not necessarily true and moral; much less does it mean that the contents, if the artist choose, may violate truth and morality. Such a meaning would contradict the nature of art, as we have now seen it. The meaning is, that while truth and good, in all their various gradations from the lowest to the highest, form the essential contents of art, its character as art - as distinguished, that is, from science and religion — turns upon its form, and that its whole business, in dealing with whatever contents compatible with its nature, is to put them into its own form, instead of the form proper to religion or to science; to put them into this form upon the form's own merits, and not merely as if the form were subsidiary to the form of science or of religion. The proper form of science is explanation and argument, and the proper form of religion and morality is exhortation and command; but that of art is simply the directest embodiment of its theme as the theme itself requires. Assured that the theme is compatible with the ideal nature of art, the artist knows that it will justify itself and work its own work, if it can only find expression in its natural embodiment.”

“It is this New Doctrine, known generally, and properly enough, as the doctrine of Rationalism that I am permitted by the courtesy of this Congress briefly to explain and defend. To the question, What is the right relation between reason and religion, you will now understand me to answer, It is that reason should be the source of which religion is the issue; that reason, when most itself, will unquestionably be religious, but that religion must for just that cause be entirely rational; that reason is the final authority from which religion must derive its warrant, and with which its contents must comply; that all religious doctrines and instrumentalities, all religious practices, all religious institutions, and all records of religion, whether in tradition or in scripture, must alike submit their claims at the bar of general human reason, and that only those approved in that tribunal can be regarded as of weight or of obligation; in short, that the only real basis of religion is our human reason, the only seat of its authority our genuine human nature, the only sufficient witness of God the human soul. Reason, I shall endeavor to show, is not confined to the mastery of the sense-world and the goods of this world only, but does cover all the range of being, and found and rule the world eternal; it is not merely natural, it is also spiritual; it is itself, when come to itself, the true divine revelation.”
(b) **Joseph Le Conte** (1823-1901): Born in Liberty County, Georgia, Le Conte was educated at Franklin College in Athens, Georgia (now the University of Georgia). “After graduation in 1841, he studied medicine and received his degree at the New York College of Physicians and Surgeons in 1845. (In 1844 he travelled with his cousin John Lawrence LeConte for over one thousand miles along the Upper Mississippi River in a birchbark canoe.) After practicing for three or four years at Macon, Georgia, he entered Harvard University, and studied natural history under Louis Agassiz. An excursion made with Professors J. Hall and Agassiz to the Helderberg Mountains of New York developed a keen interest in geology.” Le Conte interested himself in the philosophical aspects of the theory of evolution and expounded what can be described as evolutionary idealism.

“As the ultimate source of evolution, he saw a divine Energy which expresses itself immediately in the physical and chemical forces of Nature. But the efflux of this divine Energy becomes progressively individuated concomitantly with the advancing organization of matter. Le Conte’s philosophy is thus pluralistic. For he maintains that in the process of evolution we find the emergence of successively higher forms of self-active individuals, until we reach the highest form of individual being yet attained, namely the human being. In man the efflux or spark of the divine life is able to recognize and to enter into conscious communion with its ultimate source. In fact, we can look forward to a progressive elevation of man to the level of regenerated man, enjoying a higher degree of spiritual and moral development.”

(c) **Border Parker Bowne** (1847-1910): Bowne was an American Christian philosopher, preacher, and theologian in the Methodist tradition. “In 1876 he became a professor of philosophy at Boston University, where he taught for more than thirty years. He later served as dean of the graduate school. He was an acute critic of mechanistic determinism, positivism, and naturalism. He categorized his views as Kantianized Berkeleyanism, transcendental empiricism and, finally, personalism, a philosophical branch of liberal theology.” His writings include *Studies in Theism* (1870), *Metaphysics* (1882), *Philosophy of Theism* (1887), *Principles of Ethics* (1892), *The Theory of Thought and Knowledge* (1897), *The Immanence of God* (1905), and *Personalism* (1908).

Bowne at first described his philosophy as transcendental empiricism, in view of the conspicuous role played in his thought by a doctrine of categories inspired by Kant. These are not simply empirically derived, fortuitous results of adaptation to environment in the process of evolution. At the same time, they are the expression of the nature of the self and of its self-experience. And this shows that the self is an active unity and not a mere logical postulate, as Kant thought. Indeed, the self or person, characterized by intelligence and will, is the only real efficient cause. For efficient causality is essentially volitional. In nature we find indeed uniformities, but no causality in the proper sense. This idea of Nature forms the basis for a philosophy of God. Science describes how things happen. And it can be said to explain events, if we mean by this that it exhibits them as examples or cases of empirically discovered generalizations which are called laws. But in the causal sense science explains nothing. Here the alternative is supernatural explanation or none. True, in science itself the idea of God is no more required than in shoemaking. But once we turn to metaphysics, we see the order of Nature as the effect of the constant activity of a supreme rational will. In other words, as far as its causation is concerned, any event in Nature is as supernatural as a miracle would be. For in both alike God would be equally implicated.”

“We can now take a broad view of reality. If, as Bowne believes, to be real is to act, and if activity in the full sense can be attributed only to persons, it follows that it is only persons who are, so to speak, fully real. We thus have the picture of a system of person standing to one another in various active relations through the instrumentality of the external world. And this system of persons must, according to Bowne, be the creation of a supreme Person, God. On the one hand, a
being which was less than personal could not be the sufficient cause of finite persons. On the other hand, if we can apply the category of causality to a world in which the intra-personal exercises no real efficient causality, this can only be because the world is the creation of a personal being who is immanently active in it. Ultimate reality thus appears as personal in character, as a system of persons with a supreme Person at their head. Personalism, as Bowne came to call his philosophy, is the only metaphysics that does not dissolve away into self-cancelling abstractions.

**Other Tendencies:** (a) **Objective Idealism**: “Idealism, in terms of metaphysics, is the philosophical view that the mind or spirit constitutes the fundamental reality. It has taken several distinct but related forms. Among them are objective and subjective idealism. Objective idealism accepts common sense realism (the view that material objects exist) but rejects naturalism (according to which the mind and spiritual values have emerged from material things), whereas subjective idealism denies that material objects exist independently of human perception and thus stands opposed to both realism and naturalism. If subjective idealism locks itself within the sphere of the cognizing individual and the sensuous form of his cognition, objective idealism, on the contrary, lifts the result of human thought, of man's entire culture, to an absolute, ascribing to it absolutely independent supra-personal being and active power.” “Objective idealism interprets the spiritual as a reality existing outside and independent of human consciousness.” Objective idealism is “that matter is effete mind, inveterate habits becoming physical laws.” James Edwin Creighton (1861-1924) was an American Idealist philosopher and the founding president (1902) of the American Philosophical Association. “After studying in Leipzig and Berlin he obtained his Ph.D. (1892) at Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., where he had begun teaching in 1889. He remained at Cornell until his death, acting also as American editor of Kantstudien (1896–1924) and editor in chief of Philosophical Review (1902–24). He constantly defended Idealistic, or speculative, philosophy against Pragmatism, neo-Realism, Materialism, and…immaterialism.”

“Creighton distinguishes two types of idealism. The first, which he calls mentalism, is simply the antithesis of materialism. While the materialist interprets the psychical as a function of the physical, the mentalist reduces material things to psychical phenomena, to states of consciousness or to ideas. And as the material world cannot without absurdity be reduced to any given finite individual’s states of consciousness, the mentalist is inevitably driven to postulate an absolute mind. The clearest example of this type of idealism is the philosophy of Berkeley. But there are variants, such as panpsychism. The other main type of idealism is objective or subjective idealism, which does not attempt to reduce the physical to eh psychical but regards Nature, the self and other selves as three distinct but co-ordinate and complementary moments or factors within experience. In other words, experience presents us with the ego. Other selves and Nature as distinct and irreducible factors which are at the same time comprised within the unity of experience. And objective idealism attempts to work out the implications of this basic structure of experience.”

For example, Nature and mind are mutually related. “Nature, therefore, cannot be simply heterogeneous to mind; it must be intelligible. And this means that though philosophy cannot do the work of the empirical sciences it is not committed merely to accepting the scientific account of Nature, without adding anything. Science puts Nature in the center of the picture: philosophy exhibits it as a co-coordinate of experience, in its relation to spirit. This does not mean that the philosopher is competent to contradict, or even to call in question scientific discoveries. It means that it is his business to show the significance of the world as represented by the sciences in reference to the totality of experience. In other words, there is room for a philosophy of Nature. Again, objective idealism is careful to avoid placing the ego in the center of the picture by taking it as an ultimate point of departure and then trying to prove the existence of other selves.”

---
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*Book VI. The World Wars, The Cold War, and Terrorism, 1914-2015*
(b) **Dynamic Idealism** was associated with the University of Michigan, where it was expounded by George Silvester Morris (1840-89). After having studied at Dartmouth College and the Union Theological Seminary at New York, Morris passed some years in Germany, where he came under the influence of Trendelenburg at Berlin. “In 1870 he began to teach modern languages and literature at Michigan, and from 1878 he also lectured on ethics and the history of philosophy at Johns Hopkins University. Subsequently he became dean of the philosophical faculty at Michigan. His writings include *British Thought and Thinkers* (1880), *Philosophy and Christianity* (1883), and *Hegel’s Philosophy of the State and of History: An Exposition* (1887).”

“Under the influence of Trendelenburg, Morris placed in the forefront of his philosophy the Aristotelian idea of movement, that is, of the actualization of a potentiality, of the active expression of an entelechy. Life is obviously movement, energy; but thought too is a spontaneous activity, akin to other forms of natural energy. And it follows from this that the history of thought is not properly described as a dialectical development of abstract ideas or categories. Rather is it the expression of the activity of the spirit or mind. And philosophy is the science of the mind as an active entelechy. That is to say, it is the science of experience in act or of lived experience. To say that philosophy is the science of the activity of the spirit or mind, of experience in act, is not, however, to say that it has no connection with being. For the analysis of experience shows that subject and object, knowledge and being, are correlative terms. That which exists or had being is that which is known or knowable. It is that which falls within the potential field of active experience. And this is why we have to reject the Kantian Theory of the unknowable thing-in-itself, together with the phenomenalism which produces this theory.” His most famous pupil was John Dewey, though Dewey came to abandon idealism for the instrumentalism.42

(c) **Evolutionary Idealism** has been represented by John Elof Boodin (1869-1950). He was a Swedish-born American philosopher and educator. “He was the author of numerous books proposing a systematic interpretation of nature. Boodin’s work preserved the tradition of philosophical idealism within the framework of contemporary science. Boodin also focused on the social nature of human behavior believing an understanding required an appreciation of individual participation in social life and interpersonal relationship.” He immigrated to the United States from Småland, Sweden in 1887 at the age of 18. “He taught at the parochial school of the First Evangelical Lutheran Church of Galesburg, Illinois. Boodin subsequently attended Augustana College in Rock Island, Illinois. He was later educated at the University of Colorado at Boulder and University of Minnesota where he was influenced by the psychologists James Rowland Angell, William James, and Josiah Royce. He studied philosophy under James Seth at Brown University where he earned his B. A. and M. A. before doctoral work at Harvard University, where he received his Ph.D. in 1899.”43

“The main idea of this type of idealism is familiar enough, namely that in the evolutionary process we can see the emergence of successively higher levels of development through the creative activity of an imminent principle, the nature of which should be interpreted in the light of its higher rather than of its lower products. In other words, evolutionary idealism substitutes for a purely mechanistic conception of evolution, based on laws relating to the redistribution of energy, a technological conception according to which mechanical processes take place within a general creative movement tending towards an ideal goal. Thus, Boodin distinguishes between different interacting levels or fields in the evolutionary process or processes, in each of which these are interacting individual systems of energy. These levels or fields range from the primary psycho-chemical level up to the ethical-social level. And the all-inclusive field is the divine creative spirit, the spiritual field in which everything lives and moves and has its being.”44
William Ernest Hocking (1973-1966) was an American idealist philosopher at Harvard University. He continued the work of his philosophical teacher Josiah Royce in revising idealism to integrate and fit into empiricism, naturalism and pragmatism. He said that metaphysics has to make inductions from experience: ‘That which does not work is not true.’ His major field of study was the philosophy of religion, but his 22 books included discussions of philosophy and human rights, world politics, freedom of the press, the philosophical psychology of human nature; education; and more. In 1958 he served as president of the Metaphysical Society of America.” “Hocking claimed that liberalism must be superseded by a new form of individualism in which the principle is; ‘every man shall be a whole man.’ He believed that humans have only one natural right: an individual should develop the powers that are in him. The most important freedom is the freedom to perfect one’s freedom. He considered Christianity to be a great agent in the making of world civilization.”

Kocking views that “the domain of religion is divine self, a Spirit which is as Subject to all finite things, persons and arts and object, and presumably too much else that these categories do not include. The world is thus necessary to God, though at the same time we can conceive it a created. For Nature is in fact an expression of the divine mine, as well as the means by which finite selves communicate with one another and pursue common ideals. In addition to the scientific view of Nature, which treats Nature as a self-contained whole, we need the concept of it as a divine communication to the finite self. As for the divine essence in itself, it transcends the grasp of discursive thought, though mystical experience yields a valid insight.” With Hocking, we find a form of personalistic absolute idealism.

Wilbur Marshall Urban (1873-1952) was Professor of Philosophy at Dartmouth College from 1920 to 1931. He was to show that idealism and realism are ultimately based on certain judgments of value about the conditions of genuine knowledge, and that these judgments can be dialectically harmonized. He does not mean, of course, that opposed philosophical systems can be so interpreted that it is possible to transcend the opposition between idealism and realism. The realist, Urban maintains, believes that there cannot be genuine knowledge unless things are in some sense independent of mind. In other words, he asserts the priority of being to knowledge. The idealist, however, believes that there can be no genuine knowledge unless things are in some sense dependent on mind. For their intelligibility is bound up with this dependence. At first sight, realism and idealism are incompatible, the first asserting the priority of being to thought and knowledge, the second asserting the priority of thought to being. But if we consider the basic judgments of value, we can see the possibility of overcoming the opposition between them. For example, the realist claim that knowledge cannot be described as genuine knowledge of reality unless things are in some sense independent of mind can be satisfied provided that we are willing to admit that things are not dependent simply on the human mind, while the idealist claim that knowledge cannot be described as genuine knowledge of reality unless things are in some sense mind-dependent can be satisfied if it is assumed that the reality on which on all finite things ultimately depend is spirit or mind. Absolute idealism, by rejecting the claim of subjective idealism that the human mind can know only its own states of consciousness, goes a long way towards meeting the realist’s claim that genuine knowledge of reality is not possible unless the object of knowledge of reality is in some real sense independent of the subject. And a realism that is prepared to describe ultimate reality as spirit or mind goes a long way towards meeting the idealist claim that nothing is intelligible unless it is either spirit or the self-expression of spirit. At the same time, the dialectical harmonization of opposed views, which Urban has in mind, seems to demand certain stipulations…To reach agreement with the realist he must recognize the priority of existence.”
2. The Pragmatist Movement

“Pragmatism considers thought an instrument or tool for prediction, problem solving and action, and rejects the idea that the function of thought is to describe, represent, or mirror reality. Pragmatists contend that most philosophical topics - such as the nature of knowledge, language, concepts, meaning, belief, and science - are all best viewed in terms of their practical uses and successes. The philosophy of pragmatism emphasizes the practical application of ideas by acting on them to actually test them in human experiences. Pragmatism focuses on a changing universe rather than an unchanging one as the Idealists, Realists and Thomists had claimed. The first use in print of the name pragmatism was in 1898 by James, who credited Peirce with coining the term during the early 1870s. James regarded Peirce's 1877–8 ‘Illustrations of the Logic of Science’ series (1878) as the foundation of pragmatism. Peirce in turn wrote in 1906 that Nicholas St. John Green had been instrumental by emphasizing the importance of applying Alexander Bain's definition of belief, which was that upon which a man is prepared to act.”

“Peirce developed the idea that inquiry depends on real doubt, not mere verbal or hyperbolic doubt, and said, in order to understand a conception in a fruitful way, ‘Consider the practical effects of the objects of your conception. Then, your conception of those effects is the whole of your conception of the object’, which he later called the pragmatic maxim. It equates any conception of an object to the general extent of the conceivable implications for informed practice of that object's effects. This is the heart of his pragmatism as a method of experimental mental reflection arriving at conceptions in terms of conceivable confirmatory and disconfirmatory circumstances - a method hospitable to the generation of explanatory hypotheses, and conducive to the employment and improvement of verification. Typical of Peirce is his concern with inference to explanatory hypotheses as outside the usual foundational alternative between deductivist rationalism and inductivist empiricism, although he was a mathematical logician and a founder of statistics. Peirce lectured and further wrote on pragmatism to make clear his own interpretation. While framing a conception's meaning in terms of conceivable tests, Peirce emphasized that, since a conception is general, its meaning, its intellectual purport, equates to its acceptance's implications for general practice, rather than to any definite set of real consequences (or test results); a conception's clarified meaning points toward its conceivable verifications, but the outcomes are not meanings, but individual upshots. Peirce in 1905 coined the new name pragmaticism for the precise purpose of expressing the original definition, saying that all went happily with James's and Schiller's variant uses of the old name pragmatism and that he nonetheless coined the new name because of the old name's growing use in literary journals, where it gets abused. Yet in a 1906 manuscript he cited as causes his differences with James and Schiller and, in a 1908 publication, his differences with James as well as literary author Giovanni Papini. Peirce in any case regarded his views that truth is immutable and infinity is real, as being opposed by the other pragmatists, but he remained allied with them on other issues.”

“Positivism is a philosophical theory stating that positive knowledge is based on natural phenomena and their properties and relations. Thus, information derived from sensory experience, interpreted through reason and logic, forms the exclusive source of all authoritative knowledge.” Positivism holds that valid knowledge (certitude or truth) is found only in this derived knowledge. Verified data (positive facts) received from the senses are known as empirical evidence; thus, positivism is based on empiricism. Positivism also holds that society, like the physical world, operates according to general laws. Introspective and intuitive knowledge is rejected, as is metaphysics and theology. However, pragmatism criticized logical positivism in 1960s.
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Photo III-2-1. The Chicago Club including Mead, Dewey, Angell, and Moore (1896)
*Pragmatism* is sometimes called *American Pragmatism*, accessed 18 January 2017,

Photo III-2-2. Charles Sanders Peirce (1839-1914) (Left)
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Photo III-2-3. William James (1842-1910) (Middle)
Photo III-2-4. John Dewey (1859-1952) (Right)
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Charles Sanders Peirce (1839-1914) was “one of four sons of Sarah Mills and Benjamin Peirce, who was Perkins professor of astronomy and mathematics at Harvard University. After graduating from Harvard College in 1859 and spending one year with field parties of the U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey, Peirce entered the Lawrence Scientific School of Harvard University, from which, in 1863, he graduated summa cum laude in chemistry. Meanwhile, he had reentered the Survey in 1861 as a computing aide to his father, who had undertaken the task of determining, from observations of lunar occultations of the Pleiades, the longitudes of American survey points with respect to European ones. Much of his early astronomical work for the Survey was done in the Harvard Observatory, in whose Annals (1878) there appeared his Photometric Researches. In 1871 his father obtained an appropriation to initiate a geodetic connection between the surveys of the Atlantic and Pacific coasts. This cross-continental triangulation lent urgency to the need for a gravimetric survey of North America directed toward a more precise determination of the Earth’s ellipticity, a project that Charles was to supervise. In pursuit of this project, Peirce contributed to the theory and practice of pendulum swinging as a means of measuring the force of gravity. The need to make accurate measurements of lengths in his pendulum researches, in turn, led him to make a pioneer determination of the length of the meter in terms of a wavelength of light (1877–79). During 1873-86, Peirce conducted pendulum experiments at about 20 stations in Europe and the United States and at several other places, including Grinnell Land in the Canadian Arctic. Though his experimental and theoretical work on gravity determinations had won international recognition for both him and the Survey, he was in frequent disagreement with its administrators from 1885 onward. The amount of time he took for the careful preparation of reports was ascribed to procrastination. His ‘Report on Gravity at the Smithsonian, Ann Arbor, Madison, and Cornell’ (1889) was never published, because of differences concerning its form and content. He finally resigned as of the end of 1891, and, from then until his death in 1914, he had no regular employment or income,” though consulting chemical engineer, mathematician, and inventor.” “Peirce was twice married: first in 1862 to Harriet Melusina Fay, who left him in 1876, and second in 1883 to Juliette Pourtalai. There were no children of either marriage. For the last 26 years of his life, he and Juliette lived on a farm on the Delaware River near Milford, Pa.”

The essence of pragmatism lies in a theory of meaning rather than in a theory of truth. “When we speak of truth and falsity, we refer to the possibility of the proposition being refuted. That is to say, if we could legitimately deduce from a proposition in conclusion which would conflict with an immediate perceptual judgment, the proposition would be false. In other words, proposition would be false if experience would refute it. If experience would not refute a proposition, the proposition is true. This may suggest that for Piece truth and verification are the same thing. But reflection will show that he is perfectly justified in rejecting this identification. For he is say, not that a proposition is true if it is empirically verified, but that it is true if it would not be empirically falsified, supposing that such a testing was possible. In point of fact, it may not be possible. But we can still say that a proposition is false if, to put it crudely, it would conflict with reality as revealed in experience if a confrontation were possible, and that otherwise it is true. Peirce can therefore say without inconsistency that every proposition is either true or false. Now, there are some proposition which could not conceivably be refuted...Hence on the interpretation of truth mentioned above the truth of a proposition in pure mathematics lies in the impossibility of ever finding a case in which it fails...the pure mathematician deals exclusively with hypothesizes which are the products of his own imagination, and that no proposition becomes a statement of pure mathematics until it is devoid of all definite meaning. But meaning has to be understood here in the sense of reference...And this absence of meaning is the reason why the propositions of pure mathematics cannot possibly be refuted and so are necessarily true.”
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(a) Work in Logic: “Though Peirce’s career was in physical science, his ambitions were in logic. By the age of 31, he had published a number of technical papers in that field, besides papers and reviews in chemistry, philology, the philosophy of history and of religion, and the history of philosophy. He had also given two series of Harvard University lectures and one of Lowell Institute lectures, all in logic. Though Peirce aspired to a university chair of logical research, no such chair existed, and none was created for him: the day of logic had not yet come. His nearest approach to this ambition occurred at Johns Hopkins University, where he held a lectureship in logic from 1879 to 1884 while retaining his position in the Survey. Logic in its widest sense he identified with semiotics, the general theory of signs. He labored over the distinction between two kinds of action: sign action, or semiosis, and dynamic, or mechanical, action. His major work, unfinished, was to have been entitled A System of Logic, Considered as Semiotic. Although he made eminent contributions to deductive, or mathematical, logic, Peirce was a student primarily of the logic of science - i.e., of induction and of what he referred to as reproduction, or abduction, the forming and accepting on probation of a hypothesis to explain surprising facts. His lifelong ambition was to establish abduction and induction firmly and permanently along with deduction in the very conception of logic - each of them clearly distinguished from the other two, yet positively related to them. It was for the sake of logic that Peirce so diversified his scientific researches, for he considered that the logician should ideally possess an insider’s acquaintance with the methods and reasonings of all the sciences.”

(b) Work in Philosophy: “Peirce’s Pragmatism was first elaborated in a series of ‘Illustrations of the Logic of Science’ in the Popular Science Monthly in 1877–78. The scientific method, he argued, is one of several ways of fixing beliefs. Beliefs are essentially habits of action. It is characteristic of the method of science that it makes its ideas clear in terms first of the sensible effects of their objects, and second of habits of action adjusted to those effects. Here, for example, is how the mineralogist makes the idea of hardness clear: the sensible effect of x being harder than y is that x will scratch y and not be scratched by it; and believing that x is harder than y means habitually using x to scratch y (as in dividing a sheet of glass) and keeping x away from y when y is to remain unscratched. By the same method Peirce tried to give equal clarity to the much more complex, difficult, and important idea of probability. In his Harvard lectures of 1903, he identified Pragmatism more narrowly with the logic of abduction. Even his evolutionary metaphysics of 1891–93 was a higher order working hypothesis by which the special sciences might be guided in forming their lower order hypotheses; thus, his more metaphysical writings, with their emphases on chance and continuity, were but further illustrations of the logic of science. When Pragmatism became a popular movement in the early 1900s, Peirce was dissatisfied both with all of the forms of Pragmatism then current and with his own original exposition of it, and his last productive years were devoted in large part to its radical revision and systematic completion and to the proof of the principle of what he by then had come to call pragmaticism. His one contribution to philosophy, he thought, was his new list of categories analogous to Kant’s a priori forms of the understanding, which he reduced from 12 to 3: Quality, Relation, and Representation. In later writings he sometimes called them Quality, Reaction, and Mediation; and finally, Firstness, Secondness, and Thirdness. At first he called them concepts; later, irreducible elements of concepts - the univalent, bivalent, and trivalent elements. They appear in that order, for example, in his division of the modalities into possibility, actuality, and necessity; in his division of signs into icons, indexes, and symbols; in the division of symbols into terms, propositions, and arguments; and in his division of arguments into abductions, inductions, and deductions. The primary function of the new list was to give systematic support to this last division.” Peirce was in conviction that the pragmatist theory of meaning demands the rejection of nominalism and the acceptance of realism.”

William James (1842-1910) “was an American philosopher and psychologist who was also trained as a physician. The first educator to offer a psychology course in the United States, James was one of the leading thinkers of the late nineteenth century and is believed by many to be one of the most influential philosophers the United States has ever produced, while others have labeled him the Father of American psychology. Along with Charles Sanders Peirce and John Dewey, James is considered to be one of the major figures associated with the philosophical school known as pragmatism and is also cited as one of the founders of functional psychology…Born into a wealthy family, James was the son of the Swedenborgian theologian Henry James Sr, and the brother of both the prominent novelist Henry James, and the diarist Alice James. James wrote widely on many topics, including epistemology, education, metaphysics, psychology, religion, and mysticism. Among his most influential books are The Principles of Psychology, which was a groundbreaking text in the field of psychology, Essays in Radical Empiricism, an important text in philosophy, and The Varieties of Religious Experience, which investigated different forms of religious experience, which also included the then theories on Mind cure.”

“William James was born at the Astor House in New York City. He was the son of Henry James Sr., a noted and independently wealthy Swedenborgian theologian well acquainted with the literary and intellectual elites of his day. The intellectual brilliance of the James family milieu and the remarkable epistolary talents of several of its members have made them a subject of continuing interest to historians, biographers, and critics. William James received an eclectic trans-Atlantic education, developing fluency in both German and French. Education in the James household encouraged cosmopolitanism. The family made two trips to Europe while William James was still a child, setting a pattern that resulted in thirteen more European journeys during his life. His early artistic bent led to an apprenticeship in the studio of William Morris Hunt in Newport, Rhode Island, but he switched in 1861 to scientific studies at the Lawrence Scientific School of Harvard University. He took up medical studies at Harvard Medical School in 1864. He took a break in the spring of 1865 to join naturalist Louis Agassiz on a scientific expedition up the Amazon River, but aborted his trip after eight months, as he suffered bouts of severe seasickness and mild smallpox. His studies were interrupted once again due to illness in April 1867. He traveled to Germany in search of a cure and remained there until November 1868; at that time, he was 26 years old. During this period, he began to publish; reviews of his works appeared in literary periodicals such as the North American Review. James finally earned his M.D. degree in June 1869, but he never practiced medicine. What he called his soul-sickness would only be resolved in 1872, after an extended period of philosophical searching. He married Alice Gibbens in 1878. In 1882 he joined the Theosophical Society. James's time in Germany proved intellectually fertile, helping him find that his true interests lay not in medicine but in philosophy and psychology.”

James interacted with a wide array of writers throughout his life. “James spent almost all of his academic career at Harvard. He was appointed instructor in physiology for the spring 1873 term, instructor in anatomy and physiology in 1873, assistant professor of psychology in 1876, assistant professor of philosophy in 1881, full professor in 1885, endowed chair in psychology in 1889, return to philosophy in 1897, and emeritus professor of philosophy in 1907. James studied medicine, physiology, and biology, and began to teach in those subjects, but was drawn to the scientific study of the human mind at a time when psychology was constituting itself as a science. James's acquaintance with the work of figures like Hermann Helmholtz in Germany and Pierre Janet in France facilitated his introduction of courses in scientific psychology at Harvard University. He taught his first experimental psychology course at Harvard in the 1875-1876 academic year.” James joined the Anti-imperialist League in 1898 against the U.S. annexation of the Philippines. After his retirement in 1907, he continued to write and lecture.
(a) **Interest in Psychology**: “In 1872 James was appointed instructor in physiology at Harvard College, in which capacity he served until 1876. But he could not be diverted from his ruling passion, and the step from teaching physiology to teaching psychology - not the traditional mental science but physiological psychology - was as inevitable as it was revolutionary. It meant a challenge to the vested interests of the mind, mainly theological; that were entrenched in the colleges and universities of the United States; and it meant a definite break with what Santayana called “the genteel tradition. Psychology ceased to be mental philosophy and became a laboratory science. Philosophy ceased to be an exercise in the grammar of assent and became an adventure in methodological invention and metaphysical discovery. With his marriage in 1878, to Alice H. Gibbens of Cambridge, Mass., a new life began for James. The old neurasthenia practically disappeared. He went at his tasks with a zest and an energy of which his earlier record had given no hint. It was as if some deeper level of his being had been tapped: his life as an originative thinker began in earnest. He contracted to produce a textbook of psychology by 1880. But the work grew under his hand, and when it finally appeared in 1890, as The Principles of Psychology, it was not a textbook but a monumental work in two great volumes, from which the textbook was condensed two years later. The Principles, which was recognized at once as both definitive and innovating in its field, established the functional point of view in psychology. It assimilated mental science to the biological disciplines and treated thinking and knowledge as instruments in the struggle to live. At one and the same time it made the fullest use of principles of psychophysics (the study of the effect of physical processes upon the mental processes of an organism) and defended, without embracing, free will.”

(b) **Interest in Religion**: “The Principles completed, James seems to have lost interest in the subject. Creator of the first U.S. demonstrational psychological laboratory, he disliked laboratory work and did not feel himself fitted for it. He liked best the adventure of free observation and reflection. Compared with the problems of philosophy and religion, psychology seemed to him a nasty little subject that he was glad to have done with. His studies, which were now of the nature and existence of God, the immortality of the soul, free will and determinism, the values of life, were empirical, not dialectical; James went directly to religious experience for the nature of God, to psychical research for survival after death, to fields of belief and action for free will and determinism. He was searching out these things, not arguing foregone conclusions. Having begun to teach ethics and religion in the late 1880s, his collaboration with the psychical researchers dated even earlier. Survival after death he ultimately concluded to be unproved; but the existence of divinity he held to be established by the record of the religious experience, viewing it as a plurality of saving powers, “a more of the same quality” as oneself, with which, in a crisis, one’s personality can make saving contact. Freedom he found to be a certain looseness in the conjunction of things, so that what the future will be is not made inevitable by past history and present form; freedom, or chance, corresponds to Darwin’s spontaneous variations. These views were set forth in the period between 1893 and 1903 in various essays and lectures, afterward collected into works, of which the most notable is *The Will to Believe and Other Essays in Popular Philosophy* (1897). During this decade, which may be correctly described as James’s religious period, all of his studies were concerned with one aspect or another of the religious question.”

“His natural interest in religion was reinforced by the practical stimulus of an invitation to give the Gifford Lectures on natural religion at the University of Edinburgh. He was not able to deliver them until 1901–02, and their preparation focused his labors for a number of years. His disability, involving his heart, was caused by prolonged effort and exposure during a vacation in the Adirondacks in 1898. A trip to Europe, which was to have taken up a sabbatical year away from university duties, turned into two years of invalidism. The Gifford Lectures were prepared...
during this distressful period. Published as *The Varieties of Religious Experience* (1902), they had an even greater acclaim as a book than as articles. Cautious and tentative though it was, the rich concreteness of the material and the final summary of the evidence - that the varieties of religious experience point to the existence of specific and various reservoirs of consciousness-like energies with which we can make specific contact in times of trouble - touched something fundamental in the minds of religionists and...provided them with apologetic material not in conflict with science and scientific method...was the culmination of James’s interest in the psychology of religion."

(c) **Career in Philosophy:** James now turned his attention to the philosophic problems that had been at least marginally present along with his other interests. “Already in 1898, in a lecture at the University of California on philosophical conceptions and practical results, he had formulated the theory of method known as Pragmatism. Originating in the strict analysis of the logic of the sciences that had been made in the middle 1870s by Charles Sanders Peirce, the theory underwent in James’s hands a transforming generalization. He showed how the meaning of any idea whatsoever - scientific, religious, philosophical, political, social, personal - can be found ultimately in nothing save in the succession of experiential consequences that it leads through and to; that truth and error, if they are within the reach of the mind at all, are identical with these consequences. Having made use of the pragmatic rule in his study of religious experience, he now turned it upon the ideas of change and chance, of freedom, variety, pluralism, and novelty, which, from the time he had read Renouvier, it had been his preoccupation to establish. He used the pragmatic rule in his polemic against monism and the “block universe,” which held that all of reality is of one piece (cemented, as it were, together); and he used this rule against internal relations (i.e., the notion that you cannot have one thing without having everything), against all finalities, staticisms, and completenesses. His classes rang with the polemic against absolutes, and a new vitality flowed into the veins of American philosophers. Indeed, the historic controversy over Pragmatism saved the profession from iteration and dullness.”

“Meanwhile (1906), James had been asked to lecture at Stanford University, in California, and he experienced there the earthquake that nearly destroyed San Francisco. The same year he delivered the Lowell Lectures in Boston, afterward published as *Pragmatism: A New Name for Old Ways of Thinking* (1907). Various studies appeared – ‘Does Consciousness Exist?’ ‘The Thing and Its Relations’, ‘The Experience of Activity’ - chiefly in *The Journal of Philosophy*; these were essays in the extension of the empirical and pragmatic method, which were collected after James’s death and published as *Essays in Radical Empiricism* (1912). The fundamental point of these writings is that the relations between things, holding them together or separating them, are at least as real as the things themselves; that their function is real; and that no hidden substrata are necessary to account for the clashes and coherences of the world. The Empiricism was radical because until this time even Empiricists believed in a metaphysical ground like the hidden turtle of Hindu mythology on whose back the cosmic elephant rode.”

“James was now the center of a new life for philosophy in the English-speaking world. The continentals did not get Pragmatism; if its German opponents altogether misunderstood it, its Italian adherents - among them, of all people, the critic and devastating iconoclast Giovanni Papini - travestied it. In England it was championed by F.C.S. Schiller, in the United States by John Dewey and his school, in China by Hu Shih. In 1907 James gave his last course at Harvard. In the spring he repeated the lectures on Pragmatism at Columbia University. It was as if a new prophet had come; the lecture halls were as crowded on the last day as on the first, with people standing outside the door. Shortly afterward came an invitation to give the Hibbert Lectures at Manchester College, Oxford. These lectures, published in 1909 as *A Pluralistic Universe*... state, in a more systematic and less technical way than the Essays, the same essential positions. They present, in
addition, certain religious overbeliefs of James’s, which further thinking - if the implications of the posthumous Some Problems of Philosophy may be trusted - was to mitigate. These overbeliefs involve a panpsychistic interpretation of experience that goes beyond radical Empiricism and the pragmatic rule into conventional metaphysics. Home again, James found himself working, against growing physical trouble, upon the material that was partially published after his death as Some Problems of Philosophy (1911). He also collected his occasional pieces in the controversy over Pragmatism and published them as The Meaning of Truth (1909). Finally, his physical discomfort exceeded even his remarkable voluntary endurance. After a fruitless trip to Europe in search of a cure, he returned, going straight to the country home in New Hampshire, where he died in 1910.”

In Epistemology, “James defined true beliefs as those that prove useful to the believer. His pragmatic theory of truth was a synthesis of correspondence theory of truth and coherence theory of truth, with an added dimension. Truth is verifiable to the extent that thoughts and statements correspond with actual things, as well as the extent to which they hang together, or cohere, as pieces of a puzzle might fit together; these are in turn verified by the observed results of the application of an idea to actual practice.” “James went on to apply the pragmatic method to the epistemological problem of truth. He would seek the meaning of true by examining how the idea functioned in our lives. A belief was true, he said, if it worked for all of us, and guided us expeditiously through our semi-hospitable world. James was anxious to uncover what true beliefs amounted to in human life, what their cash value was, and what consequences they led to. A belief was not a mental entity which somehow mysteriously corresponded to an external reality if the belief were true. Beliefs were ways of acting with reference to a precarious environment, and to say they were true was to say they were efficacious in this environment. In this sense the pragmatic theory of truth applied Darwinian ideas in philosophy; it made survival the test of intellectual as well as biological fitness. In William James's lecture of 1896 titled ‘The Will to Believe’, James defends the right to violate the principle of evidentialism in order to justify hypothesis venturing. This idea foresaw 20th century objections to evidentialism and sought to ground justified belief in an unwavering principle that would prove more beneficial. Through his philosophy of pragmatism William James justifies religious beliefs by using the results of his hypothetical venturing as evidence to support the hypothesis' truth. Therefore, this doctrine allows one to assume belief in a god and prove its existence by what the belief brings to one's life.”

(d) Significance and Influence: “In psychology, James’s work is of course dated, but it is dated as is Galileo’s in physics or Charles Darwin’s in biology because it is the originative matrix of the great variety of new developments that are the current vogue. In philosophy, his positive work is still prophetic. The world he argued for was soon reflected in the new physics, as diversely interpreted, with its resonances from Charles Peirce, particularly by Albert Einstein, Bertrand Russell, and the Danish quantum physicist Niels Bohr - a world of events connected with one another by kinds of next-to-next relations, a world various, manifold, changeful, originating in chance, perpetuated by habits (that the scientist calls laws), and transformed by breaks, spontaneities, and freedoms. In human nature, James believed, these visible traits of the world are equally manifest. The real specific event is the individual, whose intervention in history gives it in each case a new and unexpected turn. But in history, as in nature, the continuous flux of change and chance transforms every being, invalidates every law, and alters every ideal. James lived his philosophy. It entered into the texture and rhythms of his rich and vivid literary style. It determined his attitude toward scientifically unaccepted therapies, such as Christian Science or mind cure, and repugnant ideals, such as militarism. It made him an anti-imperialist, a defender of the small, the variant, the unprecedented, the weak, wherever and whenever they appeared. His philosophy is too viable and subtle….too experiential….to have become the dogma of a school.”
John Dewey (1859-1952) was an American philosopher, psychologist, and educational reformer whose ideas have been influential in education and social reform. Dewey is one of the primary figures associated with the philosophy of pragmatism and is considered one of the fathers of functional psychology. “Dewey graduated with a bachelor’s degree from the University of Vermont in 1879. After receiving a doctorate in philosophy from Johns Hopkins University in 1884, he began teaching philosophy and psychology at the University of Michigan. There his interests gradually shifted from the philosophy of Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel to the new experimental psychology being advanced in the United States by G. Stanley Hall and the pragmatist philosopher and psychologist William James. Further study of child psychology prompted Dewey to develop a philosophy of education that would meet the needs of a changing democratic society. In 1894 he joined the faculty of philosophy at the University of Chicago, where he further developed his progressive pedagogy in the university’s Laboratory Schools. In 1904 Dewey left Chicago for Columbia University in New York City, where he spent the majority of his career and wrote his most famous philosophical work, Experience and Nature (1925). His subsequent writing, which included articles in popular periodicals, treated topics in aesthetics, politics, and religion. The common theme underlying Dewey’s philosophy was his belief that a democratic society of informed and engaged inquirers was the best means.” In 1919, while traveling in Japan on sabbatical leave, Dewey visited Peking University to visit China.

(a) Being Nature and Experience: “In order to develop and articulate his philosophical system, Dewey first needed to expose what he regarded as the flaws of the existing tradition. He believed that the distinguishing feature of Western philosophy was its assumption that true being—that which is fully real or fully knowable—is changeless, perfect, and eternal and the source of whatever reality the world of experience may possess. Plato’s forms (abstract entities corresponding to the properties of particular things) and the Christian conception of God were two examples of such a static, pure, and transcendent being, compared with which anything that undergoes change is imperfect and less real. According to one modern version of the assumption, developed by the 17th-century philosopher René Descartes, all experience is subjective, an exclusively mental phenomenon that cannot provide evidence of the existence or the nature of the physical world, the matter of which is ultimately nothing more than changeless extension in motion. The Western tradition thus made a radical distinction between true reality on the one hand and the endless varieties and variations of worldly human experience on the other. Dewey held that this philosophy of nature was drastically impoverished. Rejecting any dualism between being and experience, he proposed that all things are subject to change and do change. There is no static being, and there is no changeless nature. Nor is experience purely subjective, because the human mind is itself part and parcel of nature. Human experiences are the outcomes of a range of interacting processes and are thus worldly events. The challenge to human life, therefore, is to determine how to live well with processes of change, not somehow to transcend them.”

(b) Nature and the Construction of Ends: “Dewey developed a metaphysics that examined characteristics of nature that encompassed human experience but were either ignored by or misrepresented by more traditional philosophers. Three such characteristics - what he called the precarious, histories, and ends - were central to his philosophical project. (i) Precarious: “For Dewey, a precarious event is one that somehow makes ongoing experience problematic; thus, any obstacle, disruption, danger, or surprise of any kind is precarious. As noted earlier, because humanity is a part of nature, all things that humans encounter in their daily experience, including other humans and the social institutions they inhabit, are natural events. The arbitrary cruelty of a tyrant or the kindness shown by a stranger is as natural and precarious as the destruction wrought by a flood or the vibrant colors of a sunset. Human ideas and moral norms must also be viewed in
Chapter III. History of Philosophy

this way. Human knowledge is wholly intertwined with precarious, constantly changing nature.”

(ii) Histories: “The constancy of change does not imply a complete lack of continuity with the past stages of natural processes. What Dewey meant by a history was a process of change with an identifiable outcome. When the constituent processes of a history are identified, they become subject to modification, and their outcome can be deliberately varied and secured. Dewey’s conception of a history has an obvious implication for humanity: no person’s fate is sealed by an antecedently given human nature, temperament, character, talent, or social role. This is why Dewey was so concerned with developing a philosophy of education. With an appropriate knowledge of the conditions necessary for human growth, an individual may develop in any of a variety of ways. The object of education is thus to promote the fruition of an active history of a specific kind - a human history.”

(iii) Ends and Goods: “Since at least the time of Aristotle, many Western philosophers have made use of the notion of end, or final cause - i.e., a cause conceived of as a natural purpose or goal. In ethics, ends are the natural or consciously determined goals of moral actions; they are moral absolutes, such as happiness or “the good,” that human actions are designed to bring about. But such ends must be discerned before they can be fully attained. For Dewey, on the other hand, an end is a deliberately constructed outcome of a history. Hence, his expression “the construction of good” encapsulates much of the significance of his philosophy. A person confronted by a spontaneous intrusion of the precarious world into the seemingly steady course of his life will identify and analyze the constituents of his particular situation and then consider what changes he might introduce in order to produce, in Dewey’s parlance, a consummatory end. Such an end is a fulfillment of these particular conditions, and it is unique to them. Similarly, there is no such thing as an absolute good against which actions may be evaluated; rather, any constructed end that promotes human flourishing while taking into account the precarious is a good.”

(c) Instrumentalism: “Dewey joined and gave direction to American pragmatism, which was initiated by the logician and philosopher Charles Sanders Peirce in the mid-19th century and continued into the early 20th century by William James, among other thinkers. Anticipating Dewey, James regarded reality as an array of buzzing rather than static data, and he argued that the distinction between mental experience and the physical world is messy rather than pristine. Another theme of early pragmatism, also adopted by Dewey, was the importance of experimental inquiry. Peirce, for example, praised the scientific method’s openness to repeated testing and revision of hypotheses, and he warned against treating any idea as an infallible reflection of reality. In general, pragmatists were inspired by the dramatic advances in science and technology during the 19th century - indeed, many had formal scientific training and performed experiments in the natural, physical, or social sciences. Dewey’s particular version of pragmatism, which he called “instrumentalism,” is the view that knowledge results from the discernment of correlations between events, or processes of change. Inquiry requires an active participation in such processes: the inquirer introduces specific variations in them to determine what differences thereby occur in related processes and measures how a given event changes in relation to variations in associated events. For example, experimental inquiry may seek to discern how malignancies in a human organism change in relation to variations in specific forms of treatment, or how students become better learners when exposed to particular methods of instruction.”

“True to the name he gave it, and in keeping with earlier pragmatists, Dewey held that ideas are instruments, or tools, that humans use to make greater sense of the world. Specifically, ideas are plans of action and predictors of future events. A person possesses an idea when he is prepared to use a given object in a manner that will produce a predictable result. Thus, a person has an idea of a hammer when he is prepared to use such an object to drive nails into wood. An idea in the
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science of medicine may predict that the introduction of a certain vaccine will prevent the onset of future maladies of a definite sort. Ideas predict that the undertaking of a definite line of conduct in specified conditions will produce a determinate result. Of course, ideas might be mistaken. They must be tested experimentally to see whether their predictions are borne out. Experimentation itself is fallible, but the chance for error is mitigated by further, more rigorous inquiry. Instrumentalism’s operating premise is that ideas empower people to direct natural events, including social processes and institutions, toward human benefit.”

(d) Democracy as a Way of Life: “Given its emphasis on the revisability of ideas, the flux of nature, and the construction of ends or goods...one may wonder how Dewey’s philosophy could provide moral criteria by which purported goods may be evaluated. Dewey did not provide a thorough, systematic response to the question of how an instrumentalist determines the difference between good and evil. His typical rejoinder was that human fulfillment will be far more widespread when people fully realize that precarious natural events may come under deliberate human direction. Dewey made this claim, however, without sufficiently weighing the problem of how people are to choose between one proposed vision of fulfillment and another, especially when there are honest disagreements about their respective merits. Yet, while he never solved the problem, Dewey did address it in his philosophy of democracy, which he referred to as “democracy as a way of life. Dewey conceived of democracy as an active process of social planning and collective action in all spheres of common life. Democracy is also a source of moral values that may guide the establishment and evolution of social institutions that promote human flourishing. However, unlike other moral frameworks (e.g., great religious traditions or political ideologies), democracy as a way of life is neither absolutist nor relativistic, because its norms and procedures are fallible and experimental. It is a consciously collaborative process in which individuals consult with each other to identify and address their common problems; indeed, Dewey spoke of democracy as “social intelligence.” Within a fully democratic society, Dewey suggested, people would treat each other with respect and would demonstrate a willingness to revise their views while maintaining a commitment to cooperative action and experimental inquiry.”

(e) Logic and Method: “Dewey sees paradox in contemporary logical theory. Proximate subject matter garners general agreement and advancement, while the ultimate subject matter of logic generates unremitting controversy. In other words, he challenges confident logicians to answer the question of the truth of logical operators. Do they function merely as abstractions (e.g., pure mathematics) or do they connect in some essential way with their objects, and therefore alter or bring them to light? Logical positivism also figured in Dewey’s thought. About the movement he wrote that it eschews the use of propositions and terms, substituting sentences and words. (General Theory of Propositions, in Logic: The Theory of Inquiry) He welcomes this changing of referents “in as far as it fixes attention upon the symbolic structure and content of propositions.” However, he registers a small complaint against the use of sentence and words in that without careful interpretation the act or process of transposition “narrow unduly the scope of symbols and language, since it is not customary to treat gestures and diagrams (maps, blueprints, etc.) as words or sentences. In other words, sentences and words, considered in isolation, do not disclose intent, which may be inferred or adjudged only by means of context. Yet Dewey was not entirely opposed to modern logical trends. Concerning traditional logic, he states: Aristotelian logic, which still passes current nominally, is a logic based upon the idea that qualitative objects are existential in the fullest sense. To retain logical principles based on this conception along with the acceptance of theories of existence and knowledge based on an opposite conception is not, to say the least, conductive to clearness – a consideration that has a good deal to do with existing dualism between traditional and the newer relational logics.”
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3. The Revolt against Idealism: Realism

When we think of the revolt against idealism in Great Britain, the names which immediately come to mind are those of two Cambridge men, G. E. Moore and Bertrand Russell. Moore, however, is universally acknowledged to be one of the chief inspirers of the analytic movement, as it is commonly called, which has enjoyed a spectacular success in the first half of the twentieth century. As we already investigated previously, idealism came to occupy a dominating position in the British universities, especially at Oxford, during the second half of the nineteenth century. But even at Oxford the triumph of idealism was not complete.

Some Oxford Realists: Thomas Case (1844-1925), who occupied the chair of metaphysics from 1899 until 1910 and was President of Corpus Christi College from 1904 until 1924, published Realism in Morals in 1877 and Physical Realism in 1888. It is indeed true that in itself Case’s realism was opposed to subjective idealism and to phenomenalism rather than to objective or to absolute idealism. For it consisted basically in the thesis that there is a real and knowable world of things existing independently of sense-data. At the same time, while in the war against materialism Case was on the side of the idealists, he regarded himself as continuing or restoring the realism of Francis Bacon and of scientists such as Newton and as an opponent of the then fashionable idealist movement.”

John Cook Wilson (1849-1915) was “Wykeham Professor of Logic at New College, Oxford and the founder of ‘Oxford Realism’, a philosophical movement that flourished at Oxford during the first decades of the 20th century. Although trained as a classicist and a mathematician, his most important contribution was to the theory of knowledge, where he argued that knowledge is factive and not definable in terms of belief, and he criticized ‘hybrid’ and ‘externalist’ accounts. He also argued for direct realism in perception, criticizing both empiricism and idealism, and argued for a moderate nominalist view of universals as being in rebus and only ‘apprehended’ by their particulars. His influence helped swaying Oxford away from idealism”

(a) State of Mind: “Since Cook Wilson’s philosophy was largely defined in opposition to British Idealism, it is worth beginning with some point of explicit disagreement. Roughly put, under the idealist view knowledge is constituted by a coherent set of mutually supporting beliefs, none of which are basic, while others would be derivative. Cook Wilson did not argue directly against the coherence theory, as Russell was famously to do, but took instead the opposite, foundationalist stance…His foundationalism has this interesting particularity that he rejected the underlying thesis that knowledge is to be defined in terms of belief, together with one or more additional properties such as ‘justified’ and ‘true’.” “Still working with this ‘judicial’ definition of judgement, Cook Wilson further criticized the idealists for also thinking that judgement is a common form which includes knowledge, opinion, and belief. The notion of judgement one finds in logic books being thus a fabricated one, Cook Wilson claimed instead to follow ‘ordinary usage’ in stating that: A judgement is a decision. To judge is to decide. It implies previous indecision; a previous thinking process, in which we were doubting. Those verbal statements, therefore, which result from a state of mind not preceded by such doubt, statements which are not decisions, are not judgements, though they may have the same verbal form as judgements.” Cook Wilson held the view that knowledge, in the form of apprehension, was presupposed by other activities of thinking: “There will be something else besides judgement to be recognized in the formation of opinion, that is to say knowledge, as manifested in such activities as occur in ordinary perception; activities, in other words, which are not properly speaking decisions.”67
(b) **Knowledge**: “Cook Wilson believed that “our experience of knowing then being the presupposition of any inquiry we can undertake, we cannot make knowing itself a subject of inquiry in the sense of asking what knowing is”. This leads to his main thesis concerning knowledge, namely that it is not definable in terms of something else. In particular, it is not to be defined in terms of belief augmented by some other property or properties, as in the traditional view of knowledge as ‘justified true belief’. In particular, the difference between, on the one hand, knowledge and, say, belief or opinion, on the other, is not a difference of degree of something such as the feeling of confidence, or the amount of supportive evidence: In knowing, we can have nothing to do with the so-called ‘greater strength’ of the evidence on which the opinion is grounded; simply because we know that this ‘greater strength’ of evidence of A’s being B is compatible with A’s not being B after all.’ “Belief is also to be distinguished from knowledge, since one is likely to say ‘I believe p’ precisely when one recognizes that one’s grounds for believing p - which may be knowledge, in which case it is clear that knowing entails believing - are insufficient for one’s knowledge of p. So, when one knows, one does not believe: Belief is not knowledge and the man who knows does not believe at all what he knows; he knows it.”\(^68\)

(c) **Realism**: “Cook Wilson also argued against idealism that in apprehension it is neither the case that the object exists only within the apprehending consciousness, nor that it is constituted by it: it is just independent of it. This independence he considered to be presupposed by the very idea of knowledge. Arguing from analogy with the case of two bodies colliding, Cook Wilson reasoned that the apprehension of an object is only possible through a being of the object other than its being apprehended, and it is this being, no part itself of the apprehending thought, which is what is apprehended. Under this view, the object apprehended may or may not be ‘mental’. This also means that the object apprehended must not be some ‘copy’ of the real object: what I think of the red object is its own redness, not some mental copy of redness in my mind. I regard it as having real redness and not as having my copy of redness…If we ask in any instance what it is we think of a given object of knowledge, we find it always conceived as the nature or part of the nature of the thing known. Part of Cook Wilson’s rejection of ‘hybrid’ accounts of knowledge precisely involved the rejection of epistemological ‘intermediaries’, so that knowledge is not of some representative or copy, but, in a sense, knowledge contains its object.”\(^69\)

(d) **Universals**: Cook Wilson argued against the neo-Kantian views of idealists, that any synthesis apprehended is attributed to the object and not the result of an activity of the apprehending mind. “As he put it, in the judgment of knowledge and the act of knowledge in general, we do not combine our apprehensions, but apprehend a combination, and it is the nature of the elements themselves which determines which unity they have or can have; the apprehending mind has no power whatever to make a complex idea out of simple ones. This view implies that universals and connections between them are in rebus and to be apprehended as such. As was pointed out earlier, ‘apprehension’ is, according to Cook Wilson, not mere ‘sensation’, because in the former one recognizes the definite character of a sensation, through comparison. So, apprehension is of the universal in the sensation, albeit not necessarily an apprehension of it as universal. This conception implies that the universal is strictly objective and not a mere thought of ours. This view, Cook Wilson held as being in accordance with ordinary language and common sense, if not popular among philosophers. The universal may be a real unity in objects, but Cook Wilson also believed that the reality of the universal cannot be separated from its particulars - which he preferred to call ‘particularization of the universal’ - because the particular is not something that has the quality, it is the particularized quality. The view is, therefore, that there is no possible apprehension of the universal except as particularized: Just as the universal cannot be, except as particularized, so we cannot apprehend it except in the apprehension of a particular.”\(^70\)
Harold Arthur Prichard (1871-1947) was an English philosopher, “one of the leading members of the Oxford intuitionist school of moral philosophy, which held that moral values are ultimate and irreducible and can be ascertained only through the use of intuition. Prichard spent most of his life teaching at the University of Oxford, where he was fellow of Hertford College from 1895 to 1898 and of Trinity College from 1898 to 1924. He was White professor of moral philosophy from 1928 to 1937. His principal works are *Kant's Theory of Knowledge* (1909), *Duty and Interest* (1928), *Moral Obligation* (1949), and *Knowledge and Perception* (1950).”

“Prichard gave an influential defense of ethical intuitionism in his ‘Does Moral Philosophy Rest on a Mistake?’ (1912), wherein he contended that moral philosophy rested chiefly on the desire to provide arguments, starting from non-normative premises, for the principles of obligation that we pre-philosophically accept, such as the principle that one ought to keep one's promises or that one ought not to steal. This is a mistake…both because it is impossible to derive any statement about what one ought to do from statements not concerning obligation (even statements about what is good), and because there is no need to do so since common sense principles of moral obligation are self-evident. The essay laid a groundwork for ethical intuitionism and provided inspiration for some of the most influential moral philosophers, such as John Rawls.”

Prichard attacks Utilitarianism as not being capable of forming obligation. He states that one cannot justify an obligation by pointing to the consequences of the obligated action because pointing to the consequences only shows that the action is desirable or advisable, not that it is obligatory. In other words, he claims that, while Utilitarianism may encourage people to do actions which a moral person would do, it cannot create a moral obligation to do those actions.”

Deriving Moral Obligation: “H. A. Prichard is an ethical intuitionist, meaning he believed that it is through our moral intuitions that we come to know right and wrong. Further, while he believes that moral obligations are justified by reasons, he does not believe that the reasons are external to the obligation itself. For instance, if a person is asked why he ought not to torture chipmunks, the only satisfying answer that could be given is that he ought not to torture chipmunks. Prichard, along with other intuitionists, adopts a foundationalist approach to morality. Foundationalism is a theory of epistemology which states that there are certain fundamental principles which are the basis for all other knowledge. In the case of ethics, foundationalists hold that certain fundamental moral rules are their own justification. Walter Sinnott-Armstrong explains:

“The deepest challenge in moral epistemology, as in general epistemology, is raised by a skeptical regress argument: Someone is justified in believing something only if the believer has a reason that is expressible in an inference with premises that the believer is already justified in believing. This requires a chain of inferences that must continue infinitely, close into a circle, or stop arbitrarily. Academic skeptics reject all three options and conclude that there is no way for anyone to be justified in believing anything... If a believer can work back to a premise that the believer is justified in believing without being able to infer that premise from anything else, then there is no new premise to justify, so the regress goes no further... Moral intuitionists apply foundationalism to moral beliefs as a way to stop the skeptical regress regarding moral beliefs. Therefore, Prichard concludes that just as observation of other people necessitates that other people exist, the observation of a moral obligation necessitates that the obligation exists. Prichard finishes his essay by answering a few obvious problems. Most notably, he explains how people should guarantee the accuracy of their moral intuitions. Clearly, observations can be misleading. ... The same can occur with moral intuition. If one begins to doubt one's intuition, one should try to imagine oneself in the moral dilemma related to the decision. If the intuition persists, then the intuition is accurate. Prichard further supports these claims by pointing out how it is illegitimate to doubt previously believed moral intuitions.”
The New Realism was a philosophy expounded in the early 20th century by a group of six US based scholars: “Edwin Bissell Holt (Harvard University), Walter Taylor Marvin (Rutgers College), William Pepperell Montague (Columbia University), Ralph Barton Perry (Harvard), Walter Boughton Pitkin (Columbia) and Edward Gleason Spaulding (Princeton University).”

“The central feature of the new realism was a rejection of the epistemological dualism of John Locke and of older forms of realism. The group maintained that, when one is conscious of, or knows, an object, it is an error to say that the object in itself and our knowledge of the object are two distinct facts. If we know a particular cow is black, is the blackness on that cow or in the observer's mind? Holt wrote; ‘That color out there is the thing in consciousness selected for such inclusion by the nervous system's specific response. Consciousness is not physically identical with the nervous system: it is out there with the cow, all throughout the field of sight (and smell, and hearing) and identical with the set of facts it knows at any moment. The nervous system is merely a system of selection. This position, which belongs to a broader category of views sometimes called neutral monism or, following William James, radical empiricism, hasn't worn well over the subsequent century, partly because of the problem of the nature of abstract ideas such as blackness. It seems very natural to locate blackness as an abstract idea in the mind that's useful in dealing with the world. The new realists did not want to acknowledge representationalism at all but later embraced something akin to Aristotle's form of realism: blackness is a general quality that many objects have in common, and the nervous system selects not just the object but the commonality as a fact. But Arthur Lovejoy showed in his book The Revolt against Dualism that the perception of black varies so much, depending on context in the visual field, the perceiver's personal history and cultural usage, that it cannot be reduced to commonalities within objects. Better, Lovejoy thought, to bring representational ideas back into the account after all.”

This obviously implies that knowledge is an external relation. The new realists accepted the theory of relations as external to their terms. “This view obviously favored pluralism rather than monism in metaphysics. And it also pointed to the impossibility of deducing the world-system a priori.” “Holt’s way of dealing with the matter is to make a distinction between being and reality. Realism does not commit us to holding that all perceived things are real. While all perceived things are things, not all perceived things are real things. It does not follow, however, that unreal objects of perception or of thought are to be described as subjective in character. On the contrary, the unreal has being and subsists of its own right in the all-inclusive universe of being. In fine, the universe is not all real; but the universe all is.” If we abstract from the particular purpose or purposes which lead us to select one appearance as a thing’s real appearance, “we can say that all its appearances are on the same footing.” The universe of being is all things physical, mental, and logical, existent and non-existent, false and true, good and evil, real and unreal subsist.

“For new realism, the assumption that science is not systematically the ultimate measure of truth and reality does not mean that we should abandon the notions of reality, truth or objectivity, as was posited by much twentieth century philosophy. Rather, it means that philosophy, as well as jurisprudence, linguistics or history, has something important and true to say about the world. In this context, new realism presents itself primarily as a negative realism: the resistance that the outside world opposes to our conceptual schemes should not be seen as a failure, but as a resource – a proof of the existence of an independent world. If this is the case, however, this negative realism turns into a positive realism: in resisting us reality does not merely set a limit we cannot trespass, but it also offers opportunities and resources. This explains how, in the natural world, different life-forms can interact in the same environment without sharing any conceptual scheme and how, in the social world, human intentions and behaviors are made possible by a reality that is first given, and that only at a later time may be interpreted and, if necessary, transformed.”
The Critical Realism: Critical realism found expression in a joint-volume, *Essays in Critical Realism: A Co-operative Studies of the Problems of Knowledge*, which appeared in 1920. The contributors were D. Drake (1898-1933), A. O. Lovejoy (1873-1962), J. B. Pratt (1875-1944), A. K. Rogers (1868-1936), G. Santayana (1863-1952), R. W. Sellars (1880-1973), and C. A. Strong (1862-1940). “The strength of critical realism lay in attack. For example, in *The Revolt against Dualism* (1930), Lovejoy argued that while neo-realists originally appealed to common sense in their rejection of representationalism, they then proceeded to give an account of objects which was incompatible with the common-sense point of view. For to maintain with Holt that all the appearances of a thing are on the same footing as its objective projective properties is to commit oneself to saying that railway lines are both parallel and convergent, and that the surface of, say, a penny is both circular and elliptical.”

“In expounding their own doctrine, however, the critical realists encountered considerable difficulties. We can say that they were agreed in maintaining that what we directly perceive is some character-complex or immediate datum which functions as a sign of or guide to an independently existing thing. But they were not in full agreement about the nature of the immediate datum. Some were prepared to speak about such data as mental states. And in this case they would presumably be in the mind. Others, such as Santayana, believed that the immediate data of consciousness are essences, and ruled out any question as to their whereabouts on the ground that they exist only as exemplified. In any case, if representationalism is once admitted, it seems to follow that the existence of physical objects is inferred. And there then arises the problem of justifying this inference. What reason have I for supposing that what I actually perceive represents something other than itself? Further, if we never perceive physical objects directly, how can we discriminate between the representative values of different sense-data?”

“The critical realists tried to answer the first question by maintaining that from the very start and by their very nature the immediate data of perception point to physical objects beyond themselves. But they differed in their account of this external reference. Santayana, for instance, appeals to animal faith, to the force of instinctive belief in the external reference of our percepts, a belief which we share with the animals, while Sellars relied on psychology to explain how our awareness of externality develops and grows in definiteness.” “After all, travelers in the desert, interpreting a mirage as a prediction that they will find water ahead of them, find by bitter experience that the prediction is not verified. At the same time a theoretical difficulty still remains for the representationalist to solve. For on his premises, the process of verification terminates in sensory experience…gives us direct access to what lies beyond sense-data. True, if what we are seeking is the sensory experience of a slaking of thirst, having this experience is all that is required from the practical point of view.” But it seems to remain immersed in representation.

The word realism can have different shades of meaning. Its basic meaning is that knowledge is not a construction of the object, that knowing is a relation of compresence between the subject and object, which makes no difference to the object. We have seen, however, that in the realist movement, problems arose about the time the American philosophers who belonged to the two groups which have been mentioned were exclusively concerned with the problems to which attention has been drawn in this and the preceding sections. Among the neo-realists Perry, for example, became well known as a moral philosopher, and also devoted himself to political and social themes. Among the critical realists, Santayana developed a general philosophy, while Strong and Drake expounded a panpsychistic ontology, taking introspection as a key to the nature of reality. Sellars defended a naturalistic philosophy, based on the idea of emergent evolution with irreducible levels and comprising a theory of perception as an interpretative operation. Lovejoy exercised a considerable influence by his studies in the history of ideas.”
Chapter III. History of Philosophy

Samuel Alexander (1859-1938) was an Australian-born British philosopher. Alexander was born at now the commercial heart of Sydney, Australia. Both parents were Jewish. In 1871, he was sent to Wesley College, Melbourne, then under the headmastership of Professor Irving, and was always grateful for the efficiency and comprehensiveness of his schooling. He matriculated at the University of Melbourne in 1875 to do arts. In May 1877, he went Oxford with a scholarship, where he became under the influence of Green and Bradley. “This influence, however, was supplanted by that of the idea of evolution, as well as by an interest in empirical psychology, which was scarcely a characteristic of Oxford at the time. Later on, Alexander received stimulus from the realism of Moore and Russel and came to approach, though he did not altogether accept, the position of American neo-realism. But he regarded the theory of knowledge as preparatory to metaphysical synthesis.” After taking his degree of BA from Oxford in 1881, “Alexander was made a Fellow of Lincoln College, Oxford where he remained as philosophy tutor from 1882 to 1893. It was during this period that he developed his interest in psychology, then a neglected subject. In 1887, he won the Green moral philosophy prize with an essay on the subject ‘In what direction does Moral Philosophy seem to you to admit or require advance?’ This was the basis of his volume Moral Order and Progress, published in 1889.” In 1893 Alexander was appointed professor of philosophy to the University of Manchester. In the years of 1916-18, he delivered the Gifford Lectures at Glasgow, which was published under the title Space, Time and Deity in 1920, which made a great impression on philosophic thinkers at the time. His Arthur Davis Memorial Lecture on Spinoza and Time was published in 1921, and in 1924 he retired from his chair.

(a) History of Philosophy. “Alexander's first publication, ‘Hegel's Conception of Nature’ (1886), reveals Alexander's philosophic upbringing in the Oxford British Hegelian enclave. Alexander aims to set out Hegel's conception of nature – ‘so fantastic and so poetical that it may often be thought not to be serious’ - as clearly as possible, and show where it agrees with, and diverges from, contemporary science. He explains that science leads to a philosophy of nature through observation - for example, transforming seemingly isolated individuals into universals by discovering their general character - and the discovery of laws. Alexander also compares Hegel's account to contemporary theories of evolution and argues that there is a great likeness. Arguably, some of the positions that Alexander attributes to Hegel are similar to his own mature views; Alexander reads Hegel as holding that space and time are in the world as much as matter. Alexander's early monograph Locke (1908) discusses Locke's views on ethics, politics and religion as given in Locke's Essay. The book is extremely short but one comes away with a keen sense of Alexander's admiration for Locke. Whilst this work is mainly of scholarly interest, Alexander spends one chapter “Observations on the Essay” critiquing Locke, and here Alexander reveals the bent of his own early views. For example, Alexander complains that Locke might have gone further had he applied his observations regarding the continuity of mental experience to substance. This is suggestive, given that one of Alexander's later key claims concerning spacetime - the stuff of substances - is that it is continuous.”

(b) Evolutionary Ethics. In his Moral Order and Progress (18889), Alexander considered ethics to be concerned with the analysis of moral concepts, such as good and evil, right and wrong. “But he also regarded it as a normative science. In his interpretation of the moral life and of moral concepts he carried on the line of thought represented by Herbert Spencer and Sir Leslie Stephen. Thus, in his view the struggle for survival in the biological sphere takes the form in the ethical sphere of a struggle between rival moral ideals. And the law of natural selection, as applying in the moral field, means that that set of moral ideals tends to prevail which most conduces to the production of a state of equilibrium or harmony between the various elements and forces in the individual, between the individual and society, and between man and his environment. There is
thus an ultimate and overall ideal of harmony which in Alexander’s view includes within itself the ideals upheld by other ethical systems, such as happiness and self-realization. At the same time the conditions of life, physical and social, are constantly changing, with the result that the concrete meaning of equilibrium or harmony assumes fresh forms. Hence, even though there is in a real sense an ultimate end of moral progress, it cannot be actually attained in a fixed and unalterable shape, and ethics cannot be expressed in the form of a set of static principles which are incapable of modification or change.”

(c) Realism and Compresence: “In ‘The Basis of Realism’ (1914) Alexander rejects idealism in favor of realism. He writes that the temper of realism is to de-anthropomorphize: to put man and mind in their proper places in the world of things. Whilst mind is properly understood as part of nature, this does not diminish its value. For Alexander, realism is thus naturalistic. This paper is an expansion of Alexander's less rigorous (1909–10), where he compares the new conception of mind as a mere part of the universe - as opposed to being at the center of the universe - to the move from egocentrism to heliocentrism. A key part of Alexander's thesis is that minds exist in the world alongside other things. Minds are compresent with other objects in the world, such as tables and mountains. In fact, all existents are compresent with each other. There is nothing peculiar in the relation itself between mind and its objects; what is peculiar in the situation is the character of one of the terms, its being mind or consciousness. The relation is one of compresence. But there is compresence between two physical things. The relation of mind and object is comparable to that between table and floor.”

Thus, “His basic idea of knowledge is that it is simply a relation of compresence or together-ness between some object and a conscious being. The object, in the sense of the thing known, is what it is whether it is known or not. Further, Alexander rejects all forms of representationalism. We can, of course, direct our attention explicitly to our mental acts or states. But they do not serve as copies of signs of external things which are known only indirectly. Rather do we enjoy our mental acts while knowing directly objects which are other than the acts by which we know them. Nor are sense data intermediate objects between consciousness and physical things, they are perspectives of things. Even a so-called illusion is a perspective of the real world, though it is referred by the mind to a context to which it does not belong. Further, in knowing the past by memory we really do know the past. That is to say, past-ness is a direct object of experience.”

(d) Space, Time and Deity (1920): “The first chapter of Space, Time, and Deity opens with Alexander's proclamation that all the vital problems of philosophy depend on space and time. Alexander goes on to conceive space and time as the stuff out of which all things are made: space and time are real and concrete, and out of them emerge matter, life and so on. Space and time are unified in a four-dimensional manifold, spacetime. This single vast entity does not move but it contains all motions within itself, and so Alexander labels it Motion. In this respect, Alexander's spacetime bears some resemblance to F. H. Bradley's (1893) Absolute: neither Motion nor the Absolute move or exist in time, but they both contain motion and time within themselves.”

“Alexander presents a metaphysical argument for the unity of space and time, arguing that they are merely distinguishable aspects of Motion. He argues that space and time must be unified because, when abstracted away from each other, it becomes clear that they could not exist independently. Time would become a mere now, incapable of succession; and space would become a mere blank, without distinguishable elements. Motion is both successive and boasts distinguishable elements, and this is because it is the union of space and time. Alexander's metaphysical argument for this union was severely criticized by Broad's series of papers. Alexander considered his account of spacetime to be in line with the physics of his day; this might be understood as an argument from physics for his position.”
Chapter II

I. History of Philosophy


“In the second volume of Space, Time, and Deity, Alexander asks how spacetime is related to the various levels of existence within it: matter, life, mind and deity. Alexander argues that we should model the emergence of levels within spacetime on the emergence of mind from body. Empirical things are complexes of space-time with their qualities, and it is now my duty to attempt to show how the different orders of empirical existence are related to each other… [T]he nature of mind and its relation to body is a simpler problem in itself than the relation of lower qualities of existence to their inferior basis; and for myself it has afforded the clue to the interpretation of the lower levels of existence. Analogous to the way that Alexander takes mind to emerge from body, new levels of being emerge from spacetime when the motions within spacetime become complex enough. Empirical things or existents are… groupings within Space-Time, that is, they are complexes of pure events or motions in various degrees of complexity. Such finites have all the categorial characters, that is, all the fundamental features which flow from the nature of any space-time… [A]s in the course of Time new complexity of motions comes into existence, a new quality emerges… The case which we are using as a clue is the emergence of the quality of consciousness from a lower level of complexity which is vital [i.e., life].”

(e) Philosophy of Religion: “One of the optimistic conclusions of Space, Time, and Deity is Alexander's thesis that in the future deity will emerge as a quality of the universe as a whole. This deity-world emergence is akin to mind-body emergence. In the following passage, Alexander explains that we should not identify God with spacetime. Instead, the spacetime system is in the process of engendering God: The universe, though it can be expressed without remainder in terms of Space and Time, is not merely spatio-temporal. It exhibits materiality and life and mind. It compels us to forecast the next empirical quality of deity. On the one hand, we have the totality of the world, which in the end is spatio-temporal; on the other the quality of deity engendered or rather being engendered, within that whole. These two features are united in the conception of the whole world as expressing itself in the character of deity, and it is this and not bare Space-Time which for speculation is the ideal conception of God. For Alexander, God is the whole world possessing the quality of deity. However, the whole world does not yet exist because Alexander's universe is one of process; the universe is in progress towards becoming complete, and this is why Alexander claims the universe is in process towards deity. The whole world, which will possess the quality of deity, does not yet exist, but part of it does: As an actual existent, God is the infinite world with its nisus towards deity. The quality of deity has not yet arrived—and indeed, may never arrive - but God exists in the sense that part of his body, the growing world, does.”

(f) History of Philosophy – Spinoza: “Alexander argues that philosophy and physics has only just begun to “Take time seriously”, and had Spinoza been aware of these developments, his ontology would ultimately have resembled Alexander's. Alexander particularly refers to the thesis that space and time should be combined into the four-dimensional manifold spacetime. Spinoza argues in the Ethics that there is only one substance, and this substance is identical to God and nature. The substance has an infinite number of attributes, including spatial extension, and it supports an infinity of dependent modes. Alexander argues that his system is similar to Spinoza's except that he understands the single substance – Motion - to have only two attributes, space and time. In our gloss upon Spinoza the ultimate reality is full of Time, not timeless but essentially alive with Time, and the theatre of incessant change. It is only timeless in the sense that taken as a whole it is not particularized to any one moment of duration but comprehends them all… Reality is Space-Time or motion itself, infinite or self-contained and having nothing outside itself. Alexander argues that his gloss of Spinoza solves various problems in Spinoza's original system. He also praises Spinoza for successfully combining religious values and naturalism. Alexander… takes pride in the similarity between his system and Spinoza's.”
Alfred North Whitehead (1861-1947) was an English mathematician and philosopher. “He is best known as the defining figure of the philosophical school known as process philosophy, which today has found application to a wide variety of disciplines, including ecology, theology, education, physics, biology, economics, and psychology, among other areas. In his early career Whitehead wrote primarily on mathematics, logic, and physics.” “Although there are important continuities throughout his career, Whitehead's intellectual life is often divided into three main periods. The first corresponds roughly to his time at Cambridge, from 1884 to 1910. It was during these years that he worked primarily on issues in mathematics and logic. It was also during this time that he collaborated with Russell. The second main period, from 1910 to 1924, corresponds roughly to his time at London. During these years Whitehead concentrated mainly, but not exclusively, on issues in the philosophy of science and the philosophy of education. The third main period corresponds roughly to his time at Harvard, from 1924 onward. It was during this time that he worked primarily on issues in metaphysics.”

His most notable work in these fields is the three-volume Principia Mathematica (1910–13), which he wrote with former student Bertrand Russell. It is considered one of the twentieth century's most important works in mathematical logic. “He developed a comprehensive metaphysical system which radically departed from most of western philosophy.” His three books The Concept of Nature (1920), Science and the Modern World (1925) and Process and Reality (1929) provide a relatively complete statement of Whitehead's mature metaphysical system.

Whitehead on Metaphysics: (a) Conception of Reality: Whitehead argued that reality consists of processes rather than material objects, and that processes are best defined by their relations with other processes, thus rejecting the theory that reality is fundamentally constructed by bits of matter that exist independently of one another. “Today Whitehead's philosophical works – particularly Process and Reality – are regarded as the foundational texts of process philosophy.” “Whitehead rejects the idea of separate and unchanging bits of matter as the most basic building blocks of reality, in favor of the idea of reality as interrelated events in process. He conceives of reality as composed of processes of dynamic becoming rather than static being, emphasizing that all physical things change and evolve, and that changeless essences such as matter are mere abstractions from the interrelated events that make up the world.”

(b) Theory of Perception: “Since Whitehead's metaphysics described a universe in which all entities experience, he needed a new way of describing perception that was not limited to living, self-conscious beings. The term he coined was prehension, which comes from the Latin prehensio, meaning to seize. The term is meant to indicate a kind of perception that can be conscious or unconscious, applying to people as well as electrons. It is also intended to make clear Whitehead's rejection of the theory of representative perception, in which the mind only has private ideas about other entities. For Whitehead, the term prehension indicates that the perceiver actually incorporates aspects of the perceived thing into itself. In this way, entities are constituted by their perceptions and relations, rather than being independent of them. Further, Whitehead regards perception as occurring in two modes, causal efficacy (or physical prehension) and presentational immediacy (or conceptual prehension). Whitehead describes causal efficacy as the experience dominating the primitive living organisms, which have a sense for the fate from which they have emerged, and the fate towards which they go. It is, in other words, the sense of causal relations between entities, a feeling of being influenced and affected by the surrounding environment, unmediated by the senses. Presentational immediacy, on the other hand, is what is usually referred to as pure sense perception, unmediated by any causal or symbolic interpretation, even unconscious interpretation. In other words, it is pure appearance, which may or may not be delusive (e.g. mistaking an image in a mirror for the real thing).”
(c) **Evolution and Value:** “Whitehead believed that when asking questions about the basic facts of existence, questions about value and purpose can never be fully escaped. This is borne out in his thoughts on abiogenesis, or the hypothetical natural process by which life arises from simple organic compounds. Whitehead makes the startling observation that life is comparatively deficient in survival value. If humans can only exist for about a hundred years, and rocks for eight hundred million, then one is forced to ask why complex organisms ever evolved in the first place; as Whitehead humorously notes, they certainly did not appear because they were better at that game than the rocks around them. He then observes that the mark of higher forms of life is that they are actively engaged in modifying their environment, an activity which he theorizes is directed toward the three-fold goal of living, living well, and living better. In other words, Whitehead sees life as directed toward the purpose of increasing its own satisfaction. Without such a goal, he sees the rise of life as totally unintelligible. For Whitehead, there is no such thing as wholly inert matter. Instead, all things have some measure of freedom or creativity, however small, which allows them to be at least partly self-directed. Process philosopher David Ray Griffin coined the term pan-experientialism to describe Whitehead's view, and to distinguish it from pan-psychism.”

(d) **God:** “Whitehead's idea of God differs from traditional monotheistic notions. Perhaps his most famous and pointed criticism of the Christian conception of God is that the Church gave unto God the attributes which belonged exclusively to Caesar. Here Whitehead is criticizing Christianity for defining God as primarily a divine king who imposes his will on the world, and whose most important attribute is power. As opposed to the most widely accepted forms of Christianity, Whitehead emphasized an idea of God that he called the brief Galilean vision of humility: It does not emphasize the ruling Caesar, or the ruthless moralist, or the unmoved mover. It dwells upon the tender elements in the world, which slowly and in quietness operates by love; and it finds purpose in the present immediacy of a kingdom not of this world. Love neither rules, nor is it unmoved; also, it is a little oblivious as to morals. It does not look to the future; for it finds its own reward in the immediate present. It should be emphasized, however, that for Whitehead God is not necessarily tied to religion. Rather than springing primarily from religious faith, Whitehead saw God as necessary for his metaphysical system. His system required that an order exist among possibilities, an order that allowed for novelty in the world and provided an aim to all entities. Whitehead posited that these ordered potentials exist in what he called the primordial nature of God. However, Whitehead was also interested in religious experience.”

(e) **Religion:** “For Whitehead the core of religion was individual. While he acknowledged that individuals cannot ever be fully separated from their society, he argued that life is an internal fact for its own sake before it is an external fact relating to others. His most famous remark on religion is that religion is what the individual does with his own solitariness ... and if you are never solitary, you are never religious. Whitehead saw religion as a system of general truths that transformed a person’s character. He took special care to note that while religion is often a good influence, it is not necessarily good – an idea which he called a dangerous delusion (e.g., a religion might encourage the violent extermination of a rival religion’s adherents). However, while Whitehead saw religion as beginning in solitariness, he also saw religion as necessarily expanding beyond the individual. In keeping with his process metaphysics in which relations are primary, he wrote that religion necessitates the realization of the value of the objective world which is a community derivative from the interrelations of its component individuals. In other words, the universe is a community which makes itself whole through the relatedness of each individual entity to all the others – meaning and value do not exist for the individual alone, but only in the context of the universal community. Whitehead writes further that each entity "can find no such value till it has merged its individual claim with that of the objective universe."
George Edward Moore (1873-1958) was an English philosopher. With Bertrand Russell, Ludwig Wittgenstein, and Gottlob Frege, he was one of the founders of the analytic tradition in philosophy. “Along with Russell, he led the turn away from idealism in British philosophy and became well known for his advocacy of common-sense concepts, his contributions to ethics, epistemology, and metaphysics, and his exceptional personality and moral character. He was Professor of Philosophy at the University of Cambridge, highly influential among (though not a member of) the Bloomsbury Group, and the editor of the influential journal Mind. He was elected a fellow of the British Academy in 1918. He was a member of the Cambridge Apostles, the intellectual secret society, from 1894 to 1901, and the Cambridge University Moral Sciences Club.”

“Moore grew up in South London. In 1892 he went to Trinity College Cambridge to study Classics. He soon made the acquaintance there of Bertrand Russell who was two years ahead of him and of J. M. E. McTaggart who was then a charismatic young Philosophy Fellow of Trinity College. Under their encouragement Moore decided to add the study of Philosophy to his study of Classics, and he graduated in 1896 with a First-Class degree in the subject. At this point he turned his energies towards attempting to follow in the footsteps of McTaggart and Russell by winning a ‘Prize’ Fellowship at Trinity College which would enable him to continue the study of philosophy there. In 1898 he was successful and over the next six years he matured as a dynamic young philosopher, actually leading Russell away from the idealist philosophy of McTaggart and others which was then dominant in Britain.” “After his fellowship ended (in 1904), Moore left Cambridge for a period of seven years, during which time he lived in Edinburgh and Richmond, Surrey, and worked independently on various philosophical projects. He returned to Cambridge in 1911 as a lecturer in Moral Science, and he remained there for the majority of his career, and, indeed, his life. He earned a Litt.D. in 1913, was elected a fellow of the British Academy in 1918, and was chosen as James Ward’s successor as Professor of Mental Philosophy and Logic in 1925. He occupied that position until 1939, when he retired and was succeeded by Wittgenstein. From 1940 to 1944 Moore was a visiting professor at several universities in the United States. He then returned to Cambridge, but not to teaching. He served as editor of Mind, the leading philosophical journal of the day, from 1921 to 1947. In 1951, he was awarded the British Order of Merit.”

(a) Reputation of Idealism: In 1897 when he made his first attempt to win a Prize Fellowship at Trinity, Moore submitted a dissertation on ‘The Metaphysical Basis of Ethics’ in which he acknowledges his indebtedness to Bradley and presents an idealist ethical theory. One element of this theory is what he calls ‘the fallacy involved in all empirical definitions of the good’, which is immediately recognizable as a precursor of his famous claim in Principia Ethica that there is a fallacy, the ‘naturalistic fallacy’, in all naturalistic definitions of goodness. “A substantial part of this early dissertation is devoted to a critical discussion of Kant’s moral philosophy, and it is striking that although in his general approach and conclusions Moore endorses the kind of idealism advanced by Bradley, he is already critical of Kant’s conception of practical reason. He argues that Kant's use of this conception blurs the distinction between ‘the psychological faculty of making judgments and inferences’ and that which is ‘true and objective’. This distinction, Moore maintains, ‘cannot be either done away or bridged over’. Hence, he argues, Kant's conception of morality as founded on a priori principles of practical reason is untenable. It is easy to see how this line of thought could be extended to a general criticism of Kant's conception of the a priori; and it is precisely this generalization that Moore undertakes in his successful 1898 dissertation. At the same time, he comes to see that his previous enthusiasm for Bradley's idealism was not well founded (though it still takes him a little time to accept that the arguments of Bradley and McTaggart against the reality of time are flawed). So, it is in this 1898 dissertation that Moore turns decisively against idealist philosophy, both in its Kantian and Bradleian forms.”
(b) **Principia Ethica** (1903): Most of its first three chapters come from the 1898 lectures; whereas the last three chapter are largely new material. "In the first three chapters Moore sets out his criticisms of 'ethical naturalism'. At the core of these criticisms is the thesis that the position involves a fallacy, the 'naturalistic fallacy', of supposing that goodness, which Moore takes to be the fundamental ethical value, can be defined in naturalistic terms, in terms, say, of pleasure or desire or the course of evolution. As against all such claims Moore insists that goodness is indefinable, or unanalyzable, and thus that ethics is an autonomous science, irreducible to natural science or, indeed, to metaphysics. Moore's main argument against the possibility of any such definition of goodness is that when we confront a putative definition, such as that to be good is to be something which we desire to desire, we can tell that this is not a claim that is true by definition because its truth remains for us an 'open question' in the sense that it remains sensible to doubt it in a way which would not be possible if it were just a definition which makes explicit our understanding of the words."

Thus, "Moore insists that good is indefinable, and provides an exposition of what he calls the naturalistic fallacy. He defends the objectivity and multiplicity of values, arguing that knowledge of values cannot be derived from knowledge of facts, but only from intuition of the goodness of such states of affairs as beauty, pleasure, friendship and knowledge. In Moore's view, right acts are those producing the most good. However, he also believed that there are only various different sorts of things that are good, including knowledge and aesthetic experience. Moore argues against consequentialism. Moore's argument begins from the claim that ordinary people think they ought to do what they promised to do, not because of the probable consequences of breaking their promise, but simply because they promised. In thinking this way, they are not considering their moral duties in terms of consequences. The consequences of the actions lie in the future, but they are thinking more about the past (about the promises)."

(c) **Philosophical Analysis – Propositional Realism**: As Moore "came to think more about falsehood in his lectures Some Main Problems of Philosophy of 1910-11, it became clear to him that this position was mistaken, since the truth of a proposition should not affect its ontological status and yet it would be absurd to give false propositions the status of facts. So, he now rejected the view that facts are just true propositions. He sums up his view this way: "A proposition is composed not of words, nor yet of thoughts, but of concepts. Concepts are possible objects of thought; but this is no definition of them…It is indifferent to their nature whether anybody thinks them or not. They are incapable of change, and the relation into which they enter with the knowing subject implies no action or reaction [on the part of the proposition]…A proposition is a synthesis of concepts; and just as concepts are themselves immutably what they are, so they stand in infinite relations to one another equally immutable. A proposition is constituted by any number of concepts, together with a specific relation between them; and according to the nature of this relation the proposition may be either true or false. What kind of relation makes a proposition true, what false, cannot be further defined, but must be immediately recognized? Thus understood, propositions seem to be a lot like Platonic Forms: they are unchanging bearers of truth that exist independently of any ‘instances’ of consciousness. Historically, there is nothing peculiar in this. In fact, these views of Moore’s are in keeping with what may be called the ‘standard’ nineteenth and early-twentieth century view of propositions… What is novel in Moore, however, is his identity theory of truth, and his related identification of ordinary objects with propositions. One aspect of the standard view was that whenever a proposition happened to be involved in an occurrent act of consciousness, it played the role of object - the act was immediately of or about the proposition. Thus, prima facie, the only form of epistemological realism compatible with the standard view is indirect or representative realism."
(d) **Perception and Sense-Data:** Once the concept of a sense-datum has been introduced in this way, it is easy to see that false appearance can be handled by distinguishing between the properties of sense-data we apprehend and the properties of the physical objects which gives rise to these sense-data. But what is the relationship between sense-data and physical objects? Moore took it that there are three serious candidates to be considered: (i) an indirect realist position, according to which sense-data are non-physical but somehow produced by interactions between physical objects and our senses; (ii) the phenomenalist position, according to which our conception of physical objects is merely one which expresses observed and anticipated uniformities among the sense-data we apprehend; and (iii) a direct realist position, according to which sense-data are parts of physical objects - so that, for example, visual sense-data are visible parts of the surfaces of physical objects. The indirect realist position is that to which he was initially drawn; but he could see that it leaves our beliefs about the physical world exposed to skeptical doubt, since it implies that the observations which constitute evidence for these beliefs concern only the properties of non-physical sense-data, and there is no obvious way for us to obtain further evidence to support a hypothesis about the properties of the physical world and its relationship to our sense-data. This argument is reminiscent of Berkeley's critique of Locke, and Moore therefore considered carefully Berkeley's phenomenalist alternative. Moore's initial response to this position was that the implied conception of the physical world was just too 'pickwickian' to be believable. This may be felt to be too intuitive, like Dr. Johnson's famous objection to Berkeley; but Moore could also see that there were substantive objections to the phenomenalist position, such as the fact that our normal ways of identifying and anticipating significant uniformities among our sense-data draw on our beliefs about our location in physical space and the state of our physical sense-organs, neither of which are available to the consistent phenomenalist.

(e) **Common Sense and Certainty:** "An important aspect of Moore's rejection of idealism was his affirmation of a common-sense realist position, according to which our ordinary common-sense view of the world is largely correct. Moore first... championed this position in his 1910-11 lectures *Some Main Problems of Philosophy,* but he made it his own when he responded in 1925 to an invitation to describe his philosophical position by setting this out as 'A Defense of Common Sense'. Moore begins the paper by listing a large number of 'truisms' such as that 'the earth had existed also for many years before my body was born'. Concerning these truisms, he then asserts, first, that he knows them for certain, second, that other people likewise know for certain the truth of comparable truisms about themselves and, third, that he knows this second general truth. So, the truth and general knowledge of these truisms is a matter of common sense. Having set out these truisms, Moore then acknowledges that some philosophers have denied their truth or, more commonly, denied our knowledge of them (even though, according to Moore, they also know them) and he attempts to show that these denials are incoherent or unwarranted. These claims might seem to leave little space for radical philosophical argument. But in the last part of the paper Moore argues that his defense of common sense leaves completely undecided the question as to how the truistic propositions which make up the common sense view of the world are to be analyzed; the analysis may be as radical as one likes as long as it is consistent with the truth and knowability of the propositions analyzed...he is content to allow that philosophical argument may show that a phenomenalist analysis of propositions about the physical world is correct."

"Moore here sets himself the task of doing what Kant had earlier set himself to do, namely providing a proof of the existence of external objects. Much of the lecture is devoted to working out what counts as an external object, and Moore claims that these are things whose existence is not dependent upon our experience. So, he argues, if he can prove the existence of any such things, then he will have proved the existence of an External World."
Chapter III. History of Philosophy


Bertrand Russell was a “British philosopher, logician, and social reformer, founding figure in the analytic movement in Anglo-American philosophy, and recipient of the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1950. Russell’s contributions to logic, epistemology, and the philosophy of mathematics established him as one of the foremost philosophers of the 20th century…he published more than 70 books and about 2,000 articles, married four times, became involved in innumerable public controversies, and was honored and reviled in almost equal measure throughout the world.”

“Russell was a prominent anti-war activist; he championed anti-imperialism. Occasionally, he advocated preventive nuclear war, before the opportunity provided by the atomic monopoly had passed and welcomed with enthusiasm world government. He went to prison for his pacifism during World War I. Later, he concluded war against Adolf Hitler was a necessary lesser of two evils. He criticized Stalinist totalitarianism, attacked the involvement of the United States in the Vietnam War, and was an outspoken proponent of nuclear disarmament.”

Frederick Copleston wrote three chapters for Russell (while only one chapter for G. E. Moore) in his History of Philosophy, Volume 8 (1967), in which he writes introductory remarks as follows: “We had already had occasion to remark that of all present-day British philosophers Bertrand Russel is by far the best known to the world at large. This partly due to the fact that he has published a very considerable number of books and essays on moral, social and political topics which are salted with amusing and provocative remarks and are written at a level which can be understood by a public that is scarcely capable of appreciating his more technical contributions to philosophical thought. And it is largely this class of publications which has made of Russel a prophet of liberal humanism, a hero of those who regard themselves as rationalists, free from the shackles of religious and metaphysical dogma and yet at the same time devoted to the cause of human freedom, as against totalitarianism, and of social and political progress according to rational principles. We can also mention, as a contributing cause to Russell’s fame, his active self-commitment at various periods of his life to a particular side, sometimes an unpopular side, in issues of general concern and importance. He has always had the courage of his conviction. And the combination of aristocrat, philosopher, Voltairean essayist and ardent campaigner has naturally made an impact on the imagination of the public.”

“It scarcely needs to be said that the fame of a philosopher during his lifetime is not an infallible indication of the value of his thought, especially if his general reputation is largely due to his more ephemeral writings. In any case, the varied character of Russell’s writing creates a special difficulty in estimating his status as a philosopher. On the one hand, he is justly renowned for his work in the field of mathematical logic. But he himself regards this subject as belonging to mathematics rather than to philosophy. On the other hand, it is not fair to Russell to estimate his status as a thinker in terms of his popular writings on concrete moral issues or on social and political topics. For though in view of the traditional and common view of the word philosophy he recognizes that he has to resign himself to having his moral writings labelled as philosophical works, he has said that the only ethical topic which he regards as belonging properly to philosophy is the analysis of the ethical proposition as such. Concrete judgments of value should, strictly speaking, be excluded from philosophy. And if such judgments express, as Russell believes that they do, basic emotive attitudes, he is doubtless entitled to express his own emotive attitudes with a vehemence which would be out of place in discussing problems which, in principle at least, can be solved by logical argument. If we exclude from philosophy mathematical logic on the one hand concrete moral, valutational and political judgments on the other, we are left with what can perhaps be discussion of epistemological and metaphysical questions.”
“This general philosophy has passed through a series of phases and mutations, and it represents a strange mixture of acute analysis and of blindness to important relevant factors. But it is unified by his analytic method or methods. And the changes are hardly so great as to justify a literal interpretation of Professor C. D. Broad’s humorous remark that, ‘as we all know, Mr. Russell produces a different system of philosophy every few years.’ In any case Russell’s general philosophy represents an interesting development of British empiricism in the light of later ways of thought, to which he himself made an important contribution. In the following pages we shall be concerned mainly, though not exclusively, with Russell’s idea and practice of analysis. But a thorough treatment, even of this limited theme, will not be possible. Nor indeed could it legitimately be expected in a general history of western philosophy.”

Against Idealism: Russell was born in 1872. His parents, Lord and Lady Amberley, died when he was a small child, and he was brought up in the house of his grandfather. “At the age eighteen he went up to Cambridge, where he at first concentrated on mathematics. But in his fourth year at the university, he turned to philosophy, and McTaggart and Stout taught him to regard British empiricism as crude and to look instead to the Hegelian tradition. Indeed, Russell tells us of the admiration which he felt for Bradley. And from 1894, the year in which he went down from Cambridge, until 1898 the continued to think that metaphysics was capable of proving beliefs about the universe which religious feeling led him to think important. For a short while in 1894, Russell acted as an honorary attaché at the British Embassy in Paris. In 1895 he devoted himself to the study of economics and German social democracy at Berlin. The outcome was the publication of German Social Democracy in 1896. Most of his early essays were indeed on mathematical and logical topics, but it is worth nothing that his first book was concerned with social theory. Russell tells us that at this period he was influenced by both Kant and Hegel but sided with the latter when the two were in conflict. He has described as ‘unadulterated Hegel’ a paper on the relations of number and quantity which he published in Mind in 1896. And of An Essay on the Foundations of Geometry (1897), an elaboration of his Fellowship dissertation for Trinity College, Cambridge, he had said that the theory of geometry which he presented was mainly Kantian, though it was afterwards swept away by Einstein’s theory of relativity.”

“In the course of the year 1898 Russell reacted strongly against idealism. For one thing, a reading of Hegel’s Logic convinced him that what the author had to say on the subject of mathematics was nonsense. For another thing, while lecturing on Leibniz at Cambridge in place of McTaggart, who was abroad, he came to the conclusion that the arguments advanced by Bradley against the reality of relations were fallacious. But Russell had laid most emphasis on the influence of his friend G. E. Moore. Together with Moore he adhered to the belief that, whatever Bradley or McTaggart might say to the contrary, all that common sense takes to be real is real. Indeed, in the period in question Russell carried realism considerably further than he was later to do. It was not simply a question of embracing pluralism and the theory of external relations, not even of believing in the reality of secondary qualities. Russell also believed that points of space and instants of time are existent entities, and that there is a timeless world of Platonic ideas or essences, including numbers. He thus had, as he had put it, a very full or luxuriant universe. The lectures on Leibniz, to which reference had been made above, resulted in the publication in 1900 of Russell’s notable work A Critical Exposition of the Philosophy of Leibniz. In it he maintained that Leibniz’s metaphysics was in part a reflection of his logical studies and in part a popular or exoteric doctrine expounded with a view to edification and at variance with the philosopher’s real convictions. From then on Russell remained convinced that the substance-attribute metaphysics is a reflection of the subject-predicate mode of expression.”
The Principles of Mathematics: “Inspired by the work of the mathematicians whom he so greatly admired, Russell conceived the idea of demonstrating that mathematics not only had logically rigorous foundations but also that it was in its entirety nothing but logic. The philosophical case for this point of view - subsequently known as logicism - was stated at length in *The Principles of Mathematics* (1903). There Russell argued that the whole of mathematics could be derived from a few simple axioms that made no use of specifically mathematical notions, such as number and square root, but were rather confined to purely logical notions, such as proposition and class. In this way not only could the truths of mathematics be shown to be immune from doubt, they could also be freed from any taint of subjectivity, such as the subjectivity involved in Russell’s earlier Kantian view that geometry describes the structure of spatial intuition. Near the end of his work…Russell discovered that he had been anticipated in his logicist philosophy of mathematics by the German mathematician Gottlob Frege, whose book *The Foundations of Arithmetic* (1884) contained, as Russell put it, ‘many things…which I believed I had invented.’ Russell quickly added an appendix to his book that discussed Frege’s work…and explained the differences in their respective understandings of the nature of logic.”

“The tragedy of Russell’s intellectual life is that the deeper he thought about logic, the more his exalted conception of its significance came under threat. He himself described his philosophical development after *The Principles of Mathematics* as a retreat from Pythagoras. The first step in this retreat was his discovery of a contradiction - now known as Russell’s Paradox - at the very heart of the system of logic upon which he had hoped to build the whole of mathematics. The contradiction arises from the following considerations: Some classes are members of themselves (e.g., the class of all classes), and some are not (e.g., the class of all men), so we ought to be able to construct the class of all classes that are not members of themselves. But now, if we ask of this class ‘Is it a member of itself?’ we become enmeshed in a contradiction. If it is, then it is not, and if it is not, then it is. This is rather like defining the village barber as ‘the man who shaves all those who do not shave themselves’ and then asking whether the barber shaves himself or not. At first this paradox seemed trivial, but the more Russell reflected upon it, the deeper the problem seemed, and eventually he was persuaded that there was something fundamentally wrong with the notion of class as he had understood it in *The Principles of Mathematics*. Frege saw the depth of the problem immediately. When Russell wrote to him to tell him of the paradox, Frege replied, “arithmetic totters.” The foundation upon which Frege and Russell had hoped to build mathematics had, it seemed, collapsed. Whereas Frege sank into a deep depression, Russell set about repairing the damage by attempting to construct a theory of logic immune to the paradox. Like a malignant cancerous growth, however, the contradiction reappeared in different guises whenever Russell thought that he had eliminated it. Eventually, Russell’s attempts to overcome the paradox resulted in a complete transformation of his scheme of logic, as he added one refinement after another to the basic theory. In the process, important elements of his Pythagorean view of logic were abandoned. In particular, Russell came to the conclusion that there were no such things as classes and propositions and that therefore, whatever logic was, it was not the study of them. In their place he substituted a bewilderingly complex theory known as the ramified theory of types, which, though it successfully avoided contradictions such as Russell’s Paradox, was extraordinarily difficult to understand. By the time he and his collaborator, Alfred North Whitehead, had finished the three volumes of *Principia Mathematica* (1910–13), the theory of types and other innovations to the basic logical system had made it unmanageably complicated. Very few people, whether philosophers or mathematicians, have made the gargantuan effort required to master the details of this monumental work. It is nevertheless rightly regarded as one of the great intellectual achievements of the 20th century.”

---

**Principia Mathematica**: *Principia Mathematica* is a herculean attempt to demonstrate mathematically what The Principles of Mathematics had argued for philosophically, namely that mathematics is a branch of logic. The validity of the individual formal proofs that make up the bulk of its three volumes has gone largely unchallenged, but the philosophical significance of the work as a whole is still a matter of debate. Does it demonstrate that mathematics is logic? Only if one regards the theory of types as a logical truth, and about that there is much more room for doubt than there was about the trivial truisms upon which Russell had originally intended to build mathematics. Moreover, Kurt Gödel’s first incompleteness theorem (1931) proves that there cannot be a single logical theory from which the whole of mathematics is derivable: all consistent theories of arithmetic are necessarily incomplete. *Principia Mathematica* cannot, however, be dismissed as nothing more than a heroic failure. Its influence on the development of mathematical logic and the philosophy of mathematics has been immense.”

Russell and Frege were alike in taking an essentially Platonic view of logic. “Russell pursued the project of deriving mathematics from logic owed a great deal to what he would later somewhat scornfully describe as a kind of mathematical mysticism.” “In philosophy the greatest impact of *Principia Mathematica* has been through its so-called theory of descriptions. This method of analysis, first introduced by Russell in his article ‘On Denoting’ (1905), translates propositions containing definite descriptions into expressions that do not - the purpose being to remove the logical awkwardness of appearing to refer to things that do not exist. Originally developed by Russell as part of his efforts to overcome the contradictions in his theory of logic, this method of analysis has since become widely influential even among philosophers with no specific interest in mathematics. The general idea at the root of Russell’s theory of descriptions - that the grammatical structures of ordinary language are distinct from, and often conceal, the true logical forms of expressions - has become his most enduring contribution to philosophy.”

“Russell later said that his mind never fully recovered from the strain of writing *Principia Mathematica*, and he never again worked on logic with quite the same intensity. In 1918 he wrote Introduction to Mathematical Philosophy, which was intended as a popularization of Principia, but, apart from this, his philosophical work tended to be on epistemology rather than logic. In 1914, in Our Knowledge of the External World, Russell argued that the world is “constructed” out of sense-data, an idea that he refined in *The Philosophy of Logical Atomism* (1918–19). *In The Analysis of Mind* (1921) and *The Analysis of Matter* (1927), he abandoned this notion in favor of what he called neutral monism, the view that the “ultimate stuff” of the world is neither mental nor physical but something neutral between the two. Although treated with respect, these works had markedly less impact upon subsequent philosophers than his early works in logic and the philosophy of mathematics, and they are generally regarded as inferior by comparison.”

“Connected with the change in his intellectual direction after the completion of Principia was a profound change in his personal life. Throughout the years that he worked single-mindedly on logic, Russell’s private life was bleak and joyless. He had fallen out of love with his first wife, Alys, though he continued to live with her. In 1911, however, he fell passionately in love with Lady Ottoline Morrell. Doomed from the start (because Morrell had no intention of leaving her husband), this love nevertheless transformed Russell’s entire life. He left Alys and began to hope that he might, after all, find fulfillment in romance. Partly under Morrell’s influence, he also largely lost interest in technical philosophy and began to write in a different, more accessible style. Through writing a best-selling introductory survey called *The Problems of Philosophy* (1911), Russell discovered that he had a gift for writing on difficult subjects for lay readers, and he began increasingly to address his work to them rather than to the tiny handful of people capable of understanding *Principia Mathematica*.”

---

*Book VI. The World Wars, The Cold War, and Terrorism, 1914-2015*
Logical Atomism: “In the same year…Russell met Ludwig Wittgenstein, a brilliant young Austrian who arrived at Cambridge to study logic with Russell. Fired with intense enthusiasm for the subject, Wittgenstein made great progress, and within a year Russell began to look to him to provide the next big step in philosophy and to defer to him on questions of logic. However, Wittgenstein’s own work, eventually published in 1921 as Logisch-philosophische Abhandlung (Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus 1922), undermined the entire approach to logic that had inspired Russell’s great contributions to the philosophy of mathematics. It persuaded Russell that there were no truths of logic at all, that logic consisted entirely of tautologies, the truth of which was not guaranteed by eternal facts in the Platonic realm of ideas but lay, rather, simply in the nature of language. This was to be the final step in the retreat from Pythagoras and a further incentive for Russell to abandon technical philosophy in favor of other pursuits.”

Russell prefaced his 1918 lectures on the philosophy of logical atomism with the remark that they were largely concerned with ideas which he had learned from Wittgenstein. "As for the term atomism in logical atomism, Russell says that he wishes to arrive at the ultimate constituent elements of reality in a manner analogous to that in which in Principia Mathematica he worked back from result to the un-eliminable logical premises. But he is looking, of course, for logical and not physical atoms. Hence the use of the term logical. The point is that the atom I wish to arrive at is the atom of logical analysis, not the atom of physical analysis. The atom of physical analysis (or, more accurately, whatever physical science at the give time takes to be ultimate physical constituents of matter) is itself subject to logical analysis. But though in his final lecture on logical atomism Russell makes what he calls an excursus into metaphysics and introduces the idea of logical constructions or, as he puts it, logical fictions, he is mainly concerned with discussing propositions and facts.”

“We cannot refer to all the topics mentioned by Russell in his lectures on logical atomism. But there are two points to which attention can profitably be drawn. The first is the doctrine that every genuine particular is completely self-subsistent, in the sense that it is logically independent of every other particular. There is no reason why you should not have a universe consisting of one particular and nothing else. True, it is an empirical fact that there is a multitude of particulars. But it is not logically necessary that this should be the case. Hence it would not be possible, given knowledge of one particular, to deduce from it the whole system of the universe. The second point is Russell’s analysis of existence-propositions. I know, for example, that there are men in Canton; but I cannot mention any individual who lives there. Hence, Russell argues, the proposition ‘there are men in Canton’ cannot be about actual individuals. Existence is essentially a property of a propositional function. If we say there are men or men exist, this means that there is at least one value of X for which it is true to say, ‘X is a man’. At the same time Russell recognizes existence-facts, such as that corresponding to there are men, as distinct from atomic facts.”

Recent students of philosophy aware that Russell has shown a lack of sympathy with him. “It is true that while he had previously regarded the goal of analysis as a knowledge of simple particulars, Russell later came to think that while many things can be known to be complex, nothing can be known to be simple. But the reason why he came to think this was because in science what was formerly thought to be simple has often turned out to be complex. And the conclusion which he drew was simply that the logical analyst should refrain from any dogmatic assertion that he had arrived at a knowledge of what is simple. In other words, though Russell undoubtedly approached logical atomism with a background of mathematical logic, his attitude was much more empirical than that of Wittgenstein as manifested in the Tractatus. And in the application of reductive analysis to physical objects and minds he carried on the tradition of British empiricism, a tradition which hardly figured in Wittgenstein’s mental furniture.”
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Conversion to Neutral Monism: During World War I Russell was for a while a full-time political agitator, campaigning for peace and against conscription. His activities attracted the attention of the British authorities, who regarded him as subversive. He was twice taken to court, the second time to receive a sentence of six months in prison, which he served at the end of the war. In 1916, as a result of his antiwar campaigning, Russell was dismissed from his lectureship at Trinity College. Although Trinity offered to rehire him after the war, he ultimately turned down the offer, preferring instead to pursue a career as a journalist and freelance writer. The war had had a profound effect on Russell’s political views, causing him to abandon his inherited liberalism and to adopt a thorough-going socialism, which he espoused in a series of books including Principles of Social Reconstruction (1916), Roads to Freedom (1918), and The Prospects of Industrial Civilization (1923). He was initially sympathetic to the Russian Revolution of 1917, but a visit to the Soviet Union in 1920 left him with a deep and abiding loathing for Soviet communism, which he expressed in The Practice and Theory of Bolshevism (1920).” He published The Analysis of Mind (1921), and The Problems of China (1922) after succeeding visit of China.

“When Russell embraced pluralism in 1898, he accepted a dualist position. And, as we have seen, this position was maintained for some time, even if in an attenuated form. Russell was indeed acquainted with William James’s theory of neutral monism, according to which the mental and physical are composed of the same material, so to speak, and differ only in arrangement and context. But in his 1914 essay in the nature of acquaintance he first quoted passages from Mach and James and then expressed his disagreement with neutral monism as being incapable of explaining the phenomenon of acquaintance, which involves a relation between subject and object.” However, in The Analysis of Mind, Russell announces his conversion to neutral monism, “which is conceived as providing a harmonization of two conflicting tendencies in contemporary thought. On the one hand many psychologists emphasize more and more the dependence of mental on physical phenomena; and one can see a definite tendency, especially among the behaviorists, to a form of methodological materialism. Obviously psychologists of this kind really consider physics, which has made a much greater advance than psychology, as the basic science. On the other hand, there is a tendency among the physicists, particularly with Einstein and other exponents of the theory of relativity, to regard the matter of old-fashioned materialism as a logical fiction, a construction out of events. These two apparently conflicting tendencies can be harmonized in neutral monism, that is, by recognizing that physics and psychology are not distinguished by their material. Both mind and matter are logical constructions out of particulars, which are neither mental nor material but neutral.” [Russell remarks that I explicitly abandoned sense-data.]

“Obviously, Russell has now to abandon his former sharp distinction between the sense-datum and awareness of it...Russell admits, of course, that he formerly maintained that a sense-datum, a patch of color for example, is something physical, not psychical or mental. But he now holds that the patch of color may be both physical and mental. And that the patch of color and our sensation in seeing it are identical. How, then, are the spheres of physics and psychology to be distinguished? One way of doing so is by distinguishing between different methods of correlating particulars. On the one hand we can correlate or group together all those particulars which common sense would regard as the appearances of a physical thing in different places. This leads to the construction of physical objects as set of such appearances. On the other hand, we can correlate or group together all events in a given place, that is, events which common sense would regard as the appearances of different objects as viewed from a given place. This gives us a perspective. And it is correlation according to perspectives which is relevant to psychology. When the place concerned is the human brain, the perspective consists of all the perceptions of a certain man at a given time.” However, this conversion was not complete.
“In 1921 Russell married his second wife, Dora Black, a young graduate of Girton College, Cambridge, with whom he had two children, John and Kate. In the interwar years Russell and Dora acquired a reputation as leaders of a progressive socialist movement that was stridently anticlerical, openly defiant of conventional sexual morality, and dedicated to educational reform. Russell’s published work during this period consists mainly of journalism and popular books written in support of these causes. Many of these books—such as On Education (1926), Marriage and Morals (1929), and The Conquest of Happiness (1930)—enjoyed large sales and helped establish Russell in the eyes of the general public as a philosopher with important things to say about the moral, political, and social issues of the day. His public lecture “Why I Am Not a Christian,” delivered in 1927 and printed many times, became a popular locus classicus of atheistic rationalism. In 1927 Russell and Dora set up their own school, Beacon Hill."

“During these years Russell’s second marriage came under increasing strain, partly because of overwork but chiefly because Dora chose to have two children with another man and insisted on raising them alongside John and Kate. In 1932 Russell left Dora for Patricia Spence, a young University of Oxford undergraduate, and for the next three years his life was dominated by an extraordinarily acrimonious and complicated divorce from Dora, which was finally granted in 1935. In the following year he married Spence, and in 1937 they had a son, Conrad. Worn out by years of frenetic public activity and desiring, at this comparatively late stage in his life (he was then age 66), to return to academic philosophy, Russell gained a teaching post at the University of Chicago. From 1938 to 1944 Russell lived in the United States, where he taught at Chicago and the University of California at Los Angeles, but he was prevented from taking a post at the City College of New York because of objections to his views on sex and marriage. On the brink of financial ruin, he secured a job teaching the history of philosophy at the Barnes Foundation in Philadelphia. Although he soon fell out with its founder…and lost his job, Russell was able to turn the lectures he delivered at the foundation into a book, A History of Western Philosophy (1945), which proved to be a best-seller and was for many years his main source of income.”

Later Life: “In 1944 Russell returned to Trinity College, where he lectured on the ideas that formed his last major contribution to philosophy, Human Knowledge: Its Scope and Limits (1948). During this period Russell, for once in his life, found favor with the authorities, and he received many official tributes, including the Order of Merit in 1949 and the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1950. His private life, however, remained as turbulent as ever, and he left his third wife in 1949. For a while he shared a house in Richmond upon Thames, London, with the family of his son John and, forsaking both philosophy and politics, dedicated himself to writing short stories. Despite his famously immaculate prose style, Russell did not have a talent for writing great fiction, and his short stories were generally greeted with an embarrassed and puzzled silence, even by his admirers. In 1952 Russell married his fourth wife, Edith Finch, and finally, at the age of 80, found lasting marital harmony. Russell devoted his last years to campaigning against nuclear weapons and the Vietnam War, assuming once again the role of gadfly of the establishment. The sight of Russell in extreme old age taking his place in mass demonstrations and inciting young people to civil disobedience through his passionate rhetoric inspired a new generation of admirers. Their admiration only increased when in 1961 the British judiciary system took the extraordinary step of sentencing the 89-year-old Russell to a second period of imprisonment. When he died in 1970 Russell was far better known as an antiwar campaigner than as a philosopher of mathematics. In retrospect, however, it is possible to see that it is for his great contributions to philosophy that he will be remembered and honored by future generations.”
Non-Demonstrative Inference: “Russel has drawn attention to three books in particular as representing the outcome of his reflections in the years after the First World War on the theory of knowledge and relevant subjects. These are The Analysis of Mind (1921), An Inquiry into Meaning and Truth (1940), and Human Knowledge: Its Scope and Limits (1948).” In this section, we shall be considering Russell’s idea about non-demonstrative inference, mainly referring to the last-named book. If we assume with Russell that the physical objects of common sense and of science are logical construction out of events and that each event is a logically self-sufficient entity, it follows that from one event or group of events we cannot infer with certainty the occurrence of any other event or group of events. Demonstrative inference belongs to logic and pure mathematics, not to the empirical sciences. Indeed, on the face of it, it appears that we have no real ground for making any inferences at all in science. At the same time, we are all convinced that valid inferences, leading to conclusions which possess varying degrees of probability, can be made both on the level of common sense and in science. To be sure, not all inferences are valid. Many scientific hypotheses have had to be discarded. But this does not alter the fact that no sane man doubts that by and large science has increased and I increasing human knowledge. On this assumption, therefore, the question arises, how can scientific inference be theoretically justified?"113

We have to examine what are universally regarded as genuine instances of scientific inference and generalization and discover the principles which are required in order to justify these types of inference and generalization. Russell finds five principles. (i) The first principle, the postulate of quasi-permanence: given any event A, it frequently happens that an event very similar to A occurs in a neighboring place at a neighboring time. This postulate enables us to operate, for instance, with the common-sense concepts of person and thing without introducing the metaphysical notion of substance. (ii) The second principle, the postulate of separable causal lines: it is often possible to form a series of events such that from one or two members of the series we can infer something about the other members. This principle or postulate is clearly essential for scientific inference. (iii) The third principle, the postulate of spatio-temporal continuity, which presuppose the second principle and refers to causal lines, denies action at a distance and states that when there is a causal connection between non-contiguous events, there will be found to be intermediate links. (iv) The fourth principle, the structural postulate: when a number of structurally similar complex events occur around a center from which they are not too widely separated, it is generally the case that all are members of causal lines which have their origin in an event of similar structure at the center. Suppose, for example, that a number of persons are situated in different parts of a public square where an orator is holding forth or a radio is blaring, and that they have similar auditory experiences. This postulate confers antecedent probability on the inference that their similar experiences are causally related to the sounds made by the orator or radio. (v) The fifth principle, the postulate of analogy, states that if, when two classes of events, A and B, are observed, there is reason to believe that A causes B, then if, in a given case, A occurs but we cannot observe whether B occurs or not, it is probable that it does occur. Similarly, if the occurrence of B is observed while the occurrence of A cannot be observed, it is possible that A has occurred. According to Russell, an important function of this postulate is to justify belief in other minds.114

“In view of the fact that these postulates cannot be proved, not even rendered probable, by empirical argument, Russell explicitly admits the failure of empiricism, in the sense that it is is inadequate as a theory of knowledge and is unable to justify the presuppositions on which all inferred empirical knowledge depends for its validity. It has therefore sometimes been said that he approaches a Kantian position. But the similarity is limited...Russell is very far from developing a theory of the a priori on the line of Kant’s first Critique. Instead he proceeds to give a biological-psychological account of the origins of the postulates of non-demonstrative inference.”115
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Ethics and Political Thought: In his *Principles of Social Reconstruction* (1916), Russel writes: “All human activity springs from two sources: impulse and desire.” As he goes on to say that the suppression of impulse by purposes, desires and will means the suppression of vitality, one’s natural tendency is to think that he is talking about conscious desire. But the desire which lies at the basis of human activity is presumably in the first instance unconscious desire. And in *The Analysis of Mind* (1921) Russel insists, under the influence of psycho-analytic theory, that all primitive desire is unconscious. The expression of natural impulse is in itself a good thing because men possess a central principle of growth, a tree seeks the light. But this approval of natural impulse, which sometimes puts us in mind of Rousseau, stands in need of qualification. If we follow natural impulse along, we remain in bondage to it, and we cannot control our environment in a constructive manner. It is mind, impersonal objective thought, which exercises a critical function in regard to impulse and instinct and enables us to decide what impulses need to be suppressed or diverted because they conflict with other impulses or because the environment makes it impossible or undesirable to satisfy them. It is also mind which enables us to control our environment to a certain extent in a constructive manner. So, while he insists on the principles of vitality, Russell does not give a blanket approval to impulse.

In the *Principles of Social Reconstruction*, Russell writes in State: “Under the influence of socialism, most liberal thought in recent years has been in favor of increasing the power of the State, but more or less hostile to the power of private property. On the other hand, syndicalism has been hostile both to the State and to private property…The distinction between socialism and individualism turns on the non-essential functions of the State, which the socialist wishes to extend and the individualist to restrict.” “The power of the State is only limited internally by the fear of rebellion and externally by the fear of defeat in war.” Russell sees that the tribal feeling and fear of defeat are essential to strengthen the State, and there is a third source of strength in a national State, namely patriotism in its religious aspect. But in practice, “patriotism has many other enemies to contend with. Cosmopolitanism cannot fail to grow as men acquire more knowledge of foreign countries by education and travel. There is also a kind of individualism which is continually increasing, a realization that every man ought to use as nearly free as possible to choose his own ends, not compelled by a geographical accident to pursue ends forced upon him by the community. Socialism, syndicalism, and anti-capitalist movements generally, are against patriotism in their tendency, since they make men aware that the present State is largely concerned in defending the privileges of the rich, and that many of the conflicts between States have their origin in the financial interests of a few plutocrats. This kind of opposition is perhaps temporary, a mere incident in the struggle of labor to acquire power.”

Though Russell does not think that “there is any evidence for the existence of God, he has made it clear that belief in God, taken by itself, would no more arouse his hostility than belief in elves and fairies. It would simply be an example of a comforting but unsupported belief in a hypothetical entity, which does not necessarily make a man a worse citizen than he would otherwise be.” In Religion and the Churches, Russell view that the discovery and diffusion of new knowledge were the cause of the decay of dogmatic religion. “If a religious view of life and the world is ever to reconquer the thoughts and feelings of free-minded men and women, much that we are accustomed to associate with religion will have to be discarded. The first and greatest change that is required is to establish a morality of initiative, not a morality of submission, a morality of hope rather than fear, of things to be done rather than of things to be left undone. It is not the whole duty of man to slip through the world so as to escape the wrath of God. The world is our world, and it rests with us to make it a heaven or a hell. The power is ours, and the kingdom and the glory would be ours also if we had courage and insight to create them.”

116

117

118
In previous three sections in this chapter, Modern Philosophy (I) analyzed idealism in America; the pragmatist movement; and the revolt against idealism - mainly realism. Now next three sections are categorized Modern Philosophy (II) by three periods of French philosophy: from the French Revolution to Auguste Comte, from Auguste Comte to Henri Bergson, and from Bergson to Sartre, Camus, and Levi-Strauss. Although each philosophy chapter of Book IV (1715-1815) or Book V (1815-1914) discussed about French philosophers of the time, it would be significant for readers to overview the progress of French philosophy chronologically. Frederick Copleston well introduces Modern Philosophy (II) in Volume IX of his History of Philosophy.

"Frederick Charles Copleston, (1907-1994), British Jesuit priest and scholar who wrote the nine-volume work A History of Philosophy (1946-74), a concise, clearly written, and objective overview that became a standard introductory philosophy text for thousands of university students, particularly in its U.S. paperback edition (1962-77). Copleston attended Marlborough College, from which he was expelled after he converted from Anglicanism to Roman Catholicism, and St. John’s College, Oxford. He joined the Society of Jesus in 1930 and was ordained in 1937. In 1939 he was named professor of the history of philosophy at Heythrop College (later a school of the University of London). He retained that position until he was elevated to principal of Heythrop (1970-74) and dean of the faculty of theology (1972-74). He also taught metaphysics on a regular basis at the Gregorian University in Rome (1952-69) and served as a visiting professor at the University of Santa Clara, Calif. (1975-82). In 1946 Copleston published A History of Philosophy: Greece and Rome, the first book of what he originally envisioned as a three-volume survey. His other books include Nietzsche (1942), Philosophies and Cultures (1980), and Philosophy in Russia (1986), which many scholars felt should have been released as volume 10 in the History series. Copleston was made Commander of the Order of the British Empire in 1993."
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4. From the French Revolution to Auguste Comte

“Belief in natural law and transcendent moral order lay the foundation for traditionalist conservative thought. Reason and Divine Revelation inform natural law and the universal truths of faith. It is through these universal truths of faith that man orders himself and the world around him. Mankind organized society on the basis of these universal truths of faith. The traditionalist holds axiomatic the belief that religion precedes civilization. Most traditionalist conservatives embrace High Church Christianity. Not all traditionalists, however, are High Church Christians. Other traditionalists whose faith traditions are notable include Caleb Stegall, who is an evangelical Protestant. Many conservative mainline Protestants are also traditionalist conservatives…Many traditionalists are Jewish.”

Traditionalist believe that tradition and custom guide man and his worldview. Each generation inherits the experience and culture of its ancestors and through convention and precedence man is able to pass it down to his descendants. “To paraphrase Edmund Burke, often regarded as the father of modern conservatism: The individual is foolish, but the species is wise. Traditionalist conservatives believe that human society is essentially hierarchical (i.e., it always involves various interdependent inequalities, degrees, and classes and that political structures that recognize this fact, prove the most just, thriving, and generally beneficial). Hierarchy allows for the preservation of the whole community simultaneously, instead of protecting one part at the expense of the others. The countryside and the values of rural life are highly prized (sometimes even being romanticized, as in pastoral poetry). The principles of agrarianism (i.e., preserving the small family farm, open land, the conservation of natural resource, and stewardship of the land) are central to a traditionalist's understanding of rural life. Traditionalists defend classical Western civilization, and value an education informed by the texts of the Hebraic, Greek, Roman, and Medieval eras. Similarly, traditionalists are classicists who revere high culture in all of its manifestations (e.g., literature, music, architecture, art, theater). Unlike nationalists, who esteem the role of the State or nation over the local or regional community, traditionalists hold up patriotism as a key principle. Traditionalist conservatives think that loyalty to a locality or region is more central than any commitment to a larger political entity. Traditionalists also welcome the value of subsidiarity and the intimacy of one's community, preferring the Civil Society of Burke's little platoons over the expanded State. Nationalism, alternately, leads to jingoism and views the state as abstract from the local community and family structure rather than as an outgrowth of these local realities.”

“Traditionalist conservatism began with the thought of Anglo-Irish Whig statesman and philosopher Edmund Burke, whose political principles were rooted in moral natural law and the Western tradition. Burke believed in prescriptive rights and that those rights were God-given. He also defended what he referred to as ordered liberty (best reflected in the unwritten law of the British constitutional monarchy). Burke also advocated for those transcendent values that found support in such institutions as the church, the family, and the state. He was a fierce critic of the principles behind the French Revolution, and in 1790 his observations on its excesses and radicalism were collected in Reflections on the Revolution in France.”

A thought-out opposition to the revolution on the philosophical plane was expressed by the thus Traditionalists. “Both supporters and opponents of the revolution were inclined to regard it as the fruit of the Enlightenment, though they obviously differed sharply in their respective evaluations of and attitudes to the Enlightenment. It is of course easy to dismiss the Traditionalists as reactionaries filled with nostalgia for the past and blind to the movement of history. But however…they were eminent and influential writers and cannot simply be passed over in an account of French thought in the early decades of the nineteenth century.”
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4-1. Traditional Reaction to the Revolution

**Joseph De Maistre** (1753-1821): Maistre was a French polemical author, moralist, and diplomat who, after being uprooted by the French Revolution in 1789, became a great exponent of the conservative tradition. “Maistre studied with the Jesuits and became a member of the Savoy Senate in 1787, following the civil career of his father, a former Senate president. After the invasion of Savoy by the armies of Napoleon in 1792, he began his lifelong exile in Switzerland, where he frequented the literary salon of Germaine de Staël in Coppet. Appointed envoy to St. Petersburg by the king of Sardinia in 1803, he remained at the Russian court for 14 years, writing Essay on the Generative Principle of Political Constitutions (1814) and his best work (unfinished), The St. Petersburg Dialogues (1821). On his recall he settled in Turin as chief magistrate and minister of state of the Sardinian kingdom. Maistre was convinced of the need for the supremacy of Christianity and the absolute rule of both sovereign and pope. He also insisted on the necessity of the public executioner as a negative guardian of social order, writing in The St. Petersburg Dialogues that “all power, all subordination rests on the executioner: he is the horror and the bond of human association. Remove this incomprehensible agent from the world, and the very moment order gives way to chaos, thrones topple, and society disappears.” A devoutly religious Roman Catholic, he explained both the French Revolution and the French revolutionary and Napoleonic wars as religious expiation for the sins of the times. He opposed the progress of science and the liberal beliefs and empirical methods of philosophers such as Francis Bacon (1561–1626), Voltaire (1694–1778), Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712–78), and John Locke (1632–1704). He also wrote On the Pope (1819) and Letters on the Spanish Inquisition (1838), an apology for the punitive role of the Spanish Inquisition. In both works Maistre defended absolutism with rigorous logic, and it was as a logical thinker, pursuing consequences from an accepted premise, that Maistre excelled.”

His Considerations on France begins with the absolutism: “We are all attached to the throne of the Supreme Being by a supple chain that restrains us without enslaving us. Nothing is more admirable in the universal order of things than the action of free beings under the divine hand.” Maistre criticizes that an assault against sovereignty is “undoubtedly one of the greatest crimes” that can be committed and every assault committed against sovereignty in the name of the nation is “always more or less a national crime.” It is believed that a large indivisible free nation cannot exist under a republican government, and encourages a counter-revolution: “It is common fallacy nowadays to insist on the danger of counter revolution.” He was against confiscated properties because “People do not dare enjoy these properties publicly, and the cooler people become to the idea, the less they will dare utilize their properties.” About vengeance of counterrevolution, Maistre defends the king to extend his amnesty, and worries that the innocent individuals suffer from the Revolution. Maistre recognizes that “liberty needs its critics as well as its supporters” due to diversity and conflict of interests between individuals. He claimed that the crimes of the Reign of Terror in the French Revolution were “the logical consequence of enlightened thought, as well as its divinely-decreed punishment.” (Book IV, 284) “Political society, de Maistre insists, is certainly not a collection of individuals united through a social compact or contract. Nor can a viable constitution be thought out *a priori* by the human reason in abstraction from national traditions and the institutions which have developed through the centuries…If we look at the English constitution, we can see that it is the result of a vast number of contributing factors and circumstances which served as the instruments of providence. A constitution of this kind, which was certainly not constructed in an a priori manner, is always allied with religion and takes a monarchical form. It is not surprising therefore if revolutionaries, who wish to establish a constitution by decree, attack both religion and the monarchy.”
Defending absolutism with rigorous logic, Maistre argues in his *Essay on the Generative Principle of Political Constitutions and other Human Institutions* of 1809 that “constitutions are not the product of human reason, but come from God, who slowly brings them to maturity.” In *On the Pope* of 1819 he argues “that authority in politics should therefore derive from religion, and that in Europe this religious authority must ultimately lie with the Pope.” In his *Saint Petersburg Dialogues* of 1821, Maistre views on human justice - “God has given sovereigns the supreme prerogative of punishing crimes, in which above all they are his representatives.” He continues that “Moral vices can increase the number and intensity of illness to a degree that it is impossible to fix….There is no need to go further to justify the ways of Providence even in the temporal sphere, above all if this consideration is joined to that of human justice, since….the advantage of virtue is incalculable, without giving any reasons or even appealing to religious consideration.”

In his *Enlightenment on Sacrifices* of 1821, Maistre views that “The gods are good, and we are indebted to them for all the good things we enjoy: we owe them praise and thanks. But the gods are just, and we are guilty. They must be appeased, and we must expiate our sins; and, to do this, the most effective means is sacrifice.”

Maistre was called as “a fierce absolutist, a furious theocrat, and intransigent legitimist, apostle of a monstrous trinity composed of Pope….the champion of….the hardest, narrowest and most inflexible dogmatism…..”

In general, “de Maistre is violently opposed to the rationalism of the eighteenth century which he sees a treating of abstractions and as disregarding traditions which is, in his opinion, exhibit the operation of divine providence. The abstract human being of *les philosophes*, who is not essentially a Frenchman or an Englishman…, is a fiction. So is the State when interpreted as the product of a contract or convention. When de Maistre makes a complimentary remark about the Enlightenment thinker, it is because he regards him as transcending the spirit of *a priori* rationalism. For example, Hume is commended for his attack on the artificiality of the social contract theory. If de Maistre goes back beyond the Enlightenment and attacks Francis Bacon, the reason is that in his view modern philosophy is entirely the daughter of Bacon. Another rationalist fiction, according to de Maistre, is natural religion…a deliberate construction of the human reason. In reality belief in God is handed down from a primitive revelation to mankind, Christianity being a fuller revelation. In other words, there is only one revealed religion; and man can no more construct a religion *a priori* than he can construct a constitution *a priori*. The philosophy of the last century, which will form in the eyes of posterity one of the most shameful epochs of the human spirit…was in fact nothing but a veritable system of practical atheism.”

“According to de Maistre the philosophy of the eighteenth century has found expression in the theory of the sovereignty of the people and in democracy. The theory of the sovereignty of the people is however groundless, and the fruits of democracy are disorder and anarchy. The remedy for these evils is a return to historically grounded and providentially constituted authority. In the political sphere this means the restoration of the Christian monarchy, while in the religious sphere it means acceptance of the supreme and unique sovereignty of the infallible pope. Human beings are such that government is necessary; and absolute power is the only real alternative to anarchy. I have never said that absolute power, in whatever form it may exist in the world, does not involve great inconveniences. On contrary, I expressly acknowledge the fact, and I have no thought of attenuating these inconveniences. I said only that we find ourselves placed between two abysses. In actual practice the exercise of absolute power is inevitably restricted by a variety of factors. And in any case political sovereigns are, or out to be, subject to the jurisdiction of the pope, in the sense that he has the right to judge their actions from the religious and moral points of view…This instance however was by no means acceptable to all those who shared his hostility to the revolution and sympathized with his desire for the restoration of the monarchy.”

---

**Bicomp de Bonald** (1754-1840): “Bonald came from an ancient noble family of Provence. He was educated at the Oratorian College at Juilly, and after serving with the Artillery, he held a post in the local administration of his native province. Elected to the States General of 1789 as a deputy for Aveyron, he strongly opposed the new legislation on the civil status of the clergy and emigrated in 1791. There he joined the army of the Prince of Condé, soon settling in Heidelberg. There he wrote his first important work, the highly conservative Theory of Political and Religious Power in Civil Society, which the Directory condemned. Upon returning to France, he found himself an object of suspicion and at first lived in retirement. In 1806, he, along with Chateaubriand and Joseph Fiévée, edited the Mercure de France. Two years later, he was appointed counsellor of the Imperial University, which he had often attacked previously. After the Bourbon Restoration he was a member of the council of public instruction. [In 1800 he published an Analytical Essay on the Natural Laws of Social Order. This was followed by Primitive Legislation (1802); Philosophical Studies on the Primary Objects of the Moral Sciences (1818); and a Philosophical Demonstration of the Constitutive Principle of Society (1827).] From 1815 to 1822, de Bonald served as a deputy in the French National Assembly. His speeches were extremely conservative, and he advocated literary censorship. In 1825, he argued strongly in favor of the Anti-Sacrilege Act, including its prescription of the death penalty under certain conditions. In 1822, de Bonald was made Minister of State, and presided over the censorship commission. In the following year, he was made a peer, a dignity which he had lost by refusing to take the required oath in 1803. In 1816, he was appointed to the French Academy. In 1830, he retired from public life and spent the remainder of his days on his estate at Le Monna.”

Bonald’s writings are mainly on social and political philosophy, and are based ultimately on one great principle, the divine origin of language. “In his own words, ‘man thinks his speech before saying his thought’; the first language contained the essence of all truth. From this he deduces the existence of God, the divine origin and consequent supreme authority of the Holy Scriptures, and the infallibility of the Catholic Church. While this thought lies at the root of all his speculations, there is a formula of constant application. All relations may be stated as the triad of cause, means and effect, which he sees repeated throughout nature. Thus, in the universe, he finds the first cause as mover, movement as the means, and bodies as the result; in the state, power as the cause, ministers as the means, and subjects as the effects; in the family, the same relation is exemplified by father, mother and children. These three terms bear specific relations to one another; the first is to the second as the second to the third. Thus, in the great triad of the religious world - God, the Mediator, and Man - God is to the God-Man as the God-Man is to Man. On this basis, he constructed a system of political absolutism.”

“The power belongs naturally to the father and is derived ultimately from God. Similarly, in political society sovereignty belongs to the monarch, not the people, and it belongs to him by nature. The establishment of the public power was neither voluntary nor forced; it was necessary, in conformity with the nature of beings in society. And its causes and origins were all natural. This idea can be applied even in the case of Napoleon. The revolution was both the culmination of a long sickness and an effort made by society to return to order. That someone capable of bringing order out of anarchy should assume power was necessary and therefore natural. Napoleon was man. Like de Maistre, de Bonald insists on the unity of power or sovereignty. Sovereignty must be one, independent and definitive or absolute. It must also be lasting, from which premise de Bonald concludes to the need for hereditary monarchy. The peculiar characteristic of his thought however is his theory about the origin of language and of the transmission, by means of language, of a primitive divine revelation which lies at the basis of religious belief, morality and society.”
François-Auguste-René, vicomte de Chateaubriand (1768-1848) was “French author and diplomat, one of his country’s first Romantic writers. He was the preeminent literary figure in France in the early 19th century and had a profound influence on the youth of his day. The youngest child of an eccentric and impecunious noble, Chateaubriand spent his school holidays largely with his sister at the family estate at Combourg, with its half-derelict medieval castle set in ancient oak woods and wild heaths. After leaving school, he eventually became a cavalry officer. At the beginning of the French Revolution, he refused to join the Royalists and sailed in April 1791 for the United States, a stay memorable chiefly for his travels with fur traders and for his firsthand acquaintance with Indians in the region around Niagara Falls. After learning of Louis XVI’s flight in June 1791, Chateaubriand felt that he owed obligations to the monarchy and returned to France. Penniless, he married an heiress of 17 and took her to Paris, which he found too expensive; he then left her and joined the Royalist Army. Wounded at the siege of Thionville, he was discharged. He went to England in May 1793. Often destitute, he supported himself by translating and teaching. In London he began his Essai sur les révolutions (1797; Essay on Revolutions), an emotional survey of world history in which he drew parallels between ancient and modern revolutions in the context of France’s own recent upheavals.”

“In 1800 Chateaubriand returned to Paris, where he worked as a freelance journalist and continued to write his books. A fragment of an unfinished epic appeared as Atala (1801). Shortly after the death of his mother in 1798, Chateaubriand reconciled his conflict between religion and rationalism and returned to traditional Christianity. His apologetic treatise extolling Christianity, Le Génie du christianisme (1802; The Genius of Christianity), won favor both with the Royalists and with Napoleon Bonaparte, who was just then concluding a concordat with the papacy and restoring Roman Catholicism as the state religion in France…Napoleon rewarded Chateaubriand for his treatise by appointing him first secretary to the embassy at Rome in 1803. But in 1804, when Napoleon stunned France with the unfair trial and hasty execution of the Duke d’Enghien on a flimsy pretext of conspiracy, Chateaubriand resigned his post in protest.” Then, he published the novel Rene in 1805. “On the basis of Les Martyrs (1809), a prose epic about early Christian martyrs in Rome, and Itinéraire de Paris à Jérusalem (1811), an account of his recent travels throughout the Mediterranean, Chateaubriand was elected to the French Academy in 1811.”

“With the restoration of the Bourbon monarchy in 1814, Chateaubriand’s hopes of a political career revived. In 1815 he was made a viscount and a member of the House of Peers. His extravagant lifestyle eventually caused him financial difficulties, however, and he found his only pleasure in his liaison with Mme Récamier, who illumined the rest of his life. He began Mémoires d’outre-tombe (1849–50), his memoir from beyond the tomb, written for posthumous publication and perhaps his most lasting monument. This memoir, which Chateaubriand began writing as early as 1810, is as much a history of his thoughts and sensations as it is a conventional narrative of his life from childhood into old age. The vivid picture it draws of contemporary French history, of the spirit of the Romantic epoch, and of Chateaubriand’s own travels is complemented by many self-revealing passages in which the author recounts his unstinting appreciation of women, his sensitivity to nature, and his lifelong tendency toward melancholy. Chateaubriand’s memoirs have proved to be his most enduring work. After six months as ambassador to Berlin in 1821, Chateaubriand became ambassador to London in 1822. He represented France at the Congress of Verona in 1822 and served as minister of foreign affairs under the ultra-Royalist premier Joseph, Count de Villé, until 1824. In this capacity he brought France into the war with Spain in 1823 to restore that country’s Bourbon king Ferdinand VII. The campaign was a success, but its high cost diminished the prestige Chateaubriand won by it. He passed the rest of his life privately, except for a year as ambassador to Rome (1828–29).”
Hugues Felicité Robert de Lamennais (1782-1854): “French priest and philosophical and political writer who attempted to combine political liberalism with Roman Catholicism after the French Revolution. A brilliant writer, he was an influential but controversial figure in the history of the church in France. Lamennais was born to a bourgeois family whose liberal sympathies had been chastened by the French Revolution. He and his elder brother, Jean, early conceived the idea of a revival of Roman Catholicism as the key to social regeneration. After Napoleon’s restoration of the Roman Catholic church in France, the brothers sketched a program of reform in Réflexions sur l’état de l’égilse... (1808; Reflections on the State of the Church...). Five years later, at the height of Napoleon’s conflict with the papacy, they produced a defense of ultramontanism (a movement supporting papal authority and centralization of the church, in contrast to Gallicanism, which advocated the restriction of papal power). This book brought Lamennais into conflict with the emperor, and he had to flee to England briefly during the Hundred Days in 1815.

“Having returned to Paris, Lamennais was ordained a priest in 1816, and in the following year he published the first volume of his Essai sur l’indifférence en matière de religion (Essay on Indifference in Matters of Religion), which won him immediate fame. In this book he argued for the necessity of religion, basing his appeals on the authority of tradition and the general reason of mankind rather than on the individualism of private judgment.” “In the first volume to this work, Lamennais insists that in religion, morals and politics, no doctrines are matters of indifference. Indifference, considered as a permanent state of soul, is opposed to the nature of man and destructive of his being. This thesis is based on the premises that man cannot develop himself as man without religion, that religion is necessary for society, inasmuch as it is in the basis of morals, and that without it society degenerates into a group of persons each of whom is intent on furthering his own particular interests. In other words, Lamennais insists on the social necessity of religion and rejects the belief which spread in the eighteenth century that ethics can stand on its own feet, apart from religion, and that there could be a satisfactory human society without religion... Lamennais argues that indifference towards religion is disastrous for man.”

“Though an advocate of ultramontanism in the religious sphere, Lamennais in his political beliefs was a liberal who advocated the separation of church and state and the freedoms of conscience, education, and the press. Though he attacked the Gallicanism of the French bishops and the French monarchy in his book Des progrès de la révolution et de la guerre contre l’Église (1829; On the Progress of the Revolution and the War Against the Church), this work showed his readiness to combine Roman Catholicism with political liberalism.”

“After the July Revolution in 1830, Lamennais founded L’Avenir with Henri Lacordaire, Charles de Montalembert, and a group of enthusiastic liberal Roman Catholic writers. This daily newspaper, which advocated democratic principles and church-state separation, antagonized both the French ecclesiastical hierarchy and King Louis-Philippe’s government. And despite its ultramontanism, the paper also found little favor in Rome, for Pope Gregory XVI had no wish to assume the revolutionary role it advocated for him.” Publication of the paper was suspended in November 1831, and after a vain appeal to the pope its principles were condemned in the encyclical Mirari Vos (August 1832). Lamennais then attacked the papacy and the European monarchs in Paroles d’un croyant (1834; The Words of a Believer); this famous apocalyptic poem provoked the papal encyclical Singulari Nos (July 1834), which led to Lamennais’ severance from the church. Thenceforth Lamennais devoted himself to the cause of the people and put his pen at the service of republicanism and socialism. He wrote such works as Le Livre du peuple (1838; The Book of the People), and he served in the Constituent Assembly after the Revolution of 1848. He retired after Louis-Napoleon’s coup d’état in 1851. Because he refused to be reconciled to the church, upon his death Lamennais was buried in a pauper’s grave.”
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Traditionalism and the Church: In a broad sense, traditionalists saw the French Revolution as a disastrous attack on the valuable political, social and religious traditions of their country and advocated a return to these traditions. However, in the technical sense, “traditionalism means the theory that certain basic beliefs, necessary for man’s spiritual and cultural development and well-being, are not the result simply of human reasoning but have been derived from a primitive revelation by God and have been handed on from generation to generation through the medium of language. Obviously, traditionalism in the broad sense does not exclude traditionalism in the narrower sense. But it does not entail it. It hardly needs saying that a Frenchman could quite well support the restoration of the monarchy without the theory of a primitive revelation and without placing restorations on the range of philosophical proof. Again, it was possible to adopt traditionalist theories in the technical sense and yet not to demand a restoration of the ancient regime. The two go together, but they were not inseparable.”

It may appear at first sight that traditionalism in the technical sense, with its attack on the philosophy of the Enlightenment, its insistence on divine revelation and its tendency to ultramontanism would be highly acceptable to ecclesiastical authority. But though ultramontanist tendencies were naturally pleasing to Rome, the traditionalist philosophy brought upon itself ecclesiastical censures...But to attack the thought of the Enlightenment on the ground that the human reason in unable to attain certain truth was quite another matter. If the existence of God could be known only on authority, how did one know that the authority was trustworthy? For the matter of that, how did the first man know that what he took to be revelation was revelation? And if human reason was as powerless as the more extreme traditionalists made it out to be, how could one show that the voice of Christ was the voice of God? It is understandable that ecclesiastical authority, while sympathizing with attacks on the Enlightenment and the revolution, was not enthusiastic about theories which left its claims without any rational support save questionable appeals to the consent of mankind.”

“...To take one example. The second volume of Lamennais’s "Essai sur l’indifférence" exercised a considerable influence on Augustin Bonnetty (1798-1879), founder of the Annales de philosophie chretienne. In an article in this periodical Bonnetty wrote that people were beginning to understand that the whole of religion rested on tradition and not on reasoning. His general thesis was that revelation was the only source of religious truth, and he drew the conclusion that the scholasticism which prevailed in seminaries was an expression of a pagan rationalism which had corrupted Christian thought and had eventually born fruit in the destructive philosophy of the Enlightenment. In 1855 Bonnetty was required by the Congregation of the Index to subscribe to a number of theses, such as that the human reason can prove with certainty the existence of God, the spirituality of the soul and human freedom, that reasoning leads to faith, and that the method sued by St. Thomas Aquinas, St. Bonaventure and the Scholastics does not lead to rationalism. A series of similar propositions had already been subscribed to in 1840 by...Bautain (1796-1867).”

“It may very well occur to the reader that imposition by ecclesiastical authority of the thesis that the existence of God can be philosophically proved contributes little to showing how this is done. However, it is clear that the Church came down on the side of what Bonnetty regarded as rationalism. And definitive pronouncements on this matter were made at the first Vatican Council in 1870, the Council which also marked the triumph of ultramontanism. As for the general idea that France could be regenerated only through a return to the monarchy in alliance with the Church, this idea was to find a fresh lease of life with the Action Francaise movement, founded by Charles Maurras (1868-1952). But Maurras himself was, like some of his closer associates, an atheist, not a believer such as de Maistre or de Bonald. And it is not altogether surprising if his cynical attempt to use Catholicism for political ends led eventually to a condemnation by Pope Pius XI.”
4-2. The Ideologists and Maine de Biran

“We have seen, the Traditionalists attacked the spirit and thought of the Enlightenment, which they regarded as largely responsible for the revolution. Those who welcomed the revolution tended to take a similar view of the relation between eighteenth-century thought and the revolution. To attribute the revolution simply to the influence of les philosophes would be of course an obvious exaggeration and too flattering a compliment to the power of philosophy. Though however the philosophers of the eighteenth century aimed not at violence, bloodshed and terror but at the spread of knowledge and, through the diffusion of knowledge, at social reform, they helped to prepare the way for the overthrow of the ancient regime; and it hardly needs saying that the influence of the Enlightenment was prolonged beyond the revolution. Once conditions became sufficiently settled, the scientific work associated with a man such as d’Alembert (1717-83) began to develop and flourish. The demands of a Condorcet (1743-94) for an educational system based on a secular ethics and free from theological presuppositions and ecclesiastical influences were eventually fulfilled in the programme of public education in France. And though Condorcet was himself to become a victim of the revolution, his vision of man’s perfectibility and of history as a process of intellectual and moral advance, together with the interpretation of history expounded by Turgot (1727-81), prepared the way for the philosophy of Auguste Comte” to be considered later.140

“The immediate inheritors of the spirit of the Enlightenment, and in particular of the influence of Condillac (1715-80) were the so-called ideologists (les ideologues). In 1801 Destutt de Tracy (1754-1836) published the first volume of his Elements of Ideology (Elements d’ideologie); and it was from this work that the label ideologist was taken. The members of the group included, besides de Tracy, the Comte de Volney (1757-1820). And Cabanis (1757-1808). The group had two principal centres, the Ecole Normale and the Institut National, both of which were established in 1795. It was not long however before the ideologists aroused the suspicions of Napoleon. Though for the most part they had been favorable to his rise, they soon came to the conclusion that he had failed to preserve and implement the ideals of the revolution. In particular they resented and opposed his restoration of religion. On his side the emperor came to attribute to what he regarded as the obscure metaphysics of the ideologists all the evils from which France was suffering; and he held them responsible for a conspiracy against himself in 1812.” Destutt de Tracy regarded ideology as a basic study contributing the foundation of such sciences as logic, ethics and economics; concerning with developing a science of human nature.

“The basic faculties for de Tracy are feeling, remembering, judging and willing. The operation of judging can be seen as the foundation of both grammar and logic, which is concerned with the ways of attaining certainty in judgment. Reflection on the effects of the will ground ethics, considered mainly as the study of the origins of our desires and of their conformity or lack of it with our nature, and economics which is looked on as an enquiry into the consequences of our actions in regard to meeting our needs. Passing over the details of ideology we can notice the following two points. First, when laying down the fundamental notions of ideology de Tracy turned from the reductive analysis of Condillac to immediate self-observation, from hypothetical reconstruction of man’s psychical life out of its basis in elementary sensation to reflection on what we actually perceive to take place when we think and speak and act voluntarily. Secondly, de Tracy maintained that if Condillac’s psychology, which laid all the emphasis on receptivity, was true, we could never know that there was an external world. We should be left with the insoluble problem of Hume. In point of fact the real ground of our knowledge of the external world is our activity, our motion, our voluntary action which meets with resistance…The ideologists helped to turn his mind away from the empiricism of Locke and Condillac.”141
François-Pierre-Gontier Maine de Biran (1766-1824), usually known Maine de Biran, was a French philosopher. “Maine de Biran was born at Bergerac. After studying with distinction at Périgueux, he entered the life guards of King Louis XVI of France and was present at Versailles during the events of October 1789. He entered politics and was part of the Conseil des Cinq Cents. On the breaking up of the gardes du corps Biran retired to his patrimonial inheritance of Grateloup, near Bergerac, where he avoided the excesses of the French Revolution. It was at this period that, to use his own words, he passed per saltum from frivolity to philosophy. He began with psychology, which he made the study of his life. After the Reign of Terror, Maine de Biran took part in politics. Having been excluded from the Council of the Five Hundred on suspicion of royalism, he took part with his friend Joseph Lainé in the commission of 1813, which first expressed direct opposition to the will of the emperor Napoleon. After the restoration of the monarchy, he became treasurer to the chamber of deputies, retiring during each autumn recess to study at home.”

For his idea of human freedom, derived from this notion of willed movement, Maine de Biran has been considered by some to be the father of French Existentialist philosophy. His collected works, which fill 14 volumes (ed. Pierre Tisserand, 1920–49), include the Essai sur les fondements de la psychologie (1812; Essay on the Fundamentals of Psychology) and Nouveaux Essais d’anthropologie (1823–24; New Essays in Anthropology). In the later essays he describes the human self as developing through a purely sensitive, animal phase, the vie animale (animal life), to a phase of will and freedom, the vie humaine (human life), and culminating in experiences that transcend humanity, the vie de l’esprit (spiritual life)."

In 1802 Maine de Biran published an essay, though without the author’s name, on the Influence of Habit on the Faculty of Thinking, which won for him a prize from the Institute of France. This essay was a revised version of one which he had submitted to the Institute in 1800 and which, while not winning the prize, had aroused the attention of the ideologists Destutt de Tracy and Cabanis. In 1805 he won another prize from the Institute for an essay on the analysis of thought (Memoire sur la decomposition de la pensee) and was elected a member of the Institute. In 1812 he won a prize from the Academy of Copenhagen for an Essay on the Relations of Physics and Morals in Man. Neither of these essays was published by Maine de Biran himself; but in 1817 he published, again without giving his name, an Examination of the Lectures on Philosophy of M. Laromiguiere. And in 1819 he wrote an article on Leibniz (Exposition de la doctrine philosophique de Leibniz) for the Biographie universelle.”

“It will be seen from what has been said above that Maine de Biran published very little himself, the essay of 1802, the Examination (both anonymously), and the article on Leibniz. In addition, he published a number of papers, mainly on political topics. But he wrote copiously; and it appears that up to the end of his life he planned to produce one major work, a science of human nature or a philosophical anthropology, incorporating revised versions of early essays. This major work was never completed; but a good deal of the manuscript material seems to represent various phases in the attempt to realize the project. For example, the Essay on the Foundations of Psychology, at which de Biran was working in the years 1811-12, represents one phase in the writing of the unfinished work. In 1841 Victor Cousin published an (incomplete) edition of Maine de Biran’s writings in four volumes. In 1859 E. Naville and M. Debrit brought out three volumes of the unpublished works. In 1920 P. Tisserand began publication of the Works in fourteen volumes (Oeuvres de Maine de Biran accompagnées de notes et de d’appendices). Tisserand actually published twelve volumes (1920-39). The last two volumes were brought out by Professor Henri Gouhier in 1949. Gouhier has also published an edition of Maine de Biran’s journal in three volumes (Journal intime, 1945-7).”

Frederick Copleston focuses in his History on Philosophical Development, Psychology and Knowledge, and Levels of Human Life as follows.
Philosophical Development: By temperament Maine de Biran was strongly inclined to introspection and self-commuting. And in his youth, during the period of retirement at the castle of Grateloup, he was powerfully influenced by Rousseau, considered more as the author of Confessions... than as the expounder of the social contract theory. Rousseau speaks to my heart, but sometimes his error afflicts me. For example, while Maine de Biran sympathized with Rousseau’s idea of the inner sense or feeling as prompting belief in God and immorality, he rejected decisively the modest natural theology proposed by the vacaire savoyard. As far as reasoning was concerned, agnosticism was the only proper attitude. Another point on which Maine de Biran finds fault with Rousseau is the latter’s view of man as essentially good, good by nature. It does not follow that Maine de Biran looks on man as essentially bad or as having become prone to evil through a Fall. In his view man has a natural impulse to seek after happiness, and virtue is a condition of happiness. This by no means entails the conclusion however that man is naturally virtuous. He has the power to become either virtuous or vicious. And it is reason alone which can discover the nature of virtue and the principles of morals. In other words, the reason why Maine de Biran criticizes Rousseau’s theory of man’s natural goodness is that he looks on it as involving the doctrine of innate ideas. In point of fact, all our ideas are acquisitions. There are no innate ideas of right and wrong, good and bad. Ethics can however be established by reason, by a process of reasoning or reflection, that is to say, based on observation or experience. This can be done without any dependence on religious belief.

“Given his idea of reason, it was natural that when it was a question of developing a science of man Maine de Biran should turn to contemporary scientific psychology, which professed to be based on the empirical facts. In addition to Locke, the natural writers to turn to were [Bonnet de] Condillac [an epistemologist who studied in psychology and philosophy of mind] and Charles Bonnet (1720-93) [who made a creative study of insects in his youth, but turned to psychology of mental states]. But it requires very little time for Maine de Biran to see the extreme artificiality of Condillac’s reduction of men’s psychical life to externally caused sensations and of his notion of reconstructing man’s mental operations from this basis. For one thing, Condillac passed over the evident fact that externally caused sensation affects a subject endowed with appetite and instinct. In other words, Condillac was a theorist who constructed or invented a psychology according to a quasi-mathematical method and was quite prepared to ride roughshod over the evident fact that there is much in man which cannot be accounted for in terms of what comes from without. As for Bonnet, de Biran at first thought highly of him; and a quotation from Bonnet was placed at the beginning of his essay on the Influence of Habit. But in the case of Condillac, de Biran came to look on Bonnet as a constructor of a theory” with insufficient evidences.

Maine de Biran turned from Condillac and Bonnet to Pierre Jean Georges Cabanis and Antoine Destutt de Tracy. “True, Cabanis was the author of some pretty crude materialist statements, such as his famous assertion that the brain secretes thought as the liber secrets bile. But he saw that Condillac’s picture of the statue gradually endowed with one sense-organ after another represented an extremely inadequate and one-sided theory of the genesis of man’s mental life. For Cabanis the nervous system, interior or organic sensations, the inherited physiological constitution and other factors belonging to the statue itself were of great importance. Cabanis was indeed a reductionist, in the sense that he tried to find physiological bases for all men’s mental operations. But he studied carefully the available empirical data, and he tried to account for human activity, which could hardly be explained in terms of Condillac’s status model. As for de Tracy, Maine de Biran remarks in the introduction to his essay on the Influence of Habit that I distinguish all our impressions into active and passive, and in a note he pays tribute to de Tracy for being the first writer to have seen clearly the importance of man’s faculty of moving or motility.”
“Maine de Biran reacted against the psychology of Condillac by insisting on human activity. It is I who move or who will to move, and it is also I who am moved. Here are the two terms of the relation which are required to ground the first simple judgment of personality I am…Maine de Biran is re-echoing the conviction of Rousseau who in the first part of his Discourse on the Origin of Inequality assertedroundly that man differs from the animals by being a free agent. But among the physiological psychologists de Biran has found his stimulus in the writings of the ideologists…Though however, the ideologists regarded Maine de Biran as one of themselves, he soon came to the conclusion that Destutt de Tracy had failed to exploit his own addition to the psychology of Condillac, namely the idea of the active power in man. He may at first have regarded himself as correcting the ideas of the ideologists where they tended to fail back into the Condillacian psychology, but he was gradually moving away from the reductionist tradition to which the ideologists really belonged, in spite of the improvements which they introduced. In his Memoire sur la decomposition de la pensee, which won a prize in 1805, he is still writing as an ideologist; but he asks whether a distinction should not be made between objective and subjective ideology. An objective ideology would be based chiefly on the relations which link the sensitive being to external things, in regard to which it finds itself placed in a relation of essential dependence, both in regard to the affective impressions which it receives from them and in regard to the images which it forms of them. Subjective ideology, enclosing itself in the consciousness of the thinking subject, would endeavor to penetrate the intimate relations which it has with itself in the free exercise of its intellectual acts. But he is convinced that something more is required, something which we can describe as the phenomenology of consciousness. The self-experiences itself in its operations; and we can envisage a reflection in which knower and known are one.”

“This may sound as though Maine de Biran were engaged in reintroducing the metaphysical concept of the self as a substance, the thinking substance of Descartes…With the willed effort apperception or consciousness arises in the human being, and with consciousness personal existence as distinct from the existence of a merely sensing being. The fact of a power of action and will, proper to the thinking being, is certainly as evident to him as the very fact of his own existence; the one does not differ from the other. Again, here is the sensitive being without I; there begins an identical personality, and with it all the faculties of the intelligent and moral being. In other words, consciousness cannot be explained simply in terms of transformed sensations as understood by Condillac. It must be related to willed effort, to human activity meeting with resistance. If it is asked why in this case personality is not intermittent, present only at the moment when we are engaged in willed effort, de Biran’s reply is that it is a mistake to suppose that such effort occur only occasionally or now and again. In some form or another it continues during waking existence and lies at the basis of perception and knowledge. Perhaps we can say that through the progress of reflection first on the psychology of Condillac and Bonnet, then on that of Cabanis and de Tracy, Maine de Biran arrives at a reassertion of Rousseau’s statement that man differs from the animals by being a free agent. We must add however that the reflection on contemporary psychology is always carried out in the light of the facts, the phenomena, as de Biran sees them. In his view the ideologists have been facts to which Condillac was blind, or at any rate the significance of which he did not understand properly. And he refers to Cabanis and de Tracy as agreeing that the ego or I reside exclusively in the will. But it by no means follows that Maine de Biran feels himself at one with the ideologists. For while becoming reflectively aware of the distance which not separates him from Condillac, he has reluctantly arrived at the conclusion that de Tracy, so far from exploiting or developing his own insights, has been retreating backwards. Maine de Biran may look on himself as the heir of the ideologists. But his letters testify to his growing conviction that their paths are diverging.”
Psychology and Knowledge: Now we consider the Essay on the Decomposition of Thought and in the manuscript of the Essay on the Foundations of Psychology which Maine de Brian brought with him to Paris in 1812. “It may appear that Maine de Biran is in effect claiming that the ego intuitively perceives itself as a substance. His actual claim however is that the ego is aware of itself as cause. On the basis of the primitive fact of interior sense, one can assure oneself that every phenomenon relative to consciousness, every mode in which the ‘I’ participates or unites itself in any manner, includes necessarily the idea of a cause. This cause is I if the mode is active and perceived as the actual result of a willed effort; It is not-I if it is a passive impression, felt as opposed to this effort or as independent of every exercise of the will. I other words, awareness of the ego or I as a causal agent is fundamental. The concept of the soul as an absolute substance existing apart from self-consciousness is an abstraction. At the same time de Biran tries to include awareness of personal identity within the intuition of causal efficacy.”

“If the existence of the ego or subject as active cause is given in intuition, it is natural to think of this cause as persisting, at any rate as a virtual cause, even when it is not actually conscious of its causal efficacy in willed effort. And in this case it is natural to think of it as substance, provided at least that the concept of substance is interpreted in terms of active force or causality and not as the idea of an inert substratum. So, it is not altogether surprising to find Maine de Biran writing to Degerando that he believes in the meta-phenomenal subject or ego. If you ask me why and on what ground I believe it, I reply that I am made in this way, that it is impossible for me not to have this belief, and that it would be necessary to change my nature for me to cease to have it. In other words, we perceive or intuit the ego or I as an active cause or force in actual concrete relations, and we have a natural and irresistible tendency to believe in its meta-phenomenal or noumenal existence as a permanent substantial force which exists apart from actual apperception. The phenomenal is the object of intuition, while the noumenal or absolute is the object of belief. To put the matter in another way, the subject or I which reveals itself in willed effort is the phenomenal manner in which my soul manifests itself to the interior vision.”

“In so far as the Cogito, ergo sum (I think; therefore, I am) of Descartes could be taken as expressing not an inferential operation but an intuitive apprehension of a primitive fact or datum of consciousness, Maine de Biran came to appreciate Descartes’ insight. De Biran naturally preferred the formula Volo, ergo sum (I will, therefore I am), inasmuch as it was in the expression of willed effort encountering resistance that, in his opinion, the ‘I’ of consciousness arose. But he certainly thought of the existence of the ego as given in its appearing to consciousness as a causal agent. The existence of the subject or ego which was given as a phenomenal reality was however precisely its existence for itself, as active subject, that is to say, within consciousness or apperception. Descartes’ great mistake, in de Biran’s opinion, was that he confused the phenomenal self with the noumenal or substantial self. For from the Cogito, ergo sum Descartes draws conclusions about the ego or I in itself, this going beyond the sphere of objects of knowledge. Kant however avoids the confusion by his distinction between the ‘I’ of apperception, the phenomenal ego or the ego appearing to itself and existing for itself, and the noumenal, substantial principle. Not that Maine de Biran’s position is precisely the same as that of Kant. For instance, whereas for Kant the free agent presupposed by moral choice in the light of the concept of obligation was the noumenal self, for Maine de Biran freedom is, to use Bergsonian language, an immediate datum of consciousness, and the phenomenal ego is the free causal agent. This does not alter the fact however that de Biran sees some affinity between his idea of the permanent soul as the object of belief rather than of knowledge and Kant’s idea of the noumenal self…we have any positive knowledge or idea of the absolute, although we cannot prevent ourselves from believing that it exists or…as a primary datum inseparable from our mind, pre-existing before all knowledge.”
Levels of Human Life: “The idea of seeing in the phenomenal ego the self-manifestation of an absolute or substantial soul may suggest the idea of seeing all phenomena as manifesting the Absolute or God as their ultimate ground or as the cause of their existence. Though however Maine de Biran did come to regard all phenomena as related to God, it seems unlikely that he would have arrived at this position, had it not been for his meditative and religiously oriented nature and for a felt need for God. To argue, in the manner of traditional metaphysics, from internal phenomena to the noumenal self and from external phenomena, or from all phenomena, to the Absolute or Unconditional was really foreign to his mind. It was much more a question of a broadening of de Biran’s idea of man’s inner life. Just as he came to see in the ‘I’ of consciousness the substantial soul manifesting itself in a relation and thus to knowledge, so did he come to see in certain aspects of man’s life a manifestation of the divine reality. As he grew older, Maine de Biran developed a deeply religious philosophy. But he remained a philosopher of man’s inner life. And the change in his philosophical outlook expressed a change in his reflections on this life, not a sudden conversion to traditional metaphysics.”

“De Biran was influenced by Stoicism and admired the Stoic heroes, such as Marcus Aurelius; but he naturally brought his ethical ideal into connection with his psychology, so far as this was possible. The end or goal is happiness; and a condition of attaining it is that harmony and balance should be achieved in man’s power or faculties. This means in effect that the active thinking subject of consciousness should rule over or govern the appetites and impulses of the part of man’s nature which is presupposed by the life of consciousness. In other words, reason should rule over the impulses of sense. To give content however to the ideas of virtue and vice we have to consider man in his social relations, man as acting on others and as being acted on by society. From the feeling of free and spontaneous action which, of itself, would not have any limits, there derive what we call rights. From the necessary social reaction which follows the individual’s action, and which does not exactly conform to it and which often anticipate it, forcing the individual to coordinate his action with that of society, there arise duties. The feeling of obligation (duty) is the feeling of this social coercion from which every individual knows well that he cannot free himself.”

However, he became more and more conscious of the limitations of the human reason and will, when left to themselves. “Reason alone is powerless to provide the will with the motives of principles of action. It is necessary that these principles should come from a higher source.” He distinguished three levels of human life - the life of man as animal, the life of man as man, and the life of the spirit communicating with the divine Spirit.

“The psychological study of the self-constitutes the basis for reflection in the ethical and religious spheres, and the method to be employed throughout is that of what de Biran calls experimental psychology, though reflexive psychology would be preferable. Throughout phenomena of man’s inner life constitute the point of departure. Referring to the life of the spirit, de Biran asserts that the third division, the most important of all, is that which philosophy has hitherto felt obliged to leave to the speculation of mysticism, although it can also be reduced to facts of observation, drawn, it is true, from a nature lifted above the senses but not one which is at all alien to the spirit which knows God and itself—called divine grace. It has been claimed that de Biran turned from Stoicism to Platonism rather than to Christianity…However, de Biran’s later writings express the conviction that the Christian religion alone reveals to man a third life, superior to that of the sensibility (the first level) and to that of the reason or of the human will (the second level)...Maine de Biran was not a systematic thinker in the sense of one who creates a developed philosophical system. But he exercised a very considerable seminal or stimulating influence in psychology and on the philosophical movement…in this or that field (such as psychology of volition, phenomenology of consciousness, the concept of causality and religious experience).”
Chapter III. History of Philosophy

4-3. Eclecticism

“A philosophical term meaning either a tendency of mind in a thinker to conciliate the different views or positions taken in regard to problems, or a system in philosophy which seeks the solution of its fundamental problems by selecting and uniting what it regards as true in the various philosophical schools.” “The term [Eclecticism] is derived from a Greek verb (eklegein) meaning to pick out or choose out; and, in general, the eclectic philosophers are those who select from different schools or systems the doctrines of which they approve and then combine them. The presupposition of this procedure is obviously that every philosophical system expresses or is likely to express some truth or truths or some aspect of reality or some perspective or way of looking at the world or human life which needs to be taken into account in any overall synthesis.”

“In modern times Eclecticism has been accepted in Germany by Wolff and his disciples. It has received its most characteristic form in France in the nineteenth century from Victor Cousin (1792-1867) and his school, which is sometimes called the Spiritualistic School. Drawn away from sensualism by the teaching of Royer Collard (1763-1845), Cousin seeks in the Scottish School a sufficient foundation for the chief metaphysical, moral, and religious truths. Failing in this attempt, he takes up the different doctrines then current; he is successively influenced by Maine de Biran whom he calls "the greatest metaphysician of our time", by the writings of Kant, and by personal intercourse with Schelling and Hegel; finally, he turns to the works of Plato, Plotinus, and Proclus, only to come back to Descartes and Leibniz. He then reaches the conclusion that the successive systems elaborated throughout the preceding ages contain the full development of human thought; that the complete truth is to be found in a system resulting from the happy fusion, under the guidance of common sense, of the fragmentary thoughts expressed by the different thinkers and schools of all ages. Four great systems, he says, express and summarize the whole development of human speculation: sensism, idealism, skepticism, and mysticism. Each contains a part of the truth; none possesses exclusively the whole truth. Human thought cannot invent any new system, nor can it neglect any of the old ones. Not the destruction of any of, but the reduction of all to one, will put us in possession of the truth.”

“The experience and knowledge acquired by past ages is a factor in the development of human thought. The history of philosophy is useful; it places at our disposal the truths already discovered, and by showing us the errors into which philosophy has fallen, it guards us against them and against the principles or methods which have caused them. This is the element of value contained in the system. But Eclecticism errs when it substitutes for personal reflection as the primary source of philosophy a mere fusion of systems, or the history of philosophy for philosophy proper. Eclecticism does not furnish us with the ultimate principles of philosophy or the criterion of certitude. We cannot say that philosophy has reached the highest degree of precision either in its solution or in its presentation of every problem; nor that it knows all that can be known about nature, man, or God. But even if this were the case, the principles of Eclecticism cannot provide us with a firm, complete, and true system of philosophy. Cousin says that there is some truth in every system; supposing this to be exact, this partial truth as evidently to be acquired at first through principles and a rule of certitude which are independent of Eclecticism. When Cousin declares that there is a mingling of truth and error in every system, he evidently assumes a principle superior and antecedent to the very principle of Eclecticism. The eclectic must first separate error from truth before building into a system the results of his discrimination. But this is possible only on the condition of passing a judgment upon each of these systems…Eclecticism, considered as a study of the opinions and theories of others in order to find in them some help and enlightenment… it is a part of philosophic method; but as a doctrine it is altogether inadequate.”
Pierre Paul Royer-Collard (1763-1845): He was born at Sompuis, near Marne, the son of Anthony Royer, a small businessman. “Pierre Paul Royer was sent at twelve to the college of Chaumont of which his uncle, Father Paul Collard, was director. He subsequently followed his uncle to Saint-Omer, where he studied mathematics. At the outbreak of the French Revolution, to which he was passionately sympathetic, he was practicing at the Parisian bar. He was returned by his section, the Island of Saint-Louis, to the Commune, of which he was secretary from 1790 to 1792. After the revolution of 10 August in that year he was replaced by Jean-Lambert Tallien. His sympathies were now with the Gironde, and after the insurrection of the 12th Prairial (31 May 1793) his life was in danger. He returned to Sompuis and was saved from arrest possibly by the protection of Georges Danton and in some degree by the impression made by his mother's courageous piety on the local commissary of the Convention. In 1797 he was returned by his department (Marne) to the Council of the Five Hundred, where he allied himself especially with Camille Jordan. He made one great speech in the council in defense of the principles of religious liberty, but the coup d'état of Fructidor (4 September 1797) drove him back into private life.”

“It was at this period that he developed his legitimist opinions and entered into communication with the comte de Provence (later Louis XVIII of France). He was the ruling spirit in the small committee formed in Paris to help forward a Restoration independent of the comte d'Artois and his party; but with the establishment of the Consulate he saw the prospects of the monarchy were temporarily hopeless, and the members of the committee resigned. From that time until the Restoration Royer-Collard devoted himself exclusively to the study of philosophy. He derived his opposition to the philosophy of Condillac chiefly from the study of Descartes and his followers, and from his early veneration for the fathers of Port-Royal. He was occupied with developing a system to provide a moral and political education consonant with his view of the needs of France. From 1811 to 1814 he lectured at the Sorbonne. From this time dates his long association with François Guizot. Royer-Collard himself was supervisor of the press under the first restoration. From 1815 onwards, he sat as deputy for Marne in the chamber. As president of the commission of public instruction from 1815 to 1820 he checked the pretensions of the clerical party, the immediate cause of his retirement being an attempt to infringe the rights of the University of Paris by awarding diplomas, independent of university examinations, to the teaching fraternity of the Christian Brothers. Royer-Collard's acceptance of the Legitimist principle did not prevent a faithful adhesion to the social revolution effected in 1789, and he protested in 1815, in 1820, and again under the monarchy of July against laws of exception.”

“He was the moving spirit of the Doctrinaires, as they were called, who met at the house of the comte de Ste Aulaire and in the salon of Madame de Staël's daughter, the duchesse de Broglie. The leaders of the party, beside Royer-Collard, were Guizot, PFH de Serre, Camille Jordan and Charles de Rémusat. In 1820 Royer-Collard was excluded from the council of state by a decree signed by his former ally Serre. In 1827 he was elected for seven constituencies but remained faithful to his native department. Next year he became president of the chamber and fought against the reactionary policy which precipitated the Revolution of July. It was Royer-Collard who in March 1830 presented the address of the 221. From that time, he took no active part in politics, although he retained his seat in the chamber until 1839. Whilst during the first half of the nineteenth century the word liberal was generally synonymous with Voltaireanism and hostility to the Jesuits, certain speeches of Royer-Collard quoted by Barante show that this liberal, especially in his later years, professed a deferential attachment for the Church. If Christianity, he wrote, has been a degradation, a corruption, Voltaire in attacking it has been a benefactor of the human race; but if the contrary be true, then the passing of Voltaire over the Christian earth has been a great calamity...he comments upon...the Jesuits as a wonderful creation.”
Chapter III. History of Philosophy

“Apart from a lecture delivered to inaugurate his course on the history of philosophy, we possess only the fragments of Royer-Collard’s philosophizing which were collected by Jouffroy. He is best known for his introduction into France of the philosophy of common sense of Thomas Reid. In 1768 a French translation of Reid’s Inquiry had been published at Amsterdam; but it received little attention. Royer-Collard introduced his hearers to the work and then went on to develop some ideas of his own, though the main object of his criticism was Condillac, whereas Reid had been concerned with attacking the skepticism of Hume. Reid’s reply to Hume was not very well thought out. But one of the distinctions which he made was between Locke’s simple ideas and Hume’s impressions on the one hand and perception on the other hand.”

“Royer-Collard utilizes Thomas Reid’s distinction in his attack on the sensationalism of Condillac. Descartes started the trouble by taking a self-enclosed ego as his point of departure and then trying to prove the real existence of physical objects and other persons. But Condillac completed the development of idealism by reducing everything to fleeting sensations, which are of their nature subjective. On his premises he was unable to explain our ability to judge, and ability which shows clearly the activity of the mind. Judgment is involved in perception, inasmuch as the perceiver naturally judges both that there is a permanent and causally active self and that the object of externally directed perception really exists. By sensations Royer-Collard understands feelings of pleasure and pain. These are clearly subjective experiences. But perception gives us objects existing independently of sensation. The armchair sceptic may entertain doubts about the existence of permanent self and that there are really existing physical objects. Such judgments belong to the sphere of common sense, and they constitute the basis for the further work of reason, which can develop inductive science, and which can argue to the existence of God as ultimate cause. There is no need of any supernatural authority to reveal to man the basic principles of religion and morality. Common sense and reason are… guides… rejection of the sensationalism of Condillac does not entail recourse to Traditionalism or to an authoritarian Church. There is a middle way.”

The thought of Royer-Collard has some interest as associating a middle way in philosophy with a middle way in politics. To judge however by the fragments of his philosophizing his theories stand in need of a clarification which they do not receive. For example, in his view the self and its causal activity are given immediately to consciousness or to internal perception. Thus, in the phenomenon of deliberate attention I am immediately aware of myself as a causal agent. We might expect therefore that Royer-Collard would also claim that we enjoy intuitive knowledge of the existence of perceived objects and an immediate awareness of causal relations in the world. We are told however that each sensation is a natural sign which in some mysterious way suggests not only the idea of an external existent but also the irresistible persuasion of its reality. Royer-Collard also implies that we are led irresistibly by an awareness of the self as a causal agent to fine (non-voluntary) causal activity in the external world. As critics have pointed out, Hume explicitly admitted that we have a natural and, in practice, irresistible belief in the real existence of bodies independently of our impressions or perceptions. He could therefore quite well have said that this belief was a matter of common sense. But though Hume thought that the validity of the belief could not be proved, he at any rate inquired into its genesis, whereas Royer-Collard finds such inquiries unconvincing and leaves his hearers in some doubt about precisely what he is claiming. It is indeed clear that he rejects the reduction of the self and the external world to sensations and the attempt to reconstruct them on this basis. It is also clear that he lays emphasis on the idea of perception as distinct from sensation and as a means of overcoming subjectivism. But his treatment of the way in which perception establishes the existence of the external world is ambiguous. He seems to wish to find room for an inductive inference which leads to a conclusion which is certainly, and not simply probably true. But the point is not developed.”
Victor Cousin (1792-1867): As a French philosopher, Cousin was "the founder of eclecticism, a briefly influential school of French philosophy that combined elements of German idealism and Scottish Common-Sense Realism." "When he lectured at the Sorbonne from 1828 to 1831, the hall was crowded as the hall of no philosophical teacher in Paris had been since the days of Pierre Abélard. Cousin's spiritual philosophy inspired his listeners and revived the popularity of philosophy in France. He developed a system that moved from psychology to ontology and then to the history of philosophy. Cousin sought to combine the psychological insights of Maine de Biran, the common sense of the Scottish school, and the idealism of Hegel and Schelling, arguing that each of these philosophies contains an element of truth that can be grasped by intuition. He believed that ultimately the elements of truth from each philosophical system could be combined into a perfect philosophy. In 1840, when Cousin became Minister of Public Instruction in France, he studied the educational system of Prussia and wrote a report which became the basis for a law of primary instruction and was translated and widely distributed in the United States. He reorganized and centralized the primary system in France, introduced the study of philosophy into the curriculum, and established a policy of philosophical freedom in the universities."

"Victor Cousin was born November 28, 1792, in the Quartier Saint-Antoine of Paris, the son of a watchmaker. At the age of ten, he was sent to the local grammar school, the Lycée Charlemagne, where he studied until he was eighteen. The lycée had a connection with the university, and when Cousin left the secondary school he was crowned in the ancient hall of the Sorbonne for the Latin oration which he delivered there, in the general concourse of his schoolmates. The classical training of the lycée strongly disposed him to literature. He was already known for his knowledge of Greek. From the lycée, he passed to the Normal School of Paris, where Pierre Laromiguière was then lecturing on philosophy. In...Fragments philosophiques, in which he candidly states the varied philosophical influences on his life, Cousin speaks of the grateful emotion excited by the memory of the day when he heard Laromiguière for the first time. That day decided my whole life. Laromiguière taught the philosophy of John Locke and Étienne Bonnot de Condillac, happily modified on some points, with a clearness and grace which in appearance at least removed difficulties, and with a charm of spiritual bonhomie which penetrated and subdued."

(i) Early Influences: "Cousin wanted to lecture on philosophy and quickly obtained the position of master of conferences in the school. The second great philosophical impulse of his life was the teaching of Pierre Paul Royer-Collard. This teacher, he says, 'by the severity of his logic, the gravity and weight of his words, turned me by degrees, and not without resistance, from the beaten path of Condillac into the way which has since become so easy, but which was then painful and unfrequented, of the Scottish philosophy.' In 1815-1816, Cousin attained the position of suppliant (assistant) to Royer-Collard in the history of modern philosophy chair of the faculty of letters. Another thinker who influenced him at this early period was Maine de Biran, whom Cousin regarded as the unequalled psychological observer of his time in France."

"To Laromiguière, Cousin attributes the lesson of decomposing thought, even though the reduction of it to sensation was inadequate. Royer-Collard taught him that even sensation is subject to certain internal laws and principles which it does not itself explain, which are superior to analysis and the natural patrimony of the mind. De Biran made a special study of the phenomena of the will. He taught Cousin to distinguish in all cognitions, and especially in the simplest facts of consciousness, the voluntary activity in which a personality is truly revealed. It was through this "triple discipline" that Cousin's philosophical thought was first developed. In 1815, he began the public teaching of philosophy in the Normal School and in the faculty of letters. He then took up the study of German, worked at Immanuel Kant and Friedrich Heinrich Jacobi, and sought to..."
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master the Philosophy of Nature of Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph Schelling, which at first greatly attracted him. The influence of Schelling is evident in the earlier form of Cousin’s philosophy. He sympathized with the principle of faith of Jacobi but regarded it as arbitrary so long as it was not recognized as grounded in reason. In 1817, he went to Germany, and met Georg Hegel at Heidelberg. Hegel’s Encyclopädie… appeared the same year, and Cousin had one of the earliest copies. He thought Hegel not particularly amiable, but the two became friends. The following year, Cousin went to Munich, where he met Schelling for the first time, and spent a month with him and Jacobi, obtaining a deeper insight into the Philosophy of Nature.”

(ii) Political Troubles: “During France's political troubles of 1814-1815, Cousin took the royalist side and adopted the views of the doctrinaire party, of which Royer-Collard was the philosophical leader. He seems to have gone further and approached the extreme Left. Then came a reaction against liberalism, and in 1821-1822 Cousin was deprived of his offices in the faculty of letters and in the Normal School. The Normal School was swept away, and Cousin shared the fate of Guizot, who was ejected from the chair of history. This enforced abandonment of public teaching was a mixed blessing; he set out for Germany to further his philosophical studies. While in Berlin, in 1824-1825, he was thrown into prison, either on some ill-defined political charge at the insistence of the French police, or as a result of an indiscreet conversation. Freed after six months, he remained under the suspicion of the French government for three years. This was the period during which he developed what is distinctive in his philosophical doctrine. His eclecticism, his ontology and his philosophy of history were declared in principle and in most of their salient details in the Fragments philosophiques (Paris, 1826). Even the best of his later books, the Philosophie écossaise, the Du vrai, du beau, et du bien, and the Philosophie de Locke, were simply mature revisions lectures given during the period from 1815 to 1820. The lectures on Locke were first sketched in 1819, and fully developed in the course of 1829. The publication of Fragments philosophiques marked the first expansion of Cousin’s reputation as a philosopher. The work fused together the different philosophical influences which had shaped his opinions. It was followed in 1827, by the Cours de l'histoire de la philosophie. During the seven years when he was prevented from teaching, he produced, besides the Fragments, the edition of the works of Proclus (6 vols., 1820-1827), and the works of René Descartes (2 vols., 1826). He also commenced his Translation of Plato (13 vols.)…from 1825 to 1840.”

(iii) Reinstatement at the University: “In 1828, de Vatimesnil, minister of public instruction in Martignac's ministry, recalled Cousin and Guizot to their professorial positions in the university. The three years which followed were the period of Cousin's greatest triumph as a lecturer. His return to the chair was a symbol of the triumph of constitutional ideas and was greeted with enthusiasm. The hall of the Sorbonne was crowded as the hall of no philosophical teacher in Paris had been since the days of Pierre Abélard. The lecturer's eloquence mingled with speculative exposition, and he possessed a singular power of rhetorical climax. His philosophy showed the French intellectual tendency to generalize, and logical need to group details around central principles. There was a moral elevation in Cousin's spiritual philosophy which inspired his listeners and seemed to be a stronger basis for the higher development in national literature and art, and even in politics, than the traditional philosophy of France. His lectures produced more disciples than those of any other contemporary professor of philosophy. Cousin occupies a foremost place in the rank of professors of philosophy, who like Jacobi, Schelling and Dugald Stewart united the gifts of speculative, expository and imaginative power. The popularity of philosophy, especially its history, was revived in France to an extent unknown since the seventeenth century.”
Influence: “Among those influenced by Cousin were Théodore Simon Jouffroy, Jean Philibert Damiron, Garnier, Jules Barthelemy Saint-Hilaire, Felix Ravaission-Mollien, Charles de Rémusat, Jules Simon, and Adolphe Franck. Cousin continued to lecture for two-and-a-half years after his return to the chair. Sympathizing with the revolution of July, he was at once recognized by the new government as a friend of national liberty. Writing in June 1833, he explained the eclecticism of both his philosophical and his political position: ‘I had the advantage of holding united against me for many years both the sensational and the theological school. In 1830, both schools descended into the arena of politics. The sensational school quite naturally produced the demagogic party, and the theological school became quite as naturally absolutism, safe to borrow from time to time the mask of the demagogue in order the better to reach its ends, as in philosophy it is by skepticism that it undertakes to restore theocracy. On the other hand, he who combated any exclusive principle in science was bound to reject also any exclusive principle in the state, and to defend representative government.’ The government was quick to honor him. The ministry of which his friend Guizot was head made him a member of the Council of Public Instruction and Counselor of State, and in 1832, he was made a peer of France. He ceased to lecture but retained the title of professor of philosophy. Finally, he accepted the position of Minister of Public Instruction in 1840, under Adolphe Thiers. He was director of the Normal School and virtual head of the university, and from 1840, a member of the Institute (Academy of Moral and Political Sciences). His character and his official position gave him considerable influence over the university and the educational arrangements of France. During the seventeen and a half years of the reign of Louis Philippe, it was mainly Cousin who shaped the philosophical and even the literary tendencies of the cultivated class in France.”

Impact on Primary Instruction: “The most important work accomplished by Cousin during this period was the organization of primary instruction in France. It was to his efforts that France owed her advancement in primary education between 1830 and 1848. Cousin thought that Prussia afforded the best example of an organized system of national education; and in the summer of 1831, commissioned by the government, he visited Frankfort and Saxony, and spent some time in Berlin. The result was a series of reports to the minister, afterward published as Rapport sur Vital de l'instruction publique…(Compare also De l'instruction publique en Hollande, 1837). His views were readily accepted in France, and soon after his return, he influenced the passage of a law of primary instruction (1837). In the words of the Edinburgh Review (July 1833), these documents mark an epoch in the progress of national education and are directly conducive to results important not only to France but to Europe. The Report was translated into English by Mrs. Sarah Austin in 1834, and the translation was frequently reprinted in the United States of America. The legislatures of New Jersey and Massachusetts distributed it in the schools at government expense. Cousin remarked that, among all the literary distinctions which he had received, None has touched me more than the title of foreign member of the American Institute for Education. France’s system of primary education that had been neglected under the French Revolution, the Empire, and the Restoration. In the first two years of the reign of Louis Philippe, due to the enlightened views of the ministries of François Guizot and Adolphe Thiers and Cousin’s organizational ability, more was done for the education of the people than had been accomplished in all the history of France. Cousin spoke before the Chamber of Peers, in 1844, in defense of the freedom of the study of philosophy in the university, opposing the clerical party on the one hand and the leveling or Philistine party on the other, both of which wanted to impose restrictions on what could be taught. His speeches on this occasion were published in a tract, Défense de l’université et de la philosophie (1844 and 1845).” How then did Cousin form Eclecticism in French philosophy?
Cousin’s Eclecticism: “It was Cousin’s conviction that the nineteenth century stood in need of eclecticism. It needed it in the political sphere, in the sense that monarchy, aristocracy and democracy should function as component elements in the constitution. In the philosophical sphere the time had arrived for a systematic policy of eclecticism, for a welding together of the valuable elements contained in different systems. Man himself is a composite being, and just as in man a harmonious integration of different powers and activities is a desirable goal, so in philosophy do we require an integration of different ideas, each of which is apt to be over-emphasized by one or other philosophical system. According to Cousin, reflection on the history of philosophy reveals that there are four basic types of system, which are the fundamental elements of all philosophy. In the first place, there is sensualism, the philosophy which relies exclusively on the senses. Then there is idealism, which finds reality in the realm of thought. Thirdly there is the philosophy of common sense. And in the fourth place there is mysticism, which turns its back on the senses and takes refuge in interiority. Each of these systems or types of system contains some truth, but no one of them contains the whole truth or is uniquely true. For example, the philosophy of sensation must obviously express some truth, as sensibility is a real aspect of man. It is not however the whole of man. In regard therefore to the basic kinds of system we have to be careful not to reject anyone, and not to be the dupe of any of them. We have to combine the true elements. To do so is to practice eclecticism.”

“Eclecticism is presented by Cousin as the culmination of an historical process. The philosophy of a century arises from all the elements of which this century is composed. In other words, philosophy is the product of the complex factors which compose a civilization, even though, once arisen, it takes on a life of its own and can exercise an influence. At the close of the Middle Ages, according to Cousin, the new spirit which arose first took the form of an attack on the dominant medieval power, the Church, and so of a religious revolution. A political revolution came second. The English revolution is the great event of the end of the seventeenth century. Both revolutions expressed the spirit of freedom, which was then manifested in the science and philosophy of the eighteenth century. The spirit of freedom or liberty led indeed to the excesses of the French revolution; but subsequently it was given a balanced expression in a political system combining the elements of monarchy, aristocracy and democracy, in constitutional monarchy that is to say. It follows that the philosophy required by the nineteenth century is an eclecticism which combines independence of the Church with a rejection of materialism and atheism. In fine, an eclectic spiritualism is required which transcends the philosophy of sensation of the eighteenth century but does not fall back into subservience to ecclesiastical dogma and tutelage. It would not be fair to Cousin to suggest that he is blind to the fact that this sort of interpretation of the history of development presupposes a philosophy, a definite stand in regard to criteria of truth and falsehood. He may speak on occasion as though he were an impartial observer, judging philosophy from outside; but he also admits explicitly that we cannot separate truth from error in philosophical systems without criteria which are the result of previous philosophical reflection, and that for this reason eclecticism assumes a system, starts from a system.”

“Cousin’s rejection of the sensationalism of Condillac by no means entails a rejection of the method of observation and experiment in philosophy, nor indeed of starting with psychology. In his view, Condillac’s use of observation by no means was deficient. As was seen by Laromiguere, observation gives us phenomena such as active attention which cannot be reduced to passively received impressions. And Maine de Biran threw light, by means of observation, on the active role of the self. If Condillac rightly asserted the existence and importance of human sensibility, de Biran rightly asserted the existence and importance of the human will, of voluntary activity. Observation however, Cousin insists, will take us further than this. For it reveals to us the faculty
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of reason, which is reducible neither to sensation nor to will and which sees the necessary truth of certain basic principles, such as the principle of causality, that are implicitly recognized by common sense. Psychology therefore reveals the presence of three faculties in man, namely sensibility, will and reason. And philosophical problems fall into three corresponding groups, concerned respectively with beautiful, the good and the true. To develop a philosophy of reality we have of course to go beyond the purely psychological sphere. It is the faculty of reason which enables us to do this. For with the aid of the principles of substance and causality it enables us to refer the interior phenomena of willed effort to the self or ego and passively received impressions to an external world or Nature. These two realities, the ego and the non-ego, limit one another, as Fichte held, and cannot constitute the ultimate reality. Both must be ascribed to the creative activity of God. It is thus reason which enables us to emerge from the subjective sphere and to develop an ontology in which self and the not-self are seen as related to the causal activity of God.”

“The Traditionalists emphasized the impotence of the human reason in the metaphysical and religious spheres, when working independently of revelation. The Catholic Church eventually took a stand against this attitude; and it may thus appear that it should have been gratified by Cousin’s metaphysics. But what Cousin was driving at was the middle way between Catholicism on the one hand and eighteenth-century atheism and agnosticism on the other. It is understandable therefore that his point of view was not altogether acceptable to those who believed that the bosom of the Church was the only viable and proper alternative to infidelity. Further, Cousin was accused of pantheism on the ground that the represented the world as a necessary actualization of the divine life. That is to say, he thought of God as necessarily manifesting himself in the physical world and in the sphere of finite selves. The world, in his opinion, was a necessary to God as God to the world; and he spoke of God as returning to himself in human consciousness. Cousin denied that such ways of speaking entailed pantheism; but little weight was attached to his denial by critics who were convinced of the inherently irreligious tendencies of philosophy. To be sure, he advised philosophers to steer clear of talking about religion, by which he meant primarily Catholicism. But he certainly talked about God; and to his religious critics his way of speaking seemed to be at variance with what they believed to be true religion and to confirm their suspicions of philosophy.”

“As an exponent of a middle way, of a policy of compromise, Cousin was naturally faced with criticism from two sides. His metaphysics was acceptable neither to materialists and atheists nor to the Traditionalists. His political theories satisfied neither the republicans and the socialistically minded nor the authoritarian royalists. His more academic critics have objected that the transition which he makes from psychology to ontology is unjustified. In particular, Cousin gives no clear explanation how principles of universal and necessary validity, capable of grounding an ontology and a metaphysics, can be derived from inspection of the data of consciousness. He asserted that as I the method of a philosopher, so will be his system, and that the adoption of a method decides the destiny of a philosophy. Those critics who find Cousin’s eclecticism incoherent may be inclined to agree, adding that in his case a clearly defined method was conspicuous by its absence. Though however, Cousin’s thought has been submitted to a good deal of patronizing or even contemptuous criticism, he made a considerable contribution to the development of academic philosophy in France, especially perhaps in the field of the history of philosophy. His view that there was truth in all systems naturally encouraged study of them; and he set an example by his historical writings. It is easy to write him off as a man who gave theoretical expression to the reign of Louis-Philippe. The fact remains that he left his mark on university philosophy in France.” “He left no distinctive permanent principle of philosophy, but he left very interesting psychological analyses, and offered new views of philosophical systems, especially that of Locke and the philosophers of Scotland.”174
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Summary of Cousin’s Philosophy: (a) “There are three distinctive elements in Cousin's philosophy. His philosophy is usually described as eclecticism, but it is eclectic only in a secondary and subordinate sense. The fact that his analysis of consciousness has been borne out by history indicates that his eclecticism was based on a sound system. Cousin saw the three elements of his philosophy, the method, the results, and the philosophy of history, as intimately connected and developments in a natural order of sequence. In practice, they become psychology, ontology, and eclecticism in history. Cousin strongly insisted on the importance of method in philosophy. He adopted the ordinary method of observation, analysis, and induction, which he regarded as the method of the eighteenth century: The method which Descartes began and abandoned, and which Locke and Condillac applied, though imperfectly, and which Thomas Reid and Kant used with more success. He insisted that this was the true method of philosophy as applied to consciousness, in which alone the facts of experience appear.”

(b) “The observational method applied to consciousness gives us the science of psychology, which is the basis of ontology, metaphysics, and of the philosophy of history. Cousin complemented the observation of consciousness with induction, the making of inferences about the reality necessitated by the data of consciousness, and their interpretation using certain laws found in consciousness, those of reason. What Cousin found psychologically in the individual consciousness, he also found spontaneously expressed in the common sense or universal experience of humanity. He regarded the classification and explanation of universal convictions and beliefs as the function of the philosophy of history; common-sense was simply the material on which the philosophical method worked and in harmony with which its results must ultimately be found.”

(c) “The three results of psychological observation are sensibility, activity or liberty (volition), and reason. These three are different in character but are not separated in consciousness. Sensations, or the facts of the sensibility, are necessary. The facts of reason are also necessary, and reason is no more controlled by the will than is sensibility. Voluntary facts (facts of the will) alone have the characteristics of immutability and personality. The will alone is the person or "Me." Without the "Me" at the center of the intellectual sphere, consciousness is impossible. The will is situated between two orders of phenomena, sensations and facts of reason, which do not belong to it, and which it can apprehend only by distinguishing itself from them. Further, the will apprehends by means of a light which does not come from itself, but from reason. All light comes from the reason, and it is the reason which apprehends both itself and the sensibility which envelops it, and the will which it obliges but does not constrain. Consciousness, then, is composed of these three integrated and inseparable elements, but reason is the immediate ground of knowledge and of consciousness itself.”

(d) The doctrine of the Reason. By psychological observation, one discovers that the reason of his consciousness is impersonal, universal, and necessary by nature. The essential point in psychology is the recognition of universal and necessary principles in knowledge. The number of these principles, their enumeration, and classification, is important, but first and foremost one should recognize that they are absolute, and wholly impersonal. The impersonality or absoluteness of the conditions of knowledge can be established if one recognizes causality and substance as the two primary laws of thought, from which flow all the others. In the order of nature, that of substance is the first and causality second. In the order of one's acquisition of knowledge, causality precedes substance, but both are contemporaneous in consciousness. These two principles of reason, cause and substance, explained psychologically, enable us to pass beyond the limits of the relative and subjective to objective and absolute reality; to pass from psychology, or the science of knowledge, to ontology, or the science of being. These laws are inextricably mixed in consciousness with the data of volition and sensation, and they guide one in rising to the realization
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of a personal being, a self or free cause; and an impersonal reality, a not-me, nature, the world of force, existing outside of consciousness and affecting the self.

These two forces, the me and the not-me, are reciprocally limiting. Reason apprehends these two simultaneous phenomena, attention and sensation, and leads us immediately to conceive the two sorts of distinct absolute, causes to which they are related. The notion of this limitation makes it impossible not to conceive a supreme cause, absolute and infinite, itself the first and last cause of all. This cause is self-sufficient and is sufficient for the reason. This is God; he must be conceived under the notion of cause, related to humanity and the world. He is absolute substance only in so far as he is absolute cause; his essence lies precisely in his creative power. God thus creates out of necessity. This doctrine gave rise to charges of pantheism, which Cousin countered by pointing out that he was not deifying the law of natural phenomena and that the necessity out of which God created was spontaneous and freely creative. His concept of the absolute was criticized by Schelling and by Sir W Hamilton in the Edinburgh Review of 1829.

(f) History of philosophy: “Eclecticism means the application of the psychological method to the history of philosophy. Confronting the various systems of sensualism, idealism, skepticism, and mysticism, with the facts of consciousness, resulted in the conclusion, "that each system expresses an order of phenomena and ideas, which is in truth very real, but which is not alone in consciousness, and which at the same time holds an almost exclusive place in the system; whence it follows that each system is not false but incomplete, and that in re-uniting all incomplete systems, we should have a complete philosophy, adequate to the totality of consciousness." Philosophy, thus perfected, would not be a mere aggregation of systems, but an integration of the truth in each system after the false or incomplete is discarded.”

Theodore Simon Jouffroy (1796-1842): As a French philosopher, Jouffroy was born at Les Pontets, Franche-Comté, département of Doubs. “In his tenth year, his father, a tax-gatherer, sent him to an uncle at Pontarlier, under whom he began his classical studies. At Dijon his compositions attracted the attention of an inspector, who had him placed (1814) in the normal school, Paris. There he came under the influence of Victor Cousin, and in 1817 he was appointed assistant professor of philosophy at the normal and Bourbon schools. Three years later, being thrown upon his own resources, he began a course of lectures in his own house, and formed literary connexions with Le Courrier français, Le Globe, L'Encyclopédie moderne, and La Revue européenne. The variety of his pursuits at this time carried him over the whole field of ancient and modern literature. But he was chiefly attracted to the philosophical system represented by Thomas Reid and Dugald Stewart. The application of common sense to the problem of substance supplied a more satisfactory analytic for him than the skepticism of David Hume which reached him through a study of Kant. He thus threw in his lot with the Scottish philosophy, and his first dissertations are adaptations from Reid's Inquiry. In 1826 he wrote a preface to a translation of Stewart's Moral Philosophy, demonstrating the possibility of a scientific statement of the laws of consciousness; in 1828 he began a translation of the works of Reid, and in his preface estimated the influence of Scottish criticism upon philosophy, giving a biographical account of the movement from Francis Hutcheson onwards. In the following year he was returned to parlement by the arrondissement of Pontarlier; but the work of legislation was ill-suited to him. Yet he attended to his duties conscientiously, and ultimately broke his health in their discharge. In 1833 he was appointed professor of Greek and Roman philosophy at the college of France and a member of the Academy of Sciences; he then published the Mélanges philosophiques (1835-1838), a collection of fugitive papers in criticism and philosophy and history. In them is foreshadowed all that he afterwards worked out in metaphysics, psychology, ethics and aesthetics.”

Chapter II

1. History of Philosophy


“He had already demonstrated, in his prefaces, the possibility of a psychology apart from physiology, of a science of the phenomena of consciousness distinct from the perceptions of sense. He now classified the mental faculties, premising that they must not be confounded with capacities or properties of mind. They were, according to his analysis, personal will, primitive instincts, voluntary movement, natural and artificial signs, sensibility and the faculties of intellect; on this analytic he founded his scheme of the universe. In 1835 he published Cours de droit naturel, one of his most important works. From the conception of a universal order in the universe he reasons to a Supreme Being, who has created it and who has conferred upon every man in harmony with it the aim of his existence, leading to his highest good. Good, he says, is the fulfilment of man's destiny, evil the thwarting of it. Every man being organized in a particular way has, of necessity, an aim, the fulfilment of which is good; and he has faculties for accomplishing it, directed by reason. The aim is good, however, only when reason guides it for the benefit of the majority, but that is not absolute good. When reason rises to the conception of universal order, when actions are submitted, by the exercise of a sympathy working necessarily and intuitively to the idea of the universal order, the good has been reached, the true good, good in itself, absolute good. But he does not follow his idea into the details of human duty, though he passes in review fatalism, mysticism, pantheism, skepticism, egotism, sentimentalism and rationalism. In 1835 Jouffroy's health failed and he went to Italy, where he continued to translate the Scottish philosophers. On his return he became librarian to the university and took the chair of recent philosophy at the faculty of letters. He died in Paris. After his death were published Nouveaux mélanges philosophiques (1872) and Cours d'esthetique (1875). The former contributed nothing new to the system except a more emphatic statement of the distinction between psychology and physiology. The latter formulated his theory of beauty.”

“Jouffroy shows a marked skepticism. In 1813 he realized that he had lost his Christian faith. He tended to emphasize the co-existence of philosophy and religion rather than the replacement of the latter by the former. Though however Jouffroy remained convinced that each individual had in fact a vocation, a task in life, he did not believe that anyone could know with certainty what his vocation was, nor that philosophy as it existed could provide definite answers to problems of this kind. In his opinion philosophical systems reflected the outlook, ideas, historical and social circumstances and needs of their times. Systems, in other words, express relative, not absolute truth. Like religion, they can have pragmatic value; but a final philosophical system is a remote ideal, not an actuality. Jouffroy combined this partial skepticism in regard to philosophical systems with belief in principles of common sense which are prior to explicit philosophy and express the collective wisdom of the human race. Royer-Collard and Cousin aroused in him an interest in the Scottish philosophy of common sense, an interest which bore fruit in his translation into French of Dugald Stewart’s Outlines of Moral Philosophy and of Reid’s work. Reflecting on the Scottish philosophy Jouffroy came to the conclusion that there are principles of common sense which possess a degree of truth and certainty which is not enjoyed by the philosophical theories of individuals. To be sure, these theories cannot be simply the product of individuals, if philosophies express the spirit of their times. But the principles of common sense represent something more permanent, the collective wisdom of mankind or the human race, to which appeal can be made against the one-sidedness of a philosophical system. One philosopher, for example, may expound a materialist system, while another regards spirit as the sole reality. Common sense however recognizes the existence of both matter and spirit. Presumably therefore any adequate or universally true philosophy would be basically an explication of common sense, of the wisdom of mankind, rather than of the ideas, outlook, circumstances and needs of particular society.”

His lectures on natural law largely devoted to ethical themes.
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4-4. Social Philosophy in France

Chapter III of Book V (467-520) widely discussed socialism - introduction, meaning of socialism, development of socialism, Utopian socialism (Saint-Simon, Robert Owen, Charles Fourier, Étienne Cabet), Revolutionary versus Evolutionary Socialism, Marxism, and socialist theory after Marx. However, this section briefly describes socialist philosophy in France, which includes general remarks, the utopian socialism of Fourier, of Saint-Simon, and of Proudhon, anarchism and syndicalism, and Marx on the French socialists.

As discussed, the Traditionalists were “concerned with what they regarded as the breakdown of social order exhibited in and consequent on the revolution, the revolution itself being attributed in large measure to the thought and influence of the eighteenth-century philosophers. To depict the Traditionalists as being reactionaries to such an extent as to envisage the restoration of the pre-revolutionary regime together with all the abuses which rendered change inevitable would be to do them an injustice. But they certainly believed that social reconstruction on a firm basis demanded reassertion of traditional principles of religion and of monarchic government. In this sense, they looked backwards, though a writer such as de Maistre was...a strong upholder of ultramontanism and no friend of the tradition of Gallicanism. The ideologists, regarded by Napoleon as pestilential meta-physicians, were not much given to political pronouncements. But their methods had implications in the social field. For example, they insisted on careful analysis of empirical phenomena and on education through discussion. The emperor doubtless thought that the ideologists were concerned with trivialities and useless or unprofitable inquiries; but the fact of the matter is that they were opposed to the idea of molding the youth to a pattern and to the educational system as envisaged by Napoleon, as well as to his restoration of the Catholic religion in France. The eclectics favored constitutional monarchy and a compromise policy, acceptable to the bourgeoisie. They were themselves active in political life; and they can be said to have represented a class which gained in status through the revolution and which did not desire further drastic experiments, whether imperialistic conquests or socialist programmes of change.”

“It is only to be expected however that there should have been other thinkers who were convinced that the revolution ought to be carried further, not indeed in the sense of a renewal of bloodshed but in the sense that the ideals of the revolution needed to be realized in a reformation of the structure of society. Liberty might have been achieved by the revolution; but the realization of equality and fraternity was by no means so conspicuous. These would-be social reformers who were convinced that the work of the revolution needed to be extended, were idealists, and their positive proposals have often been described as utopian, especially by Marx and his followers. In some cases, at any rate the description has an obvious foundation in fact. It the Traditionalists had their dreams, so had their opposite numbers. To admit this patent fact does not however entail the conclusion that Marxism is scientific as opposed to utopian socialism. In any case, a sharp distinction tends to conceal the fact that the ideas of the French social reformers in the first half of the nineteenth century contributed to the development of political theory on socialist lines.”

A similar schools of thought emerged in the early 20th century is ethical socialism. A key difference between utopian socialists and other socialists is that utopian socialists generally do not believe any form of class struggle or political revolution is necessary for socialism to emerge. “Utopians believe that people of all classes can voluntarily adopt their plan for society if it is presented convincingly. They feel their form of cooperative socialism can be established among like-minded people within the existing society, and that their small communities can demonstrate the feasibility of their plan for society.” Currents like Saint-Simonianism and Fourierism were attractive to later authors but failed to compete with the dominant Marxist or Leninist schools on a political level.
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Claude Henri Saint-Simon (1760-1825) was born of an impoverished aristocratic family. “His grandfather’s cousin had been the Duke de Saint-Simon, famous for his memoirs of the court of Louis XIV. Henri was fond of claiming descent from Charlemagne. After an irregular education by private tutors, he entered military service at 17. He was in the regiments sent by France to aid the American colonies in their war of independence against England and served as a captain of artillery at Yorktown in 1781. During the French Revolution he remained in France, where he bought up newly nationalized land with funds advanced by a friend. He was imprisoned in the Palais de Luxembourg during the Reign of Terror and emerged to find himself enormously rich because of the depreciation of the Revolutionary currency. He proceeded to live a life of splendor and license, entertaining prominent people from all walks of life at his glittering salons. Within several years he had brought himself close to bankruptcy. He turned to the study of science, attending courses at the École Polytechnique and entertaining distinguished scientists. In his first published work, Lettres d’un habitant de Genève à ses contemporains (1803; Letters of an Inhabitant of Geneva to His Contemporaries), Saint-Simon proposed that scientists take the place of priests in the social order. He argued that the property owners who held political power could hope to maintain themselves against the property-less only by subsidizing the advance of knowledge. By 1808 Saint-Simon was impoverished, and the last 17 years of his life were lived mainly on the generosity of friends. Among his many later publications were De la réorganisation de la société européenne (1814; On the Reorganization of European Society) and L’industrie (1816–18, in collaboration with Auguste Comte; Industry). In 1823, in a fit of despondency, Saint-Simon attempted to kill himself with a pistol but succeeded only in putting out one eye.”

“Throughout his life Saint-Simon devoted himself to a long series of projects and publications through which he sought to win support for his social ideas. As a thinker, Saint-Simon was deficient in system, clearness, and coherence, but his influence on modern thought, especially in the social sciences, is undeniable. Apart from the details of his socialist teachings, his main ideas are simple and represented a reaction against the bloodletting of the French Revolution and the militarism of Napoleon. Saint-Simon correctly foresaw the industrialization of the world, and he believed that science and technology would solve most of humanity’s problems. Accordingly, in opposition to feudalism and militarism, he advocated an arrangement whereby businessmen and other industrial leaders would control society. The spiritual direction of society would be in the hands of scientists and engineers, who would thus take the place occupied by the Roman Catholic Church in the European Middle Ages. What Saint-Simon desired, in other words, was an industrialized state directed by modern science, and one in which society would be organized for productive labor by the most capable men. The aim of society would be to produce things useful to life. Saint-Simon also proposed that the states of Europe form an association to suppress war. These ideas had a profound influence on the philosopher Auguste Comte, who worked with Saint-Simon until the two men quarreled. Although the contrast between the laboring and the propertied classes in society is not emphasized by Saint-Simon, the cause of the poor is discussed, and in his best-known work, Nouveau Christianisme (1825; The New Christianity), it takes the form of a religion. It was this development of Saint-Simon’s teaching that occasioned his final rupture with Comte. Before the publication of Nouveau Christianisme, Saint-Simon had not concerned himself with theology, but in this work, beginning with a belief in God, he tries to resolve Christianity into its essential elements, and he finally propounds this precept: that religion “should guide the community toward the great aim of improving as quickly as possible the conditions of the poorest class.” This became the watchword of the entire school of Saint-Simon. Saint-Simon died in 1825, and, in the subsequent years, his disciples carried his message to the world and made him famous. By 1826 a movement supporting his ideas had begun to grow.”
“Saint-Simon described the philosophy of the eighteenth century as critical and revolutionary, whereas the philosophy of the nineteenth century was destined to be inventive and organizational. The philosophers of the eighteenth century made an Encyclopaedia to overthrow the theological and feudal system. The philosophers of the nineteenth century should also make an Encyclopaedia to bring into being the industrial and scientific system. That is to say, the thinkers of the eighteenth century subjected the old regime and the beliefs on which it rested to destructive criticism. If, in Saint-Simon’s opinion, the last kings of France had had the good sense to ally themselves with the rising industrial class instead of with the nobility, the transition to a new system could have been affected peaceably. In point of fact however the old regime was swept away in a violent revolution. As the same time a political system cannot disappear entirely, unless a new system, capable of taking its place, is waiting, so to speak, in the wings. In the case of the French revolution the new system, destined to take the place of the old, was not ready. It is no matter for surprise therefore if after a time the monarchy was restored. The nineteenth century however was destined to be a period of new social construction and organization. And in the fulfilment of this task the nineteenth-century thinkers had an important role to play, the thinkers, that is to say, who, like Saint-Simon himself, could point out the lines which the process of constructive organization should take.”

“Though however Saint-Simon emphasized the critical and destructive aspects of the philosophy of the eighteenth-century Enlightenment, there was another aspect of it which he regarded as providing the basis for altered construction. This was its exaltation of the rational and scientific spirit. In Saint-Simon’s opinion, it was science which had undermined the authority of the Church and the credibility of theological dogmas. At the same time, it was the extension of the scientific approach from physics and astronomy to man himself which provided the basis for social reorganization. Knowledge of man is the one thing which can lead to the discovery of the ways of reconciling the interests of people. And knowledge of man can be attained only by treating man as a part of nature and by developing the idea, already prepared by certain writers of the Enlightenment and by Cabanis, of psychology as a department of physiology. Psychology however must also include study of the social organism. In other words, a new science is needed, described by Saint-Simon as social physiology. Society and politics or, more generally, man in society can then be studied no less scientifically than the movements of the heavenly bodies. In fine, the application of Newtonian science of man himself, his psychology, his moral behavior and his politics, is an indispensable basis for solving the social problems of Europe.”

“The sciences of astronomy, physics and chemistry have already been placed on a positive basis, that is to say on observation and experiment. The time has now come to place the science of man on a similar basis. This will bring about the unification of the sciences and the realization of the ideal which inspired the Encyclopaedia. It is true that a completely unified and final scientific knowledge of the world remains an ideal towards which the human mind can approximate but which it cannot fully attain, inasmuch as advance in scientific knowledge is always possible. At the same time Saint-Simon thinks in terms of the extension of the approach and method of classical physics, considered as definitive in its main lines, to the study of man. And he believes that this extension will complete the transition from the stage of human thought in which theology and metaphysics passed as knowledge to the stage of positive or scientific knowledge. Some writers have seen a discrepancy between Saint-Simon’s ideal of the unification of the sciences and his later insistence on the superior dignity of the science of man. It has been argued, that is to say, that the ideal in question implies that all sciences are on the same level, whereas to ascribe a higher dignity to the science of man is to assume that there is a qualitative difference between man and other beings and to fall back on the medieval notion that the dignity of a science depends on its subject-matter or formal object.”
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“This may be the case. But it does not seem necessary to postulate any radical change in Saint-Simon’s position. He does indeed come to hold that social physiology has a special subject-matter, namely the social organism, which is more than a collection of individuals. But he demands that society should be studied by means of the same sort of method which is employed in other sciences. And if he adds a value-judgment, this does not necessarily involve him in a radical shift of position, not at any rate if we interpret him as referring to the importance of the science of man rather than as implying that man is qualitatively different from other things to an extent which precludes scientific study of human society. This implication was obviously not intended. Saint-Simon does not of course treat society in a purely abstract manner. Social and political institutions develop and change; and Saint-Simon assume that there must be a law which governs such changes. To study human society scientifically involves therefore discovery of the law or laws of social evolution. If we take it that any such law can be discovered only inductively, by investigating and reflecting on the historical phenomena, it is obvious that a survey of the widest possible field is desirable. Or, if a preliminary statement of the law of social change is based on an inquiry into a limited field, inquiry into other fields is required in other to see whether the hypothesis is confirmed or falsified. Though however Saint-Simon does make general remarks about historical stages in the process of social evolution, what really interests him is the transition from medieval to modern civilization, apart from what he has to say about the future.”

“In his general views of the transition from theological beliefs and metaphysical speculation to the era of positive or scientific knowledge, of the need for a science of human society, and of historical changes as law-governed, Saint-Simon obviously anticipates the positivism of Auguste Comte. The latter’s disciples were inclined to belittle the former’s influence; and some even tried to make out that it was Saint-Simon who was influenced by Comte rather than the other way round. But this contention cannot be defended successfully. To be sure, both men had their precursors in the eighteenth century, writers such as Turgot and Condorcet. And during their period of collaboration Saint-Simon doubtless derived stimulus from Comte. The point is however that Saint-Simon arrived at this basic ideas well before the period of his association with Comte. And whatever some of his disciples may have said, Comte could bring himself on occasion, at any rate in correspondence, to recognize his debt to Saint-Simon. True, Comte worked out his ideas in his own way. But it is a question of deriving stimulus from Saint-Simon and being influenced by him in important respects rather than of slavish appropriation of ideas. In view of the Comte’s reputation as the founder of classical positivism it is as well to draw attention to the important role played by Saint-Simon.”

“In his account of social change Saint-Simon lays great emphasis on the basic importance of ideas. For example, the beliefs and ideas of the Middle Ages exercised a determining influence on the social and political institutions of the time, while the development of the sciences and the transition to the stage of positive knowledge demands and leads to the creation of new social and political structures. In thus emphasizing the basic role played by ideas he is linked with Comte rather than with Marx. At the same time Saint-Simon also stresses the importance of man’s economic life by what he has to say about the rise of the class of merchants and artisans. In his opinion the feudal society of the Middle Ages reached its culminating point in the eleventh century. After this time there emerged within it two factors which were the remote augurs of its dissolution. One was the introduction of scientific ideas from the Islamic world, while the other was the emergence of the communes, representing a class of production in a sense in which the Church and the feudal nobility were not producers. Within the medieval period itself neither factor became strong enough to constitute a real threat to existing authority. In the sixteenth century however, the power of the Church was weakened by the challenge of the reformers; and it allied itself with,
or subordinated itself to the monarchy instead of being, as in the Middle Ages, a rival to the temporal power. Scientific knowledge grew and threatened theological beliefs, eventually leading intellectuals at any rate to question all established authority and ideas. Further, as the French monarchs foolishly associated themselves with the nobility, once it had been reduced to a condition of submission, rather with the interests of the rising class of producers, violent revolution became in the end inevitable. The French revolution was simply the outcome of a process which had been going on for more than six centuries. It set the rising class free and rendered possible the transition to industrial society.”

“Saint-Simon looked on contemporary society as being in an intermediary phase, intermediate, that is to say, between the old regime and the establishment of a new society based on scientific knowledge and on industry. The condition for a new society were already there. It would not matter if France were to lose the monarchy, the bishops and the landowners; but it would certainly matter if it lost the only really useful class, the producer or workmen. It by no means follows however that Saint-Simon demanded the development of social democracy or concerned himself with extension of the franchise to all citizens or with their participation in government. What he does look forward to is the rule of scientists and of captains of industry. In *L’Organisation* (1819) he envisaged three chambers of experts. The first, the chamber of invention, consisting of engineers and artists, would draw up plans or projects which would then be examined by the second chamber, consisting of mathematicians, physicochemists and physiologists. The third chamber would be responsible for putting into execution projects proposed by the first chamber and examined and approved by the second. Saint-Simon called the third body the chamber of deputies. It would consist of elected representatives of agriculture and industry; but the electorate would consist only of producers. There is no need to lay a great deal of emphasis on these proposals. In his work *On the Industrial System* (1821-22) Saint-Simon more or less contented himself with demanding that finances should be put into the hands of a chamber of industry and that the Institute of France should take over the role in education which had once been played by the Church. In any case, the concrete proposals express a number of general presuppositions. For example, it is presupposed that the scientists have become the intellectual elite and that they can be trusted to make and approve plans beneficial to society. Again, it is presupposed that in contemporary society the interests which bind men together and which call for common deliberation and action are no longer theological or military but economic. Government, when understood as coercive and as associated with military adventures is on its way to being transformed into a managerial administration concerned with promoting the real interests of society.”

“Industrial society, according to Saint-Simon, would be a peaceful society, at any rate when fully developed and given the appropriate form of government or administration. What he calls the industrial class includes not only captains of industry but also the workmen. And Saint-Simon assumes that their interests coincide or harmonize with one another. Further, the industrial class in, say, France has much more in common with the parallel class in England than it has with the French nobility. The rise of the industrial class therefore provides the basis for human solidarity and for overcoming national enmities. True, governments as they actually exist represent a prolongation of the old regime, a hangover, as one might express it, from an outmoded social structure. The tradition however to a form of administration appropriate to the new industrial society and devoted to its interests will justify confidence in international peace. This goal cannot be attained by alliance between or conferences between governments which do not properly represent the interests of the productive and naturally peaceful class. A fuller development of industrial society is first required. Karl Marx showed considerable respect of Saint-Simon. But he obviously disagrees with the latter’s assumption that the real or true interests of the captain of
industry coincided with those of the workmen. From Marx’s point of view Saint-Simon, while seeing the importance of man’s economic life, had failed to understand the clash of interests between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat and the connection between bourgeois society and war. In brief, Saint-Simon was a utopian. We may indeed be inclined to think that in his own way Marx himself was a utopian, and that people living in glass houses would be well advised to refrain from throwing stones. But it can hardly be denied that Saint-Simon was over-optimistic in regard to the inherently peaceful nature of industrial society.”

“To do Saint-Simon justice however, he came to see that ignorance is not the only bar to progress, and that the spread of scientific knowledge and government by experts was not sufficient to secure realization of the ideal of human brotherhood, the ideal of fraternite. There was man’s self-seeking and egoism to reckon with. And selfishness could not be overcome without an appropriate morality or ethics. In his New Christianity (1824) Saint-Simon found this morality in the Christian ethics of love. He was not recommending a return to the Christian system of dogmas which, in his view, had been superseded by positive scientific knowledge of the world. He was however convinced that the Christian ideal of fraternal love, which had been obscured by the Church’s power-structure and by the policy of religious intolerance and persecution, possessed permanent value and relevance. The Catholic system was outmoded, while Lutheranism had emphasized an interiority divorced from political life. What was needed was the realization of the message of the Christian gospel in the social-political sphere.”

“As Saint-Simon’s insistence on ethico-religious motivation was expressed in a work which appeared in the year preceding that of his death, it has sometimes been thought that it represented a radical change in his thought and pretty well a recantation of positivism. But this view is inaccurate. Saint-Simon does not appear to have ever been a complete positivist, if we understand the term as implying rejection of all belief in God. He seems to have believed in an impersonal immanent Deity, pan-theistically conceived, and to have thought this belief quite compatible with his positivism. Further, he always regarded Christianity with respect. To be sure, he did not accept Christian dogmas. But he looked on the theological outlook of the Middle Ages not as deplorable superstition but as an historical necessity. And though the theological stage of thought had, in his opinion, been superseded by the scientific stage, he did not think of this transition as entailing abandonment of all Christian moral values. He did indeed become convinced that the new society needed a new religion, to overcome both individual and national egoism and to recreate in a new form the organic society of the Middle Ages. But the new religion was for him the old religion, in regard, that is to say, to what he considered to be the essential and permanently valuable element in the old religion…Saint-Simon envisaged a secularized Christianity. The new Christianity was Christianity as relevant to the age of the industrial society and of positive science.”

“This ideology soon inspired and influenced utopian socialism, liberal political theorist John Stuart Mill, anarchism through its founder Pierre-Joseph Proudhon who was inspired by Saint-Simon’s thought and Marxism with Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels identifying Saint-Simon as an inspiration to their ideas and identifying him among the utopian socialists. However, historian Alan Ryan regards certain followers of Saint-Simon…as being responsible for the rise of utopian socialism that based itself upon Saint-Simon’s ideas. He also regards strong differences as existing between Saint-Simon’s conceptions and Marxism’s as Saint-Simon did not promote class conflict as a solution to societal problems nor did he adhere to the narrower definition of the working class as manual laborers as defined by Marxists. Saint-Simon unlike Marx did not regard the prevalent form of ownership as being paramount issue in the economy but rather the form of management. Furthermore, Saint-Simon held no opposition to capitalists as a whole unlike Marx and he regarded them as an important component of the industrial class.”
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Charles Fourier (1772–1837) was a French philosopher and an influential early socialist thinker later associated with utopian socialism. “Fourier was born in Besançon, France on April 7, 1772. The son of a small businessman, Fourier was more interested in architecture than in his father’s trade. He wanted to become an engineer, but the local military engineering school accepted only sons of noblemen. Fourier later said he was grateful that he did not pursue engineering, because it would have consumed too much of his time and taken away from his true desire to help humanity. When his father died in 1781, Fourier received two-fifths of his father’s estate, valued at more than 200,000 francs. This inheritance enabled Fourier to travel throughout Europe at his leisure. In 1791 he moved from Besançon to Lyon, where he was employed by the merchant M. Bousquet. Fourier’s travels also brought him to Paris, where he worked as the head of the Office of Statistics for a few months. Not satisfied with making journeys on behalf of others for their commercial benefit, and desiring to seek knowledge in everything he could, Fourier would often change business firms and residences in order to explore and experience new things. From 1791 to 1816 Fourier was employed in Paris, Rouen, Lyon, Marseille, and Bordeaux. As a traveling salesman and correspondence clerk, his research and thought were time-limited: he complained of serving the knavery of merchants and the stupefaction of deceitful and degrading duties.”

Fourier’s writings include a *Theory of the Four Movements and of General Destinies* (1808), a *Theory of Universal Unity* (1822), and *The New Industrial and Social World* (1829).

“Fourier was an uncompromising and outspoken critic of established society as he knew it. More accurately, he followed Rousseau in blaming civilization for the ills of mankind. Everywhere in civilized society, according to Fourier, we can see selfishness and self-interest masquerading as service to humanity. For example, doctors thrive on the spread of ailments among their fellow citizens, and the clergy desire the deaths of their wealthier parishioners in order to receive substantial fees for performing the funeral rites. Moreover, civilized society is afflicted with hordes of parasites. Women and children, for instance, are domestic parasites, while soldiers and traders are social parasites... What he means is that in civilized society women and children lead unproductive lives... Armies are engaged in destruction, not production; and in times of peace they are parasites on society. As for traders and merchants, commerce is the natural enemy of the producer... civilized society is infected throughout with selfishness, discord and disharmony. What is the origin of the evils of civilized society? According to Fourier it is the repression of the passions, for which civilization is responsible. The world was created by a good God who implanted in man thirteen passions which must therefore be good in themselves. Among the thirteen passions implanted by God Fourier includes, for example, the five senses, social passions such as love and family feeling, distributive passions such as that for variety, and the crowning passion for harmony which unites of synthesizes the others. Civilization has repressed these passions in such a way as to render harmony impossible. What is required therefore is a reorganization of society which will secure the release of the passions and, consequently, both the development of individuals and the attainment of concord or harmony between them.”

“He argued that a natural social order exists corresponding to Newton’s ordering of the physical universe and that both evolved in eight ascending periods. In harmony, the highest stage, man’s emotions would be freely expressed. That stage could be created, he contended, by dividing society into phalanges. The phalange, in Fourier’s conception, was to be a cooperative agricultural community bearing responsibility for the social welfare of the individual, characterized by continual shifting of roles among its members. He felt that phalanges would distribute wealth more equitably than under capitalism and that they could be introduced into any political system, including a monarchy. The individual member of a phalange was to be rewarded on the basis of the total productivity of the phalange. After inheriting his mother’s estate in 1812, Fourier was
able to devote himself exclusively to writing and refined his theories in *Treatise on Domestic Agricultural Association* (1822) and *The New Industrial World* (1829–30). His emphasis on adapting society to human needs and on the wastefulness of the competitive capitalist system foreshadowed the ideas of Karl Marx. Cooperative settlements based on Fourier’s ideas were started in France and especially the U.S., among which the best known were the short-lived Brook Farm in Massachusetts (1841–46) and the North American Phalanx at Red Bank, New Jersey.  

Thus, his social organization was called the phalanx with a group of men, women and children amounting in number to between one and a half and two thousand people. The numbers of a phalanx would be persons of different temperaments, abilities and tastes. They would be grouped according to occupation or type of work; but no member would be given work for which he was unsuited or which he would find repugnant. If his tastes changed or he felt that need for other work, he could satisfy the butterfly passion. Thus, each member of a phalanx would have full opportunity to develop his talents and passions to the full; and he would understand the significance of his particular work in the general scheme. There would be competition between sub-groups; but harmony would reign. Indeed, if only one phalanx was successfully established, the evidence of harmony, happiness and prosperity of its members would inevitably stimulate imitation. Relations between different phalanxes would be loose, though there would have to be provision for groups of workers to perform special temporary tasks in different phalanxes. There would not of course be any wars. Their place would be taken by gastronomic contests or competitions.

Thus, he believed that human social regeneration would have remarkable effects not only in the animal kingdom but even among the heavenly bodies. But the oddity of some of his ideas does not alter the fact that he saw a real problem which is acute enough today, namely that of humanizing industrial society and labor and overcoming what is described as alienation. His solution obviously suffers from the defects of utopianism, such as the notion that there is only one ideal form of social organization. At the same time, it had its points. To a certain extent it was a socialist solution; but Fourier did not envisage the abolition of private property, which he believed to be necessary for the development of the human personality. What he was suggesting was an experimental cooperative society with shareholders, the shares being allotted in stated proportion to labor, capital and talent, and the highest interest going to those who held the least stock. Fourier himself never succeeded in realizing his project. But after his death a disciple called Godin founded a phalanstery in France, while another disciple, Victor Considerant, experimented on Fourierists lines in Texas. Fourier’s doctrines, trimmed of their more bizarre features, attracted a number of adherents both in France and America; but their effect was understandably limited and passing. He regarded himself as the Newton of social thought, the discoverer of the laws of social development and, in particular, of the transition from civilization to the harmonious and perfect society which would realize the divine plan. His own estimate of himself has not been accepted… Such problems as how to organize social and industrial structures in the service of man and how to harmonize individual and collective needs are obviously still with us.

On education, Fourier felt that civilized parents and teachers saw children as little idlers. Fourier felt that this way of thinking was wrong. He felt that children as early as age two and three were very industrious. He listed the dominant tastes in all children to include, but not limited to: (i) Rummaging or inclination to handle everything, examine everything, look through everything, to constantly change occupations; (ii) Industrial commotion, taste for noisy occupations; (iii) Aping or imitative mania; (iv) Industrial miniature, a taste for miniature workshops; and (v) Progressive attraction of the weak toward the strong. Fourier was deeply disturbed by the disorder of his time and wanted to stabilize the course of events which surrounded him. Fourier saw his fellow human beings living in a world full of strife, chaos, and disorder.
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Pierre-Joseph Proudhon (1809-1865): Proudhon was a French politician and the founder of mutualist philosophy. “He was the first person to declare himself an anarchist and is widely regarded as one of the ideology's most influential theorists. Proudhon is even considered by many to be the father of anarchism. He became a member of the French Parliament after the revolution of 1848, whereafter he referred to himself as a federalist.” Anarchism was discussed in Chapter III of Book V (541-560) including Proudhon. “Anarchism is a political philosophy that advocates self-governed societies based on voluntary institutions. These are often described as stateless societies, although several authors have defined them more specifically as institutions based on non-hierarchical free associations. Anarchism holds the state to be undesirable, unnecessary, and harmful. While antistatism is central, anarchism entails opposing authority or hierarchical organization in the conduct of all human relations, including, but not limited to, the state system. Anarchism does not offer a fixed body of doctrine from a single particular world view, instead fluxing and flowing as a philosophy. Many types and traditions of anarchism exist, not all of which are mutually exclusive…Anarchism is usually considered a radical left-wing ideology, and much of anarchist economics and anarchist legal philosophy reflects anti-authoritarian interpretations of communism, collectivism, syndicalism, mutualism, or participatory economics.”

“Anarchist ideas have sometimes been traced back to Taoist or Buddhist ideas, to the Stoics and Cynics of Ancient Greece, or to the Diggers of English Civil War. However, the first, and in a sense classic, statement of anarchist principles was produced by William Godwin (1756-1836) in his *Enquiry Concerning Political Justice* (1793), although Godwin never described himself as an anarchist. During the nineteenth century, anarchism was a significant component of a broad but growing socialist movement.” In 1840, Pierre-Joseph Proudhon (1809-65) declared that ‘I am an anarchist’ in his *What is Property?*. In 1864, his followers joined Marx’s First International, which collapsed in 1871 because of growing antagonism between Marxists and anarchists led by Michael Bakunin (1814-76). “In the late nineteenth century, anarchists sought mass support amongst the landless peasants of Russia and southern Europe and, more successfully, through anarcho-syndicalism, amongst the industrial working class.”

“Syndicalism was a form of revolutionary trade unionism, popular in France, Italy and Spain, which made anarchism a genuine mass movement in the early twentieth century. The powerful CGT union in France was dominated by anarchists before 1914, as was the CNT in Spain, which claimed a membership of over two million during the Civil War. Anarcho-syndicalist movement also emerged in Latin America in the early twentieth century, especially in Argentina and Uruguay, and syndicalist ideas influenced the Mexican Revolution, led by Emiliano Zapata. However, the spread of authoritarianism and political repression gradually undermined anarchism in both Europe and Latin America. The victory of General Franco in the Spanish Civil War (1936-39) brought an end to anarchism as a mass movement…The influence of anarchism was also undermined by the success of Lenin and the Bolsheviks in 1917.”

Table III-4. Anarchism: Theories, Theorists, and Key Activists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theories</th>
<th>Central Themes</th>
<th>Anti-statism, Natural order, Anti-clericalism, Economic freedom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collective Anarchism</td>
<td>Mutualism, Anarcho-Syndicalism, Anarcho-Communism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Anarchism</td>
<td>Egoism, Liberalism, Anarcho-Capitalism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Pacifists</td>
<td>William Godwin, Pierre Proudhon, Leo Tolstoy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revolutionaries</td>
<td>Mikhail Bakunin, Peter Kropotkin, Emma Goldman, Nihilists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualist Anarchists</td>
<td>Max Stirer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Militant Civ. Militias</td>
<td>Radical anti-governmental and conspiratorial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Above is summarized from Chapter III of Book V (page 547-566)
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“Proudhon was born into poverty as the son of a feckless cooper and tavern keeper, and at the age of nine he worked as a cowherd in the Jura Mountains. Proudhon’s country childhood and peasant ancestry influenced his ideas to the end of his life, and his vision of the ideal society almost to the end remained that of a world in which peasant farmers and small craftsmen like his father could live in freedom, peace, and dignified poverty, for luxury repelled him, and he never sought it for himself or others. Proudhon at an early age showed the signs of intellectual brilliance, and he won a scholarship to the college at Besançon. Despite the humiliation of being a child in sabots (wooden shoes) among the sons of merchants, he developed a taste for learning and retained it even when his family’s financial disasters forced him to become an apprentice printer and later a compositor. While he learned his craft, he taught himself Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, and in the printing shop he not only conversed with various local liberals and Socialists but also met and fell under the influence of a fellow citizen of Besançon, the utopian Socialist Charles Fourier.

With other young printers, Proudhon later attempted to establish his own press, but bad management destroyed the venture, and it may well have been compounded by his own growing interest in writing, which led him to develop a French prose difficult to translate but admired by writers as varied as Flaubert, Sainte-Beuve, and Baudelaire. Eventually, in 1838, a scholarship awarded by the Besançon Academy enabled him to study in Paris. Now, with leisure to formulate his ideas, he wrote his first significant book, Qu’est-ce que la propriété? (1840; What Is Property?, 1876). This created a sensation, for Proudhon not only declared, ‘I am an anarchist’; he also stated, ‘Property is theft!’ This slogan, which gained much notoriety, was an example of Proudhon’s inclination to attract attention and mask the true nature of his thought by inventing striking phrases. He did not attack property in the generally accepted sense but only the kind of property by which one man exploits the labor of another. Property in another sense - in the right of the farmer to possess the land he works and the craftsman his workshop and tools - he regarded as essential for the preservation of liberty, and his principal criticism of Communism, whether of the utopian or the Marxist variety, was that it destroyed freedom by taking away from the individual control over his means of production.”

“In the somewhat reactionary atmosphere of the July monarchy in the 1840s, Proudhon narrowly missed prosecution for his statements in What Is Property?; and he was brought into court when, in 1842, he published a more inflammatory sequel, Advertisement aux propriétaires (Warning to Proprietors, 1876). In this first of his trials, Proudhon escaped conviction because the jury conscientiously found that they could not clearly understand his arguments and therefore could not condemn them. In 1843 he went to Lyon to work as managing clerk in a water transport firm. There he encountered a weavers’ secret society, the Mutualists, who had evolved a proto-anarchist doctrine that taught that the factories of the dawning industrial age could be operated by associations of workers and that these workers, by economic action rather than by violent revolution, could transform society. Such views were at variance with the Jacobin revolutionary tradition in France, with its stress on political centralism. Nevertheless, Proudhon accepted their views and later paid tribute to his Lyonnais working-class mentors by adopting the name of Mutualism for his own form of anarchism.”

“As well as encountering the obscure working-class theoreticians of Lyon, Proudhon also met the feminist Socialist Flora Tristan and, on his visits to Paris, made the acquaintance of Karl Marx, Mikhail Bakunin, and the Russian Socialist and writer Aleksandr Herzen. In 1846 he took issue with Marx over the organization of the Socialist movement, objecting to Marx’s authoritarian and centralist ideas. Shortly afterward, when Proudhon published his Système des contradictions économiques, ou Philosophie de la misère (1846; System of Economic Contradictions: or, The Philosophy of Poverty, 1888), Marx attacked him bitterly in a book-length polemic La misère de
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It was the beginning of a historic rift between libertarian and authoritarian Socialists and between anarchists and Marxists which, after Proudhon’s death, was to rend Socialism’s First International apart in the feud between Marx and Proudhon’s disciple Bakunin and which has lasted to this day.”

“Early in 1848 Proudhon abandoned his post in Lyon and went to Paris, where in February he started the paper Le Représentant du peuple. During the revolutionary year of 1848 and the first months of 1849 he edited a total of four papers; the earliest were more or less regular anarchist periodicals and all of them were destroyed in turn by government censorship. Proudhon himself took a minor part in the Revolution of 1848, which he regarded as devoid of any sound theoretical basis. Though he was elected to the Constituent Assembly of the Second Republic in June 1848, he confined himself mainly to criticizing the authoritarian tendencies that were emerging in the revolution and that led up to the dictatorship of Napoleon III. Proudhon also attempted unsuccessfully to establish a People’s Bank based on mutual credit and labor checks, which paid the worker according to the time expended on his product. He was eventually imprisoned in 1849 for criticizing Louis-Napoleon, who had become president of the republic prior to declaring himself Emperor Napoleon III, and Proudhon was not released until 1852.”

His conditions of imprisonment were - by 20th-century standards - light. His friends could visit him, and he was allowed to go out occasionally in Paris. He married and begat his first child while he was imprisoned. From his cell he also edited the last issues of his last paper (with the financial assistance of Herzen) and wrote two of his most important books, the never translated Confessions d’un révolutionnaire (1849) and Idée générale de la révolution au XIXe siècle (1851; The General Idea of the Revolution in the Nineteenth Century, 1923). The latter - in its portrait of a federal world society with frontiers abolished, national states eliminated, and authority decentralized among communes or locality associations, and with free contracts replacing laws - presents perhaps more completely than any other of Proudhon’s works the vision of his ideal society. After Proudhon’s release from prison in 1852 he was constantly harassed by the imperial police; he found it impossible to publish his writings and supported himself by preparing anonymous guides for investors and other similar hack works. When, in 1858, he persuaded a publisher to bring out his three-volume masterpiece De la justice dans la Révolution et dans l’église, in which he opposed a humanist theory of justice to the church’s transcendental assumptions, his book was seized. Having fled to Belgium, he was sentenced in absentia to further imprisonment. He remained in exile until 1862, developing his criticisms of nationalism and his ideas of world federation (embodied in Du Principe fédératif, 1863).”

“On his return to Paris, Proudhon began to gain influence among the workers; Paris craftsmen who had adopted his Mutualist ideas were among the founders of the First International just before his death in 1865. His last work, completed on his death bed, De la capacité politique des classes ouvrières (1865), developed the theory that the liberation of the workers must be their own task, through economic action. Proudhon was not the first to enunciate the doctrine that is now called anarchism; before he claimed it, it had already been sketched out by, among others, the English philosopher William Godwin in prose and his follower Percy Bysshe Shelley in verse. There is no evidence, however, that Proudhon ever studied the works of either Godwin or Shelley, and his characteristic doctrines of anarchism (society without government), Mutualism (workers’ association for the purpose of credit banking), and federalism (the denial of centralized political organization) seem to have resulted from an original reinterpretation of French revolutionary thought modified by personal experience…Proudhon remained the most important single influence on French working-class radicalism, while…his ideas of decentralization and his criticisms of government had revived in the later 20th century.”
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The French revolution asserted the ideals of liberty, equality, and fraternity; but on the positive side it was incomplete, a partial failure. It produced a measure of political liberty and equality, but it failed to produce liberty and equality in the economic sphere. “Property (or possession, duly distributed, safeguards independence and equality. But human society obviously cannot exist without some form or forms of organization. Such organization may be imposed from above, by the authority of State as represented by the government. But what Proudhon envisages is a transition from political to economic organization, when the economic organization or forms of association are not dictated from above but are produced by agreements or contracts freely made by producers. This is what he calls anarchy. The centralized government State will, he hopes, wither away, its place being taken by a social order arising out of associations freely entered into for economic reasons, such as the demands of production, the needs of consumption and the security of the producers. The notion of anarchy in politics is just as rational and positive as any other. It means that once industrial functions have taken over from political functions, then business transactions and exchange alone produce the social order. Writing towards the end of his life Proudhon remarks that he has always had a particular horror of regimentation. In his opinion, freedom can flourish only when associations and federations of associations are based on free contracts, contract being the dominant idea in politics. As he puts it, commutative justice or rule by contract must take the place of the old systems of distributive justice, associated with the rule of law and a centralized government regime. In so far as Proudhon envisages the existence and self-maintenance of a coherent and stable industrial society in the form of a loosely knit system of producers’ associations, with contracts instead of laws and industrial companies instead of armies, he cannot unfairly be described as a Utopian. For he sees all citizens as cooperating harmoniously, inasmuch as private and collective interests will be identical.”

Proudhon professed the Labor Theory of Value (the value of any object is determined by the amount of labor needed to produce it), meaning that all unearned property (rent, interest, profits) was stolen from the workers who produced it. “Proudhon, the first person to call himself an anarchist, demanded the elimination of government and other institutions, which he claimed unduly denied the people earned property and human rights so that the governing class might flourish. Denouncing the established order, he advocated restructuring society into voluntary associations of workers. These institutions, syndicates they were called, would dispense the necessary services usually provided by government. Thus, anarcho-syndicalism was born; it remains to this day a potent influence in the labor movement of France as well as many other countries. Indeed, the industrial unions – the United Mine Workers, the United Auto Workers, and many others – in this country are organized on a syndical (industry-wide) basis as opposed to the skilled-crafts, or guild, model. Syndicalism, Proudhon believed, should be voluntary and should be created at the expense of the state. It should liberate the worker from the twin masters of capitalism and government. Frustrated by the growing complexity of modern bureaucracy and decrying the lack of morality in state policy, Proudhon condemned authority as corrupt and decadent. Traditional political authority, he claimed, exists solely to maintain order in society, by consecrating and sanctifying obedience of the citizen to the state, subordination of the poor to the rich, of the common people to the upper class, of the worker to the idler, of the laymen to the priest. Since he thought the state exploitative and without moral justification, Proudhon would see it eliminated and replaced with an institution that more accurately reflected the economic and political rights of the people. Still, however, Proudhon did not call for violent overthrow of the state. Indeed, he would have the workers take it upon themselves to ignore traditional authority and organize the syndicates. Thus, denied the support of the productive elements in society, the state would collapse, leaving only the voluntary associations of workers or syndicates.”
Marx on the French Socialists: Among three socialist writers – Saint-Simon, Fourier, and Proudhon – Saint-Simon gives the most coherent and developed general view of the pattern of historical and social change. And we naturally think of him as a predecessor of Auguste Comte and Karl Marx. Marx and Engels describe the early French socialists as utopians... When Marx and Engels described the French socialists as utopians, what they had primarily in mind was the French writers’ failure to understand the nature of the class-antagonism and the irreconcilable nature of class-interests. Though early socialists certainly believed that the ideals which had found expression in the French revolution had only been partially and very imperfectly realized and that a further transformation of society was required, they tended to think that this transformation could be brought about in a peaceful manner, by men coming to understand the problems and needs of society and the appropriate way of solving the problem and meeting the needs. Marx and Engels however were convinced that the desired transformation of society could be achieved only by revolution, by, that is to say, a class-war in which the proletariat, led by the enlightened, would seize power. In their view it was simply an expression of utopianism if anyone thought that the interests of the ruling class or classes and those of the exploited could be peacefully reconciled through a spread of knowledge or understanding. For the interest of the dominant class was precisely the preservation of the actual state of affairs, whereas it was in the interest of the exploited class that the actual state of affairs should be radically changed.

“For the proletarian revolution envisaged by Marx and Engels to take place, it was a pre-requisite that there should be men who understood the movement of history and who could turn the exploited class into a self-conscious united whole, a class not only in itself but also for itself. They thus had a considerable respect for Saint-Simon, not only because he conceived of history as law-governed (Fourier had this concept) but also because in his case there was a much closer connection than in the case of Fourier between his theory of history and his idea of the desirable transformation of society. Moreover, Saint-Simon, with his notion of social physiology, could be said to have expounded a materialist interpretation of man. At the same time, if we bear in mind the role contributed by Saint-Simon to captains of industry in the transformation of society, it is clear that he too would be guilty of utopianism in the eyes of Marx and Engels. For thought captains of industry might agree to changes within the existing social framework, it would not be in their interest to contribute to the radical transformation which was required.”

“In view of the great historical importance of Marxism, it is natural enough to think of the early French socialists in terms of their relations to Marx and Engels. But though this approach is easily understandable, it is a rather one-sided approach if we insist on looking at them simply as predecessors of Marx. In any case they realized clearly enough that while the revolution had destroyed the old regime, it had failed to bring peace and harmony between individuals, groups and nations... Obviously, if we assume with Saint-Simon that the course of history is governed by laws...there arises the problem of harmonizing this view of history with the emphasis on the role of human initiative and action...Saint-Simon saw the need for economic planning; but he envisaged the transformation of government into managerial administration and in this sense can he said to have anticipated the doctrine of the withering away of the State. As for Fourier and Proudhon, it is clear that they both mistrusted and disliked the increasing power of the State, the centralized political authority. And it is ironic that it should be such a conspicuous feature of Soviet communism. In spite however of the rather fantastic ideas of Fourier and Proudhon, we can see in the French socialist a respect for the individual and a marked dislike of violence. Marx of course thought that they were over-optimistic in their conviction that radical changes could be brought about without revolutionary violence.”
4-5. Auguste Comte: Positivism

Auguste Comte (1798–1857) was a French philosopher, “who founded the discipline of sociology, coining the term, and the doctrine of positivism. He is sometimes regarded as the first philosopher of science in the modern sense of the term. Influenced by the utopian socialist Henri Saint-Simon, Comte developed the positive philosophy in an attempt to remedy the social malaise of the French Revolution, calling for a new social doctrine based on the sciences. Comte was a major influence on 19th-century thought, influencing the work of social thinkers such as Karl Marx, John Stuart Mill, and George Eliot. His concept of sociologie and social evolutionism set the tone for early social theorists and anthropologists such as Harriet Martineau and Herbert Spencer, evolving into modern academic sociology presented by Émile Durkheim as practical and objective social research. Comte’s social theories culminated in his Religion of Humanity (1851-54, four volumes) which presaged the development of religious humanist and secular humanist organizations in the 19th century. Comte may have coined the word altruisme (altruism).”

**Biography:** “Comte was born in Montpellier on January 20, 1798. Having displayed his brilliance in school, he was ranked fourth on the admissions list of the École Polytechnique in Paris in 1814. Two years later, the Bourbons closed that institution, and its students were dismissed. In August 1817, Auguste Comte met Henri de Saint-Simon, who appointed him as his secretary to replace Augustin Thierry. The young Comte was thus initiated into politics and was able to publish a great number of articles, which placed him very much in the public eye. (The most important of these articles were republished by him in 1854 and remain the best introduction to his oeuvre as a whole.) In April 1824, he broke with Saint-Simon. Shortly afterward, in a civil wedding, he married Caroline Massin, who had been living with him for several months. In April 1826, Comte began teaching a Course of Positive Philosophy, whose audience included some of the most famous scientists of the time. It was suddenly interrupted because of a ‘cerebral crisis’ due to overwork and conjugal sorrows. Comte was then hospitalized in the clinic of Dr. Esquirol. Upon leaving, he was classified as ‘not cured’. He recovered gradually.”

“The resumption of the Course of Positive Philosophy in January 1829, marks the beginning of a second period in Comte’s life that lasted 13 years and included the publication of the six volumes of the Course (1830, 1835, 1838, 1839, 1841, 1842). In addition, during this period, more and more of his ties with the academic world were severed. After being named tutor in analysis and mechanics at the École Polytechnique in 1832, in 1833 he sought to create a chair in general history of science at the Collège de France, but to no avail. Two unsuccessful candidacies for the rank of professor at the École Polytechnique led him in 1842 to publish a ‘personal preface’ to the last volume of the Course, which put him at odds with the university world forever. The two years that followed mark a period of transition. In quick succession, Comte published an Elementary Treatise on Analytic Geometry (1843), his only mathematical work, and the Philosophical Treatise on Popular Astronomy (1844), the fruit of a yearly course, begun in 1830, for Parisian workers. The Discourse on the Positive Spirit, also from 1844, which he used as the preface to the treatise on astronomy, marked a sharp change of direction by its emphasis on the moral dimension of the new philosophy: now that the sciences had been systematized, Comte was able to return to his initial interest, political philosophy. Public recognition of the positivist Comte, as opposed to the saint-simonian, twenty years earlier, came with Émile Littré’s articles in Le National.”
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“The year 1844 also marked his first encounter with Clotilde de Vaux. What followed was the ‘year like none other’ that launched what Comte himself called his ‘second career’. The main theme of the second career was the ‘continuous dominance of the heart’. An abundant correspondence testifies to Comte's passion, who, in spite of a heavy teaching load, found the time to start working on the System of Positive Polity, which he had announced at the end of the Course. After Clotilde’s death, in April 1846, Comte began to idolize her, to such an extent that it became a true cult. A few months later, his correspondence with Mill, begun in December 1841, came to an end. The next year, Comte chose the evolution of Humanity as the new topic for his public course; this was an occasion to lay down the premises of what would become the new Religion of Humanity. He was an enthusiastic supporter of the revolution of 1848: he founded the Positivist Society, modelled after the Club of the Jacobins, and published the General View of Positivism, conceived of as an introduction to the System to come, as well as the Positivist Calendar. In 1849, he founded the Religion of Humanity. The years 1851–1854 were dominated by the publication of the four-volume System of Positive Polity, which was interrupted for a few months in order for him to write the Catechism of Positive Religion (1852). Relieved of all his duties at the École Polytechnique, Comte now lived off of the ‘voluntary subsidy’ begun by the followers of his in England and now also granted to him from various countries. In December 1851, Comte applauded the coup d'état by Napoleon III, who put an end to the parliamentary ‘anarchy’. Littré refused to follow Comte on this point, as on the question of religion, and broke with him shortly after. Soon disappointed by the Second Empire, Comte shifted his hopes to Czar Nicholas I, to whom he wrote. In 1853, Harriet Martineau published a condensed English translation of the Course of Positive Philosophy.

“Disappointed by the unenthusiastic response his work got from the workers, Comte launched an Appeal to Conservatives in 1855. The next year, he published the first volume of a work on the philosophy of mathematics announced in 1842, under the new title of Subjective Synthesis, or Universal System of the Conceptions Adapted to the Normal State of Humanity. Increasingly occupied by his function as High Priest of Humanity, he sent an emissary to the Jesuits in Rome proposing an alliance with the ‘Ignacians’. Comte died on September 5, 1857, without having had time to draft the texts announced up to 35 years before: a Treatise of Universal Education, which he thought he could publish in 1858, a System of Positive Industry, or Treatise on the Total Action of Humanity on the Planet, planned for 1861, and, finally, for 1867, a Treatise of First Philosophy. He is buried in the Père-Lachaise cemetery.”

The Collaboration with Saint-Simon and the Early Writings: His formative years were dominated by his relationship with Saint-Simon. Comte took over three ideas from the complex thought of Saint-Simon: “(1) The contrast between organic and critical periods in history, of which the Revolution had just provided an example. (2) The idea of industrial society. In 1817, under the influence, notably, of B. Constant and J.-B. Say, Saint-Simon had turned himself into an apostle of industry. As an attentive observer of the industrial revolution that was going on before his eyes, he understood that it would completely change all existing social relations. Heretofore, we had lived in military societies: man acted on man, and power belonged to the warrior class. Henceforth, trade would replace war, and man would mainly concern himself with acting on nature. Comte drew the quite mistaken conclusion that the era of wars was over. (3) The idea of spiritual power. This is Comte's most obvious debt to Saint-Simon. The theme was present from the first work by Saint-Simon (Letters from an Inhabitant, 1803) to the last (The New Christianity, 1825). It resulted from an observation and a conviction. Saint-Simon observed the role of science in modern society: he suggested, for example, that public funds be made available to finance scientific research. He was also convinced of the religious nature of social cohesion and, therefore, of the need for a
priestly class in charge of maintaining it. This belief led him to the idea of a science of social organization, linking these two components: religion would become an application of science, permitting enlightened men to govern the ignorant. So, instead of trying to destroy every form of religious life, one should entrust to the learned the spiritual power left weakened by the decline of traditional religions. It is also within this framework that the text he wrote in 1814 on the reorganization of European society has to be understood: handling international relations are one of the main attributes of spiritual power, as shown by the medieval papacy.”

“Comte quickly assimilated what Saint-Simon had to offer him. But Comte aspired to free himself of a tutelage that weighed ever heavier on him, as he found the unmethodical and fickle mind of the self-taught, philanthropic aristocrat barely tolerable. The break occurred in 1824, occasioned by a shorter work of Comte that would prove to be fundamental. Aware of already possessing the main ideas of his own philosophy, Comte accused his teacher of trying to appropriate his work and furthermore, he pointed out that he had not contented himself with giving a systematic form to borrowed concepts. The *Philosophical Considerations on the Sciences and the Scientists* (1825) contains the first and classical formulations of the two cornerstones of positivism: the law of the three stages, and the classification of the sciences. The *Considerations on Spiritual Power* that followed some months later presents dogmatism as the normal state of the human mind. It is not difficult to find behind that statement, which may seem outrageous to us, the anti-Cartesianism that Comte shares with Peirce and that brings their philosophies closer to one another. As the mind spontaneously stays with what seems true to it, the irritation of doubt ceases when belief is fixed: what is in need of justification, one might say, is not the belief but the doubt. Thus, the concept of positive faith is brought out, that is to say, the necessity of a social theory of belief and its correlate, the logical theory of authority.”

“In the year 1826 two major events take place. First, Comte’s program was reshaped. The first System of 1822 was unfinished, and writing the remaining part was one of Comte’s priorities. But in 1826 he postponed that project for an indeterminate period. To provide a more solid base for the social science and its resulting positive polity, he decided first to go through the whole of positive knowledge again and to begin a course on positive philosophy. It should be kept in mind that the *Course* does not belong to Comte’s initial program and that it originally was meant as a parenthesis, or prelude, that was supposed to take a few years at most. The second major event of 1826, the famous ‘cerebral crisis’ which occurred immediately after the opening lecture of the course forced Comte to stop his public lessons; but it also had longstanding effects. Thus, it is customary to say that Comte received public acknowledgement only belatedly: in 1842, with the first letter from Mill, and in 1844, with the articles of Littré in *Le National*. But that amounts to forgetting that in 1826 Comte was a well-known personality in the intellectual circles of Paris. Guizot and Lamennais held him in high esteem. The *Course*’s attendance list included prestigious names such as A. von Humboldt, Arago, Broussais or Fourier. Mill, who had visited Saint-Simon in 1820–21, was deeply impressed by the first *System*, which one of Comte’s pupils had introduced him to in 1829. Finally, even though Comte had broken with Saint-Simon, the general public saw him as one of the master’s most authoritative spokesmen. This earned him the somewhat peculiar animosity of the Saint-Simonians: they, with few exceptions, had the distinctive characteristic of never having personally known the one they called ‘the father’, whereas Comte had been on intimate terms with him. However, the cerebral crisis made Comte unable to take advantage of the high regard he enjoyed: he disappeared from the public scene until 1844.”
The Course of Positive Philosophy (1830-1842): “Comte was agitated by the fact that no one had synthesized physics, chemistry, and biology into a coherent system of ideas, so he began an attempt to reasonably deduce facts about the social world from the use of the sciences. Through his studies, he concluded that the growth of the human mind progresses in stages, and so must societies. He claimed the history of society could be divided into three different stages: theological, metaphysical, and positive. The Law of three Stages, an evolutionary theory, describes how history of societies is split into three sections due to new thoughts on philosophy. Comte believed that evolution was the growth of the human mind, splitting into stages and evolving through these stages. Comte concluded that society acts similarly to the mind… The Law of Three Stages is the evolution of society in which the stages have already occurred or are currently developing. The reason why there are newly developed stages after a certain time period is that the system has lost its power and is preventing the progression of civilization, causing complicated situations in society. The only way to escape the situation is for people within the civilized nations to turn towards an organic new social system. Comte refers to kings to show the complications of re-establishment on society. Kings feel the need to reorganize their kingdom, but many fail to succeed because they do not consider that the progress of civilization needs reform, not perceiving that there is nothing more perfect than inserting a new, more harmonious system. Kings fail to see the effectiveness of abandoning old systems because they do not understand the nature of the present crisis. But in order to progress, there needs to be the necessary consequences that come with it, which is caused by a series of modifications, independent of the human will, to which all classes of society contributed, and of which kings themselves have often been the first agents and most eager promoters.”215 His Law of Three Stages is as follows:

(a) **Theological Stage**: “The first stage, the theological stage, relies on supernatural or religious explanations of the phenomena of human behavior because the human mind, in its search for the primary and final causes of phenomena, explains the apparent anomalies in the universe as interventions of supernatural agents. The Theological Stage is the necessary starting point of human intelligence, when humans turn to supernatural agents as the cause of all phenomena. In this stage, humans focus on discovering absolute knowledge. Comte disapproved this stage because it turned to simple explanation humans created in their minds that all phenomena was caused by supernatural agents, rather than human reason and experience. Comte refers to Bacon’s philosophy that “there can be no real knowledge except that which rests upon observed facts”, but he observes that the primitive mind could not have thought that way because it would have only created a vicious circle between observations and theories. For if, on the one hand, every positive theory must necessarily be founded upon observations, it is, on the other hand, no less true that, in order to observe, our mind has need of some theory or other. Because the human mind could not have thought in that way in the origin of human knowledge, Comte claims that humans would have been “incapable of remembering facts” and would not have escaped the circle if it were not for theological conceptions, which were less complicated explanations to human life…he explains that theology was necessary in the beginning of the developing primitive mind.”

(b) **Metaphysical or Abstract Stage**: “The second stage, the metaphysical stage, is merely a modification of the first because a supernatural cause is replaced by an abstract entity; it is meant to be a transitional stage, where there is the belief that abstract forces control the behavior of human beings. Because it is a transitional stage between the theological stage and the positive stage, Comte deemed it the least important of the three stages and was only necessary because the human mind cannot make the jump from the theological to the positive stage on its own. The metaphysical stage is the transitional stage. Because ‘Theology and physics are so profoundly incompatible’, and their ‘conceptions are so radically opposed in character, human intelligence
must have a gradual transition. Other than this, Comte says that there is no other use for this stage. Although it is the least important stage, it is necessary because humans could not handle the significant change in thought from theological to positivity. The metaphysical stage is just a slight modification of the previous stage, when people believed in the abstract forces rather than the supernatural. The mind begins to notice the facts themselves, caused by the emptiness of the metaphysical agents through over subtle qualification that all right-minded persons considered them to be only the abstract names of the phenomena in question. The mind becomes familiar with concepts, wanting to seek more, and therefore is prepared to move into the positive stage.\(^{216}\)

(c) The Positive Stage is when the mind stops searching for the cause of phenomena and realizes that laws exist to govern human behavior, and that this stage can be explained rationally with the use of reason and observation, both of which are used to study the social world. This stage relies on science, rational thought, and empirical laws. Comte believed that this study of sociology he created was the science that came after all the others; and as the final science, it must assume the task of coordinating the development of the whole of knowledge because it organized all of human behavior. The final, most evolved stage is the positivist stage, the stage when humans give up on discovering absolute truth, and turn towards discovering, through reasoning and observation, actual laws of phenomena. Humans realize that laws exist, and that the world can be rationally explained through science, rational thought, laws, and observation. Comte was a positivist, believing in the natural rather than the supernatural, and so he claimed that his time period, the 1800s, was in the positivist stage.\(^{217}\) In Comte’s classification of science, we can note two points: The first relates to religious belief. “The spread of atheism is a feature of the mind’s advance into maturity, not the result of a philosophical proof of God’s non-existence.” “The second point relates to the way in which Comte correlates three main types of social organization with the three main stages of man’s intellectual development. He is perfectly ready to admit that man’s intellectual advance can outstrip his social progress, and that the positivist spirit, for example, can make its appearance before the corresponding form of social organization has developed.”\(^{218}\) In his Course, Comte discovers six basic sciences: mathematics, astronomy, physics, chemistry, physiology and biology, and social physics or sociology; but psychology does not appear in the list. Later Comte found room for ethics as an additional science.

The basic affirmations of positivism are that all knowledge regarding matters of fact is based on the positive data of experience and that beyond the realm of fact is that of pure logic and pure mathematics. However, the positivists became noted for their repudiation of metaphysics. In its basic posture, positivism is thus “worldly, secular, anti-theological, and anti-metaphysical.”\(^{219}\) According to Comte, “the fundamental characteristic of the positive philosophy is to regard all phenomena as subject to invariable natural laws. The phrase of all phenomena includes of course human phenomena. Comte does not claim that the coordination of human phenomena by the formulation of laws has reached the same degree of development in sociology which it has reached in some other sciences. Nonetheless, he maintains that the philosopher should regard human phenomena as capable of being subsumed under laws. This means in effect that the successive forms of social-political organization must be correlated with the successive stages of man’s intellectual development…In a positive stage society is organized with a view to production, and it is by nature a peaceful society, aiming at the common good. In fine, the three successive modes of human activity, conquest, defense and labor, correspond exactly with the three states of intelligence, fiction, abstraction and demonstration. From this basic correlation there results at once the general explanation of the three natural ages of humanity.”\(^{220}\) Comte’s firm conviction is that society should be organized by those who possessed real know knowledge, but the formulation of law in sociology is more complex than physical laws to make any predictions.
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(d) Comte and Mill: “The Course's first readers are to be found in Great Britain; the reform projects of the English Radicals had many points in common with the positivist concerns. A reading of the first volumes made enough of an impression on Mill to induce him to write to their author. The correspondence that followed, which lasted from 1841 to 1846, is of considerable philosophical interest. In his first letter, Mill presents himself almost as a follower of Comte and recalls how, some ten years before, it had been the reading of Comte's 1822 work that had liberated him from the influence of Bentham. But the tone of the letters, while remaining friendly, soon changes. Mill does not hesitate to voice objections to the exclusion of psychology from the classification of the sciences and to Comte's conception of biology. In particular, Mill had strong reservations about Gall's phrenology, while Comte endorsed it, and proposed to replace it by ethology. Their disagreements crystallize around 'la question féminine', that is the status of women in society, where it is possible to see how epistemological and political considerations are linked. After 1846, Mill quickly distanced himself from his correspondent... Even though each new edition of Mill's System of Logic saw fewer references to the Course than the previous one, the influence of Comte on Mill ran deep, to an extent that today is greatly underestimated. Mill's Autobiography is quite explicit on this point, as Comte figures much more prominently in it than Tocqueville... Conversely, Mill contributed much to the spreading of positivism.” His book on Comte (1865) enjoyed a considerable success, and he himself was considered a positivist.\(^{221}\)

The System of Positive Polity (1851-1854): (a) The mind as a servant of the heart. “After Clotilde's death in 1846, positivism was transformed into complete positivism... Mill and Littré answered negatively and complete positivism was never very popular. The transformation of philosophy into religion does not yield a religion of science because, having overcome modern prejudices, Comte now unhesitatingly ranks art above science. Now that the break-up with the academic world was complete, the positivists placed their hopes on an alliance with women and proletarians. Comte reserved a decisive role in the positive era for women. However, this aspect of his work is difficult to accept for a contemporary reader, in particular because it involves the utopian idea of the virgin mother, which means parthenogenesis for human beings. As for the proletarians, he saw them as spontaneous positivists, just as the positivists were systematic proletarians! The mind, then, is not destined to rule but to serve, not, however, as the slave of the heart, but as its servant. Science thus retains an essential function. The dominance of the heart is founded biologically in the ‘positive classification of the eighteen internal functions of the brain, or systematic view of the soul’. The cerebral table distinguishes ten affective forces, five intellectual functions, and three practical qualities; these correspond to the heart, mind, and character, respectively. The functions being ordered according to increasing energy and decreasing dignity, the dominance of the heart can be considered a datum from positive biology. This classification is indispensable for an understanding of the System. It should be mentioned in passing that it shows that the exclusion of psychology does not at all have the meaning usually given to it: Comte had never refused to study man's higher functions, be they intellectual or moral, but for him this belongs to biology, and so does not require the creation of a new science. Historically, the conception of the System began with this table, of which different versions were elaborated in succession from 1846. Conceptually, it is the first application of the subjective method, understood as feedback from sociology to the sciences that precede it, starting with the nearest. In this way, the sociologist helps the biologist define the cerebral functions, a task in which, most often, the biologist simply takes up again the divisions of folk psychology. Later, in what has become known as the ‘letters on illness’, Comte likewise proposes a sociological definition of the brain, as the organ through which dead people act on living ones.”
(b) **Positive Politics:** “Today, we are no longer used to associate positivism and politics. However, the later was present from the outset, when Comte served as secretary of Saint-Simon, and it was quite influential at the end of the nineteenth century. The two main tenets of positive politics are: there is no society without government; the proper functioning of society requires a spiritual power independent from the temporal power. The first principle has two sides. A negative one: it expresses Comte’s lack of interest in the concept of State. A positive one: in order to understand why there must be a government, we have to consider how social life works. Surprisingly, Comte’s starting point is the same as Hayek’s, namely the existence of a spontaneous order. The title of the fiftieth lesson of the Course reads: Social statics, or theory of spontaneous order of human society. But, for positivism, spontaneous order covers all-natural phenomena and is moreover neither perfect nor immutable. In general, human action aims to substitute for this natural order an artificial one, more in line with our desires. Government action is only a special case, applied to the spontaneous order intrinsic to human society, which is determined by division of labor. The increasing specialization which accompanied it, even if it is the sine qua non condition of progress, threatens the cohesion of society. That is why a government is needed: its function is ‘to check the disorganizing and to foster the converging tendencies’ of the agents.”

“Regarding the second principle, one usually remembers only the idea of spiritual power, but such a power can be understood only in its relation to temporal power: by nature, it is a moderating power, which presupposes the existence of a temporal power, which in contrast does not presuppose the existence of a spiritual power. Furthermore, Comte strongly disagrees with historical materialism: it is ideas that rule the world, in the sense that there is no sustainable social order without a minimal consensus on the principles that govern life in society. Initially, Comte planned to entrust this new spiritual power to scientists, because he saw science not only as the rational basis for our action upon nature, but also as the spiritual basis of social order... This cosmic character of positive politics helps to understand what could appear as an inconsistency. After 1851, Comte proposed to break down France into nineteen ‘intendances’. Such a suggestion is quite puzzling, being incompatible with the received view, according to which he was a supporter of centralization, but, as soon as we take account of the distinction between temporal and spiritual power, the inconsistency disappears. According to the kind of power we are considering, the situation changes totally. Centralization applies only to spiritual power and temporal power is by nature local. There is a lot of passages where the correlation is clearly stated. This follows from the fact that the mind does not know boundaries; a spiritual power has no choice but to be Catholic, that is, universal. Its domain is the planet Earth.”

“From this, we have at least two consequences. The first one is a strong interest in European reconstruction, a political priority between 1815 and 1820, but not anymore in 1850, after the triumph of nationalism. The second one is the realization that States as we know them are a historical product, which did not exist before 1500, and there is no reason to believe that they will exist for ever. Hence his proposal to break down France into nineteen ‘intendances’: the extension of temporal power is not allowed to go beyond territories like Belgium or Corsica. Comte was also one of the first anti-colonialists. As the place where positive thinking appeared and developed, Europe is the elite of humanity, but the way it took possession of the planet in modern times contradicts the very idea positivism had of Europe’s place in history. Much before socialists, English positivists objected to Victorian imperialism. In this context, Comte and his followers discussed also extensively the respective merits of Christianity and Islam. Turks were greatly appreciative of their secularism, which represented a solution to many of the problems of the Ottoman Empire. Ahmed Reza, an influent politician, was overtly positivist. Atatürk and the Young Turks were strongly influenced by them.”
(c) The Religion of Humanity: “The System's subtitle is Treatise on Sociology Instituting the Religion of Humanity. While the different forms of deism preserve the idea of God and dissolve religion into a vague religiosity, Comte proposes exactly the contrary: a religion with neither God nor the supernatural. His project had little success; he even accomplished a tour de force by uniting both believers and non-believers against him…Comte defines religion as ‘the state of complete harmony peculiar to human life…when all the parts of Life are ordered in their natural relations to each other’. Comte also defines religion as a consensus, analogous to what health is for the body. Religion has two functions…in its moral function, religion should govern each individual; in its political function, it should unite all individuals. Religion also has three components, corresponding to the threefold division of the cerebral table: doctrine, worship, and moral rule. Comte's discussion is mainly about the first two. If one considers the first to be related to faith and the second to love, their relation takes two forms: 'Love comes first and leads us to the faith, so long as the growth is spontaneous; but when it becomes systematic, then the belief is constructed in order to regulate the action of love'. At first, Comte had followed the traditional order and presented doctrine before worship, but he soon gave priority to worship, and saw this change as a considerable step forward.”

“In the positivist religion, worship, doctrine and moral rule all have the same object, namely Humanity, which must be loved, known, and served. Already the General Conclusions of the Course compared the concept of Humanity to that of God, affirming the moral superiority of the former. But only in 1847 does Comte make the substitution explicitly; sociological synthesis comes to replace theological synthesis. Membership of Humanity is sociological, not biological. In order to belong to what is defined as the continuous whole of convergent beings - Comte's term for (mainly human) beings who tend to agree - one has to be worthy of it. All ‘producers of dung' are excluded; conversely, animals that have rendered important services can be included. Strictly speaking, it is to sociology that one should turn for knowledge of the laws of the human order but, as the final science recapitulates all others, it is the whole encyclopedic scale, that constitutes the doctrine of the new religion, which thereby becomes demonstrated and is no longer revealed or inspired. The principal novelty of Comte's religion therefore resides in worship, which is both private and public. The positivists set up a whole system of prayers, hymns, and sacraments. As these were all largely inspired by Catholic worship, it was said that it was ‘Catholicism without Christ', to which the positivists replied that it was ‘Catholicism plus science'.”

“The wish to maintain the distinction between temporal and spiritual powers led Comte and his followers to demand the separation of Church and State. It has been noticed less often, however, that the two forms of power stand in differing relations to space. The religious society is by its nature catholic, in the sense of universal, and therefore has no boundaries other than those of the planet; the surface of a State meets different demands, which impose rather strict geographic limits. The contrast between French political history and English political history, which was a common place in Comte's time illustrates the point: there is no separation of Church and State in Great Britain, in that sense that the Queen is also the head of the Anglican Church. Nevertheless, its main application is related to the issue: centralization against local powers, which is another aspect of the spatial dimension of politics. Of the two political models constantly confronted in the Course, Comte clearly prefers the French one. Its characteristic alliance of the monarchy with the people against the aristocracy was accompanied by a centralization that the Revolution contented itself with consolidating. One might therefore be led to believe that Comte was a partisan of centralized political power, whereas the contrary was in fact the case, as he proposed to divide France into seventeen administrative regions, more or less equivalent to the old provinces. Centralization applies only to the spiritual power.”
(d) **Ethics and Sociology:** “Positivism asserted very early its wish to construct a moral doctrine that owes nothing to the supernatural. If we need a spiritual power, it is because social questions are quite often moral rather than political. The reforms of society must be made in a determined order: one has to change ideas, then morals, and only then institutions. But with the System, the moral doctrine (ethics) changes status and becomes a science, whose task is to extend sociology in order to take individual phenomena into account, in particular affective ones. The terms of the problem as well as its solution are given by a saying to be found in the margin of the cerebral table: “Act from affection and think in order to act”. The first part of this systematic verse is guaranteed by the dominance of the heart; but, among the ten affective forces, the first seven correspond to egoism, the final three to altruism. The whole question is knowing which ones would prevail, those of personality or those of sociability. While it is important to acknowledge the innateness of the sympathetic instincts, one is forced to admit their native weakness: the supremacy of the egoistic tendencies is so clear that it is itself one of the most striking traits in our nature. The great human problem is to reverse the natural order and to teach ourselves to live for others. The solution consists in ‘regulating the inside through the outside’ and depends, as a consequence, on a good use of the mind. The only way in which altruism can win, is to ally itself with the mind, to make it its servant and not its slave. The heart, without the light of reason, is blind. Left to itself, affectivity is characterized by its inconsistency and instability. That is why the inside has to be regulated, that is, disciplined. And this task is assigned to the outside, because exterior reality is the best of regulators. Whatever its own defects may be, the order that science discloses in nature is, by its indifference to our desires, a source of discipline.”

**Conclusion:** “On the whole, the System was not well received. Almost immediately, Mill and Littré put forward the idea that there were a good Comte, the author of the Course, and a bad Comte, the author of the System…The early works had made a strong impression on some of the best minds of the time; they remain required reading for everyone wishing to understand positive philosophy, as they are still among the best introductions to the subject. The Course was not part of the initial project, which Comte never lost sight of; the work is best considered as a parenthesis, admittedly open for twenty years, but which Comte had meant to close very quickly. The reason why Comte had always presented the Plan of 1822 as fundamental is that, beginning with the very title, one finds the two themes that he planned to think through in their relation to one another: science and society. The foremost question is a political one: how should society be reorganized? Science, although present from the beginning, plays a secondary role as the means to achieve the chosen goal. All of Comte's work aims at the foundation of a discipline in which the study of society will finally become positive, scientific. His idea of sociology is not quite the one we are used to today; but the current meaning of the term ‘positivism’, according to which it is merely a philosophy of science, is even more misleading as a clue to Comte's thought. Even though the founder of positivism is rightly considered to be one of the great philosophers of science, along with Poincaré and Carnap, his natural place is elsewhere, along with sociologists such as his contemporaries Marx and Tocqueville. Only when the question arises of what distinguishes Comte from the latter does science enter into the picture. The limits of Comte's philosophy of science are easily seen, but this does not diminish their value, which remains considerable. Yet the same cannot be said of the positive polity. Given that the separation of spiritual power and temporal power rests on the separation between theory and practice, Comte abstained from any direct political action, and, for example, condemned Mill's decision to stand in parliament. But his own project for the reorganization of society presents a similar problem. In his writings, it is difficult to distinguish that which concerns objective social science from a reform program.”
“Positivism is a philosophical theory stating that certain (positive) knowledge is based on natural phenomena and their properties and relations. Thus, information derived from sensory experience, interpreted through reason and logic, forms the exclusive source of all certain knowledge. Positivism holds that valid knowledge (certitude or truth) is found only in this a posteriori knowledge. Verified data (positive facts) received from the senses are known as empirical evidence; thus, positivism is based on empiricism. Positivism also holds that society, like the physical world, operates according to general laws. Introspective and intuitive knowledge is rejected, as are metaphysics and theology. Although the positivist approach has been a recurrent theme in the history of western thought, the modern sense of the approach was formulated by the philosopher Auguste Comte as discussed previously...Comte argued that, much as the physical world operates according to gravity and other absolute laws, so does society, and further developed positivism into a Religion of Humanity.”

“The basic affirmations of positivism are (1) that all knowledge regarding matters of fact is based on the positive data of experience and (2) that beyond the realm of fact is that of pure logic and pure mathematics. Those two disciplines were already recognized by the 18th-century Scottish empiricist and skeptic David Hume as concerned merely with the “relations of ideas,” and, in a later phase of positivism, they were classified as purely formal sciences. On the negative and critical side, the positivists became noted for their repudiation of metaphysics—i.e., of speculation regarding the nature of reality that radically goes beyond any possible evidence that could either support or refute such “transcendent” knowledge claims. In its basic ideological posture, positivism is thus worldly, secular, anti-theological, and anti-metaphysical. Strict adherence to the testimony of observation and experience is the all-important imperative of positivism. That imperative was reflected also in the contributions by positivists to ethics and moral philosophy, which were generally utilitarian to the extent that something like the greatest happiness for the greatest number of people was their ethical maxim. It is notable, in this connection, that Comte was the founder of a short-lived religion, in which the object of worship was not the deity of the monotheistic faiths but humanity.”

The types of Positivism may include logical, sociological, legal, and particular positivism according to its engagement or environment. (i) Logical Positivism (or Logical Empiricism) is a school of philosophy that developed out of Positivism and attempted to combine Empiricism (the idea that observational evidence is indispensable for knowledge of the world) with a version of Rationalism (the idea that our knowledge includes a component that is not derived from observation). (ii) Sociological Positivism is the view, developed from Auguste Comte's philosophical Positivism (see above), that the social sciences (as all other sciences) should observe strict empirical methods. Today, although many sociologists would agree that a scientific method is an important part of sociology, orthodox positivism is rare. (iii) Legal Positivism is a school of thought in Philosophy of Law which holds that laws are rules made (whether deliberately or unintentionally) by human beings, and that there is no inherent or necessary connection between the validity conditions of law and Ethics or morality. It stands in opposition to the concept of natural law (that there is an essential connection between law and justice or morality). (iv) Polish Positivism was a political movement in the late 19th Century, drawing its name and much of its ideology from Comte's philosophy (as well as from the works of British scholars and scientists). It advocated the exercise of reason before emotion, and argued that Polish independence from Russia, Germany and Austro-Hungary must be regained gradually from the ground up.”
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5-1. Positivism in France

Paul-Emile Littre (1801-81). “French language scholar, lexicographer, and philosopher whose monumental *Dictionnaire de la langue française*, 4 vol. (1863–73, *Dictionary of the French Language*), is one of the outstanding lexicographic accomplishments of all time. A close friend of the philosopher Auguste Comte, Littre did much to publicize Comte’s ideas. Educated in medicine as well as English, German, Greek, Latin, and Sanskrit and Sanskrit philology, Littre was an ardent democrat who took part in the insurrection against King Charles X in 1830. In the decade that followed, he began preparation of a 10-volume translation of the writings of Hippocrates, completed in 1862. About the time the first volume appeared (1839), he became acquainted with the writings of Comte and was soon a fervent disciple, publishing many works on Positivism. After Comte lost his teaching position at the École Polytechnique, Paris (1842), Littre became one of his principal financial supporters. After 1852 he diverged from Comte’s increasingly mystical views but waited until after Comte’s death to publish his points of disagreement both in *Paroles de philosophie positive* (1859) and in another work (1863), in which he traced the origin of Comte’s ideas and analyzed his philosophical system and its effects. When finally completed, Littre’s dictionary, begun in 1844, proved to be of incomparable value for its precise definitions and historical grasp of the growth of the French language.”

When it became obvious the Littre would not live much longer, his wife and his daughter strove to convert him to Catholic; on the point of death, he was baptized, and his funeral was conducted by the rite of the Church.

“In his early career, Littre was a strong proponent of Comtean ideas. His essays contributed during this period to the newspaper National, in which he actively promoted positivist philosophy. Those essays were later collected and published under the title *Conservation, revolution et positivisme* (1852). In it he showed a thorough acceptance of all the doctrines propounded by Comte. However, during the later years of Comte’s life, Littre started to realize that he could not wholly accept all the ideas of his friend and master. He nevertheless concealed his differences of opinion, and never challenged Comte directly. Comte failed to perceive that his pupil had outgrown him, as he himself had outgrown his master Comte de Saint-Simon.”

“Comte’s death in 1858 freed Littre from any fear of embittering his master’s later years, and he published his own ideas in his *Paroles de la philosophie positive* in 1859, and at still greater length in his work in *Auguste Comte et la philosophie positive* in 1863. In the latter book he traced the origin of Comte’s ideas through Turgot, Kant, and Saint-Simon, then eulogized Comte’s own life, his method of philosophy, his great services to the cause and the effect of his works, and finally proceeded to show where he differed from Comte. He approved wholly of Comte’s philosophy, his great laws of society, and his philosophical method, which indeed he defended warmly against John Stuart Mill, but declared that, while he believed in a positivist philosophy, he did not believe in a religion of humanity. Littre claimed that Comte had abandoned the positive method in his later works, and suggested it was necessary to clean Comte’s works of any trace of subjectivism. He held that Positivism was the only true philosophy, and that through the scientific method one can ultimately realize everything that is known about the world, man, and society. Unlike Comte, Littre doubted that Positivism was sufficiently advanced to serve as a basis for social and political action. Littre’s great work, his *Dictionnaire de la langue française*, was completed in 1873 after three decades of effort. The dictionary was published in four volumes, plus a supplement issued in 1877. It contained an authoritative interpretation of the use of each word, based on the various meanings it had held in the past, beginning with the earliest meaning. It also contained numerous quotations from works of literature, illustrating the use of words and the development of the French language.”
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“In Littre’s opinion, Comte filled a vacuum. On the one hand the mind seeks a general or overall view; and this was just what metaphysics provided. The trouble was however that the metaphysician developed his theories a priori, and that these theories lacked a solid empirical basis. On the other hand, the particular sciences, while proposing empirically testable hypotheses, inevitably lacked the generality which was characteristic of metaphysics. In other words, the discrediting of metaphysics left a gap which could be filled only by the creation of a new philosophy. And it was Comte who met this need. ‘M. Comte is the founder of the positive philosophy. Saint-Simon did not possess the necessary scientific knowledge. Further, by trying to reduce the forces of nature to one ultimate force, namely gravitation, he relapsed into the metaphysical mentality. Comte however has constructed what nobody before him had constructed, the philosophy of the six fundamental sciences and has exhibited the relations between them. By discussing the interconnection of the sciences and their hierarchic system, Comte discovered at the same time the positive philosophy.’ Comte also showed how and why the sciences developed historically in a certain order from mathematics to sociology. Metaphysicians may reproach other philosophers with neglecting consideration of man, the subject of knowledge; but this reproach does not affect Comte, who established the science of man, namely sociology, on a sound basis. Moreover, by excluding all absolute questions and by giving philosophy a firm scientific basis, Comte at last made philosophy capable of directing minds in research, men in their conduct and societies in their development. Theology and metaphysics tried to do this; but as they treated of questions which transcended human knowledge, they were necessarily ineffective.”

“The positive philosophy, Littre asserts, regards the world as consisting of matter and the forces immanent in matter. Beyond these two terms, matter and force, positive science knows nothing. We do not know either the origin of matter or its essence. The positive philosophy is not concerned with absolutes or with knowledge of things in themselves. It is concerned simply with reality as accessible to human knowledge. If therefore it is claimed that phenomena can be accounted for in terms of matter and its immanent forces, this is not equivalent to a dogmatic materialism, which professes, for example, to tell us what matter is in itself or to explain the development of life or thought. The positive philosophy shows, for instance, how psychology presupposes biology, and biology other sciences; but it steers clear of questions about the ultimate cause of life or about what thought is in itself, apart from our scientific knowledge of it.”

“Though however Littre is keen on differentiating between positivism and materialism, it is not at all clear that he is successful in this attempt. As mentioned above, he maintains that the positive philosophy recognizes nothing beyond matter and the forces immanent in matter. It is true of course that this thesis is expressed in terms of an assertion about scientific knowledge, and not as an assertion about ultimate reality or about what is really real. At the same time Littre finds fault with J. S. Mill for leaving the existence of a supernatural reality an open question; and he criticizes Herbert Spencer’s attempt to reconcile science and religion by means of his doctrine of the Unknowable. Perhaps we can say that two lines of thought are discernible in Littre’s mind. On the one hand there is the tendency to insist that the positive philosophy simply abstains from questions relating to realities the existence of which cannot be verified by sense-experience. In this case there is no reason why such questions should not be left open, even if they are considered unanswerable. On the other hand, there is a tendency to regard assertions about alleged realities which transcend the sphere of the scientifically verifiable as nonsensical.” Despite substantial agreements with Comte’s Course, Littre writes differences with him. Among the particular points criticized by Littre are identification of mathematics with logic and his subordination of the mind to the heart or to the affective aspect of man. As for ethics or moral, he blames Comte for having added moral to the list of sciences as a seventh member.”
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Joseph Earnest Renan (1823-92): Renan was a French philosopher, historian, and scholar of religion, a leader of the school of critical philosophy in France. “Renan was educated at the ecclesiastical college in his native town of Tréguier. He began training for the priesthood, and in 1838 he was offered a scholarship at the seminary of Saint-Nicolas-du-Chardonnet. He later went on to the seminary of Saint-Sulpice, where he soon underwent a crisis of faith that finally led him, reluctantly, to leave the Roman Catholic Church in 1845. In his view, the church’s teachings were incompatible with the findings of historical criticism, but he kept a quasi-Christian faith in God.”

When Renan left the seminary in 1845, he became a friend of Eugene Berthelot (1827-1907), “who was to become professor of organic chemistry at the College of France and subsequently minister of education. Like Comte, Berthelot believed in the triumph of scientific knowledge over theology and metaphysics. And Renan, who had lost his faith in the supernatural, shared this belief up to a point. In his Memoirs of Childhood and Youth he remarked that from the first months of 1846 the clear scientific vision of a universe in which there is no perceptible action of a free will superior to that of man became for Berthelot and himself an immovable anchor. Similarly, in the preface…of the Life of Jesus Renan asserted that he had rejected the supernatural for the very same reason for which he rejected belief in centaurs, namely that they have never been seen. In other words, knowledge of reality is obtained through observation and the verification of empirical hypotheses. This was the view expressed in The Future of Science (1890). The scientific view of the world did not indeed mean for Renan simply the natural scientist’s view. He emphasized the importance and role of history and philology. But positive knowledge of reality, he insisted, must have an experimental basis. This is why the enlightened man cannot believe in God. A being who does not reveal himself by any act is for science a being which does not exist.”

Renan rejects the idea of a personal God who intervenes in history. “The occurrence of divine interventions has never been proved. And events which seemed to past generations to be divine acts have been explained in other ways. But to reject the personal transcendent Deity is not to embrace atheism…What reveals the true God, is the moral sentiment. If humanity were simply intelligent, it would be atheist; but the great races have found in themselves a divine instinct. Duty, devotion, sacrifice, all of them things of which history is full, are inexplicable without God. True, all statements about God are simply symbolic. But the divine nonetheless reveals itself to the moral consciousness. To love God, to know God, is to love what is beautiful and good, to know what is true…To give a precise account of Renan’s concept of God is probably something which exceeds human capacity. We can discern the general influence, to a certain extent, of German idealism. More basic however is Renan’s own religiosity or religious feeling which expresses itself in a variety of ways, not always mutually consistent, and which makes him quite incapable of being a positivist in the style of Littre. Obviously, there is no reason why a positivist should not have moral ideals. And if he wishes to interpret religion as a matter of sentiment of the heart and religious belief as the expression of feeling, not of knowledge, he can combine religion with a positivist theory of knowledge. But if he introduces the idea of the Absolute, as Renan does in his letter to Berthelot of August 1863, he clearly goes beyond the limits of what can reasonably be described as positivism with the term being deprived of definite meaning.”

Renan’s attitude to metaphysics is complex. In his Metaphysics and Science (1858), Renan insists that “man had both the power and the right to rise above facts and to pursue speculation about the universe. He also made it clear however that he regarded such speculation as akin to poetry or even to dreaming. What he denied was not the right to indulge in metaphysical speculation but the view of metaphysics as the first and fundamental science containing the principles of all the others, a science which can by itself alone, and by abstract reasoning, lead us to the truth about God, the world and man. For we know by the study of nature or of history.”
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Renan views that metaphysics can be a science provided that it is regarded simply as conceptual analysis, but if it professes to treat of existing realities, such as God, which transcend the spheres of natural science and of history, it is not and cannot be a science. One is entitled to speculate, but such speculation no more increases our knowledge of reality. Renan says that philosophy is the general result of all the science. Taken by itself, this statement might be understood in the Comtean sense. But Renan adds that to philosophize is to know the Universe, and that the study of nature and of humanity is then the whole of philosophy. It is true that he uses the word philosophy, not the word metaphysics. But philosophy considered as the science of the whole is, one would have thought, one of the meanings not uncommonly ascribe to metaphysics. In other words, philosophy as the general result of all the sciences tends to mean metaphysics, though the precise status attributed by Renan to philosophy in this sense is by no means clear."

"Renan was obviously a man who believed that positive knowledge about the world could be obtained only through the natural sciences and through historical and philosophical inquiries. In other words, science, in a broad sense of the word, had taken the place of theology and metaphysics as a science of information about existing reality. In Renan’s view, belief in the transcendent personal God of Jewish and Christian faith had been deprived of any rational bound by the development of science. This is to say; such belief was incapable of being confirmed experimentally. As for metaphysics, whether it was regarded as speculation about problems which were scientifically unanswerable or as some form of conceptual analysis, it could not increase man’s knowledge of what is the case in the world. In one aspect of his thought therefore Renan was clearly on the side of the positivists. At the same time, he was unable to rid himself of the conviction that through his moral consciousness and his recognition of ideals man entered, in some real sense, into a sphere transcending that of empirical science. Nor could he rid himself of the conviction that there was in fact a divine reality, even if all attempts at definite description were symbolic and open to criticism. It is evident that he wished to combine a religious outlook with the positivist elements in his thought. But he was not enough of a systematic thinker to achieve a coherent and consistent synthesis. Further, it was hardly possible in any case to harmonize all his various beliefs, not at any rate in the forms in which he expressed them. How, for example, could one reconcile the view that experimental or empirical verification is required to justify the assertion that something exists with the following claim? Nature is only an appearance; man is only a phenomenon. There is the eternal ground, there is the finite substance, the absolute, the ideal…there is…he who is. Empirical verification, in any ordinary sense, of the existence of the Absolute seems to be excluded. It is therefore not altogether surprising if in the last years of his life Renan showed a marked tendency to skepticism in the religious sphere. We cannot know the infinite or even that there is an infinite, nor can we establish that there are absolute objective values. True, we can act is if there were objective values and as if there were a God. But such matters lie outside the range of any positive knowledge. To claim therefore that Renan abandoned positivism would be inaccurate, though it is evident that it did not satisfy him."

Hugely influential in his lifetime, Renan was eulogized after his death as the embodiment of the progressive spirit in western culture. "Renan believed that racial characteristics were instincutal and deterministic. He has been criticized for his antisemitic claims that the Semitic race is inferior to the Aryan race. Renan claimed that the Semitic mind was limited by dogmatism and lacked a cosmopolitan conception of civilization. For Renan, Semites were an incomplete race. Some authors argue that Renan developed his antisemitism from Voltaire's anti-Judaism...Renan was also known for being a strong critic of German ethnic nationalism, with its antisemitic undertones. His notions of race and ethnicity were completely at odds with the European anti-Semitism of the 19th and 20th centuries."
Hippolyte-Adolphe Taine (1828-93) was a French thinker, critic, and historian, one of the most esteemed exponents of 19th-century French positivism. He attempted to apply the scientific method to the study of the humanities. “Taine was born into a professional middle-class family; his father was a lawyer. He was educated privately at home until shortly after his father’s death; thereafter, he went with his mother to live in Paris and became an outstanding pupil at the Collège Bourbon and…École Normale. He gained his licencees-lettres (preliminary degree) in 1848 and began to study for his agrégation (advanced degree) in philosophy, one of his dominant interests... He had apparently lost his Christian faith by the age of 15, and his youthful rationalist attitude led him to admire the ideas of the ideologue philosophers, who held that all knowledge must be based on sense experience, on observation, and on controlled experiment; this overriding conviction guided his later career. He was also already attracted by the metaphysical ideas of Hegel and Spinoza, which inspired in him a desire to find a total explanation of the causal forces of life and the universe. In contrast to these views, his new teachers of philosophy in Paris held the prevailing philosophical doctrine of eclecticism...Taine’s agrégation jury failed him in 1851. He then taught for brief periods at Nevers and Poitiers but in 1852 applied for leave of absence. Returning to Paris, he devoted himself to preparing his two dissertations for the doctorate in literature:”

In 1853 he published his Essay on the Fables of La Fontaine. He gained a doctoral degree in May 1853 and published an Essay on Livy in 1856; followed by Essays in Criticism and History (1858), and four-volume History of English Literature. In philosophy, Taine published The French Philosophers of the Nineteenth Century in 1857. In 1864 Taine obtained a chair at the Ecole des Beaux-Arts and lectured on aesthetics. In 1870 he published his De l’intelligence in two volumes; and The Origins of Contemporary France during 1975-93 in five volumes. He also published some travels books including Voyage to the Waters of the Pyrenees.

“Taine was brought up a Christian but lost his faith at the age of fifteen. Doubt and skepticism were not however to his taste. He looked for knowledge that was certain; and he hankered after comprehensive knowledge, knowledge of the totality. Science, developed through the empirical verification of hypotheses, seemed to be the only road to secure knowledge of the world. At the same time Taine believed that the continuation of a metaphysical worldview, a view of the totality as a necessary system, was not only a legitimate but also a necessary enterprise. And his persistent problem was that of combining his conviction that there was nothing in the world but events or phenomena and the relations between them with his conviction that a metaphysics was possible which would go beyond the results of the particular sciences and achieve a synthesis. From the chronological point of view the attraction which he felt for the philosophies of Spinoza and Hegel preceded the development of his positivist ideas. But it was not a case of positivism arriving on the scene and driving out metaphysics. Taine reasserted his belief in metaphysics and endeavored to reconcile the two tendencies in his thought. Whether he was successful, and indeed whether he could have been successful, is disputable…there can be no doubt about what he was trying to do.”

“The general nature of this attempt is made clear by Taine himself in his work on the French philosophers of the nineteenth century, in his study of John Stuart Mill (Le positivism anglais: Etude sur Stuart Mill, 1864) and in his history of English literature. The English empiricists, in Taine’s opinion, regard the world as collection of facts. To be sure, they concern themselves with the relations between phenomena or facts; but these relations are for them purely contingent. For Mill, who represents the culmination of a line of thought starting with Francis Bacon, the causal relation is simply one of factually regular sequence. Indeed, the law which attributes a cause to every event has for him no other basis, no other value and no other bearing than an experience… It simply gathers together a sum of observations. By confining himself simply to experience and its immediate data Mill has described the English mind while believing that he was describing the
human mind. The German metaphysical idealists however have had the vision of the totality. They have seen the universe as the expression of ultimate causes and laws, as a necessary system, not as a collection of facts or of phenomena which are related in a purely contingent manner. At the same time, in their enthusiasm for the vision of the totality they have neglected the limitations of the human mind and have tried to proceed in a purely a priori manner. They have tried to reconstruct the world of experience by pure thought. In point of fact, they have constructed imposing edifices which presently collapse in ruins. There is thus room for a middle way, a combination of what is true and valuable in both English empiricism and German metaphysics.

The achievement of this synthesis is reserved for the French mind. If there is a place between the two nations, it is ours. It is the French mind which is called to correct the faults of both English positivism and German metaphysics, to synthesize the corrected outlooks, to express them in a style which everyone understands and thus to make of them the universal mind. The English excel in the discovery of facts, the Germans in the construction of theories. Fact and theory need to be brought together by the French, if possible by Taine.”

“One’s mind my well boggle at the thought of combining English empiricism with German idealism, Mill with Hegel. But Taine is not concerned simply with stating an ideal which doubtless seems to many minds unrealizable and perhaps even silly. He indicates what he considers to be the ground on which a synthesis can be constructed, namely man’s power of abstraction. Taine’s use of the word abstraction stands however in need of some explanation. In the first place, Taine does not mean to imply that we are entitled to assume that abstract terms refer to corresponding abstract entities. On the contrary, he attacks not only Cousin and the eclectics but also Spinoza and Hegel for making precisely this assumption. Words such as substance, force and power are convenient ways of grouping similar phenomena, but to think, for example, that the word force signifies an abstract entity is to be misled by language. We believe that there are no substances, but only systems of facts. We regard the idea of substance as a psychological illusion. We consider substances, force and all the metaphysical beings of the moderns as a relic of Scholastic entities. We think that there is nothing in the world but facts and laws, that is to say events and their relations; and like you we recognize that all knowledge consists in the first instance in linking of in adding facts. In his work on intelligence Taine insists that there are no entities corresponding to words such as faculty, power, self. Psychology is the study of facts; and in the self or ego we find no facts except the series of events, which are all reducible to sensations. Even positivists have been guilty of the reification of abstract terms. A signal example of this is provided by Herbert Spencer’s theory of the Unknowable, considered as absolute Force.”

“In this line of thought, considered by itself, Taine goes as far as any empiricist could wish. We think that there are neither minds nor bodies, but simply groups of movements present or possible, and groups of thoughts present or possible. And it is interesting to observe Taine’s insistence on the bewitching power of language, which induces philosophers to postulate unreal entities that vanish when one scrupulously examines the meaning of the words. His empiricism also shows itself in his rejection of the a priori method of Spinoza, a method which can do more than reveal ideal possibilities. Any knowledge of existing reality must be based on and result from experience. By abstraction therefore Taine does not mean the formation of abstract terms or concepts which are then mistakenly thought to stand for abstract entities. But what does he mean by it? He describes it as the power of isolating the elements of facts and considering them separately. The assumption is that what is give in experience is complex and that it is analyzable into constituent elements which can be considered separately or in abstraction. The natural way of understanding this is in terms of reductive analysis as practiced by Condillac in the eighteenth century or by Bertrand Russel in the twentieth. Analysis is said to give us the nature or essence of
what is analyzed. But Taine takes it that among the constituent elements which form the interior of a being there can be found causes, forces and laws. They are not a new fact added to the first; they are a portion of it, and extract; they contained in them, they are nothing else but the facts themselves. For example, proof of the statement that Tom is mortal does not consist in arguing from the premise that all men die, not in appealing to the fact that we do not know of any human being who has not eventually died, but rather by showing that mortality is joined to the equality of being a man, inasmuch as the human body is an unstable chemical compound. To find out whether Tom will die or not, there is no need to multiply examples of men who have died. What is required is abstraction, which enables us to formulate a law. Every single example contains the cause of human mortality; but it has of course to be isolated by the mind, picked out or extracted from complex phenomena, and formulated in an abstract manner. To prove a fact, as Aristotle said, it to show its cause. This cause is comprised within the fact. And when we have abstracted it, we can argue from the abstract to the concrete, that is to say from cause to effect.”

“We can however go further than this. We can practice the operation of analysis on groups or sets of laws and, in principle at any rate, arrive at the most primitive and basic elements of the universe. There are simple elements from which derive the most general laws, and from these the particular laws, and form these laws the facts which we observe. If these simple or unanalyzable elements can be known, metaphysics is possible. For metaphysics is the search for first causes. And, according to Taine, the first causes are knowable, inasmuch as they are everywhere exemplified, in all facts. It is not as though we had to transcend the world in order to know its first cause or causes. They are everywhere present and operative; and all that the human mind has to do is to extract or abstract them. Given his insistence that the ultimate causes of empirical facts are contained within the facts themselves and so within experience, Taine can think of himself as correcting and enlarging British empiricism, not as contradicting it flatly. As far as he is concerned, metaphysics is really continuous with science, though it has a higher degree of generality. It is however evident that he starts with the assumption that the universe is one rational or law-ordered system. The notion that laws are convenient or practically useful fictions of the mind is quite alien to his thought. He assumes that there is a reason for everything, that every fact has its law; that every composite is reducible to simple elements; that every product implies causes; that every quality and every existence must be deducible from some superior and anterior term. Taine assumes too that cause and effect are really the same thing under two appearances. These assumptions are obviously derived not from empiricism but from the influence on his mind of Spinoza and Hegel. When he envisages one ultimate cause, one eternal axiom and creative formula, he is clearly speaking under the influence of the metaphysical vision of the totality as a necessary system which exhibits in innumerable ways the creative activity of an ultimate cause.”

“As we have noted, Taine criticizes the German idealists for having tried to deduce a priori such particular cases as the planetary system and the laws of physics and chemistry. But he appears to be objecting not to the idea of deducibility as such, deducibility in principle that is to say, but rather to the assumption that the human mind is able to perform the deduction, even when it has ascertained the primitive laws or ultimate causes. Between, so to speak, the primitive laws and a particular exemplification in the world as given in experience, there is an infinite counterbalancing causal influences. And the human mind is too limited to be able to take in the whole pattern of the universe. But if Taine admits, as he seems to do, deducibility in principle, this admission obviously expresses a general vision of the universe which he has derived not from empiricism but from Spinoza and Hegel. This vision includes in its scope not only the physical universe but also human history. In his view history cannot become a science in the proper sense until causes and laws have been abstracted from the facts or historical data.”
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*History of English Literature* (1863-34): “Taine is best known now for his attempt at a scientific account of literature, based on the categories of race, milieu, and moment. Taine used these words in French (*race, milieu et moment*); the terms have become widespread in literary criticism in English but are used in this context in senses closer to the French meanings of the words than the English meanings, which are, roughly, nation, environment or situation, and time. Taine argued that literature was largely the product of the author's environment, and that an analysis of that environment could yield a perfect understanding of the work of literature. In this sense he was a sociological positivist, though with important differences. Taine did not mean race in the specific sense now common, but rather the collective cultural dispositions that govern everyone without their knowledge or consent. What differentiates individuals within this collective "race", for Taine, was milieu: the particular circumstances that distorted or developed the dispositions of a particular person. The "moment" is the accumulated experiences of that person, which Taine often expressed as momentum; to some later critics, however, Taine's conception of moment seemed to have more in common with Zeitgeist. Though Taine coined and popularized the phrase *race, milieu, et moment*, the theory itself has roots in earlier attempts to understand the aesthetic object as a social product rather than a spontaneous creation of genius.”246

*On Intelligence* (1870) was a major work in the discipline of psychology. “His devotion to science is most fully illustrated here; he opposes the speculative and introspective approach of the eclectics and outlines a scientific methodology for the study of human personality that established him, alongside thinkers such as Théodule Ribot and Pierre Janet, as a founder of empirical psychology. Though much of the work is now outdated, in its day it helped to modify methods of research by its emphasis on experiment, the search for causes, the study of pathological cases, and the physiological basis of personality. It also intensified opposition to his ideas, and he was angrily accused of holding a strictly determinist and materialist view of man - not altogether unfairly, even though he claimed to reject materialism and argued that moral responsibility was compatible with determinism as he conceived it. The work also develops his long-standing attempt to fuse Positivism and Hegelian idealism and to provide a method for a scientific metaphysics. Through such a metaphysics, he maintained, the final causes of life itself might be discovered; its insights inspired him to an exalted pantheistic trust in nature that is movingly expressed in essays on Marcus Aurelius (in Nouveaux essais) and Iphigeneia (in Derniers essais).”247

*The Origins of Contemporary France* (1893) was Taine's monumental achievement. “His object was to explain the existing constitution of France by studying the more immediate causes of the present state of affairs - the last years of the *Ancient Régime*, the French Revolution and the beginning of the nineteenth century, to each of which several volumes were assigned. His work also had another object, although he was perhaps hardly conscious of it, namely, the study man in one of his pathological crises. Taine is interested in studying human nature, checking and endorsing the pessimism and misanthropy of Graindorge. The problem which Taine set himself was an inquiry into the centralization of modern France so that all individual initiative was practically non-existent, and why the central power, whether in the hands of a single ruler or an assembly, is the sole and only power. He also wished to expose the error underlying two prevalent conceptions of the Revolution – (1) The proponents view that the Revolution destroyed absolutism and set up liberty; (2) The opponents view that the Revolution destroyed liberty instead of establishing it, based on the notion that France was less centralized before the Revolution. On the contrary, Taine argues, the Revolution did not establish liberty, it merely caused absolutism to change hands, and France was not less centralized before 1789 than after 1800. France was already a centralized country before 1789 and grew rapidly more and more so from the time of Louis XIV onwards. The Revolution merely gave it a new form.”248
Emile Durkheim (1858-1917): “Emile Durkheim was born in Épinal in Lorraine, the son of Mélanie (Isidor) and Moïse Durkheim. He came from a long line of devout French Jews; his father, grandfather, and great-grandfather had been rabbis. He began his education in a rabbinical school, but at an early age, he decided not to follow in his family's footsteps and switched schools. Durkheim led a completely secular life. Much of his work was dedicated to demonstrating that religious phenomena stemmed from social rather than divine factors. While Durkheim chose not to follow in the family tradition, he did not sever ties with his family or with the Jewish community. Many of his most prominent collaborators and students were Jewish, and some were blood relations… A precocious student, Durkheim entered the École Normale Supérieure (ENS) in 1879, at his third attempt. The entering class that year was one of the most brilliant of the nineteenth century and many of his classmates, such as Jean Jaurès and Henri Bergson, would go on to become major figures in France’s intellectual history. At the ENS, Durkheim studied under the direction of Numa Denis Fustel de Coulanges, a classicist with a social scientific outlook, and wrote his Latin dissertation on Montesquieu. At the same time, he read Auguste Comte and Herbert Spencer. Thus, Durkheim became interested in a scientific approach to society very early on in his career. This meant the first of many conflicts with the French academic system, which had no social science curriculum at the time. Durkheim found humanistic studies uninteresting, turning his attention from psychology and philosophy to ethics and eventually, sociology. He obtained his agrégation in philosophy in 1882.”

Academic Career: “From 1882 to 1887 he taught philosophy at several provincial schools. In 1885 he decided to leave for Germany, where for two years he studied sociology at the universities of Marburg, Berlin and Leipzig. As Durkheim indicated in several essays, it was in Leipzig that he learned to appreciate the value of empiricism and its language of concrete, complex things, in sharp contrast to the more abstract, clear and simple ideas of the Cartesian method. By 1886, as part of his doctoral dissertation, he had completed the draft of his The Division of Labor in Society… working towards establishing the new science of sociology. Durkheim’s period in Germany resulted in the publication of numerous articles on German social science and philosophy; Durkheim was particularly impressed by the work of Wilhelm Wundt. Durkheim’s articles gained recognition in France, and he received a teaching appointment in the University of Bordeaux in 1887, where he was to teach the university’s first social science course… he taught both pedagogy and sociology. The appointment of the social scientist to the mostly humanistic faculty was an important sign of the change of times, and also the growing importance and recognition of the social sciences. From this position Durkheim helped reform the French school system and introduced the study of social science in its curriculum. However, his controversial beliefs that religion and morality could be explained in terms purely of social interaction earned him many critics. Also, in 1887, Durkheim married Louise Dreyfus.”

“The 1890s were a period of remarkable creative output for Durkheim. In 1893, he published The Division of Labor in Society, his doctoral dissertation and fundamental statement of the nature of human society and its development. Durkheim’s interest in social phenomena was spurred on by politics. France’s defeat in the Franco-Prussian War led to the fall of the regime of Napoleon III, which was then replaced by the Third Republic. This in turn resulted in a backlash against the new secular and republican rule, as many people considered a vigorously nationalistic approach necessary to rejuvenate France’s fading power. Durkheim, a Jew and a staunch supporter of the Third Republic with a sympathy towards socialism, was thus in the political minority, a situation that galvanized him politically. The Dreyfus affair of 1894 only strengthened his activist stance. In 1895, he published The Rules of Sociological Method, a manifesto stating what sociology is and how it ought to be done and founded the first European department of sociology at the University...
of Bordeaux. In 1898, he founded *L'Année Sociologique*, the first French social science journal. Its aim was to publish and publicize the work of what was, by then, a growing number of students and collaborators. In 1897, he published *Suicide*, a case study that provided an example of what the sociological monograph might look like. Durkheim was one of the pioneers of the use of quantitative methods in criminology during his suicide case study."

"By 1902, Durkheim had finally achieved his goal of attaining a prominent position in Paris when he became the chair of education at the Sorbonne. Durkheim aimed for the Parisian position earlier, but the Parisian faculty took longer to accept what some called sociological imperialism and admit social science to their curriculum. He became a full professor (Professor of the Science of Education) there in 1906, and in 1913 he was named Chair in Education and Sociology. Because French universities are technically institutions for training secondary school teachers, this position gave Durkheim considerable influence—his lectures were the only ones that were mandatory for the entire student body. Durkheim had much influence over the new generation of teachers; around that time, he also served as an advisor to the Ministry of Education. In 1912, he published his last major work, *The Elementary Forms of The Religious Life*."

The outbreak of World War I was to have a tragic effect on Durkheim's life. His leftist was always patriotic rather than internationalist—he sought a secular, rational form of French life. But the coming of the war and the inevitable nationalist propaganda that followed made it difficult to sustain this already nuanced position. While Durkheim actively worked to support his country in the war, his reluctance to give in to simplistic nationalist fervor (combined with his Jewish background) made him a natural target of the now-ascendant French Right. Even more seriously, the generations of students that Durkheim had trained were now being drafted to serve in the army, and many of them perished in the trenches. Finally, Durkheim's own son, André, died on the war front in December 1915—a loss from which Durkheim never recovered. Emotionally devastated, Durkheim collapsed of a stroke in Paris on November 15, 1917."

"Throughout his career, Durkheim was concerned primarily with three goals. First, to establish sociology as a new academic discipline. Second, to analyze how societies could maintain their integrity and coherence in the modern era, when things such as shared religious and ethnic background could no longer be assumed; to that end he wrote much about the effect of laws, religion, education and similar forces on society and social integration. Lastly, Durkheim was concerned with the practical implications of scientific knowledge."

(a) **Inspirations**: "During his university studies at the École, Durkheim was influenced by two neo-Kantian scholars, Charles Bernard Renouvier and Émile Boutroux. The principles Durkheim absorbed from them included rationalism, scientific study of morality, anti-utilitarianism and secular education. His methodology was influenced by Numa Denis Fustel de Coulanges, a supporter of the scientific method. (i) A fundamental influence on Durkheim's thought was the sociological positivism of Auguste Comte, who effectively sought to extend and apply the scientific method found in the natural sciences to the social sciences. According to Comte, a true social science should stress for empirical facts, as well as induce general scientific laws from the relationship among these facts. There were many points on which Durkheim agreed with the positivist thesis. First, he accepted that the study of society was to be founded on an examination of facts. Second, like Comte, he acknowledged that the only valid guide to objective knowledge was the scientific method. Third, he agreed with Comte that the social sciences could become scientific only when they were stripped of their metaphysical abstractions and philosophical speculation. At the same time, Durkheim believed that Comte was too philosophical in his outlook."
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(ii) A second influence on Durkheim's view of society beyond Comte's positivism was the epistemological outlook called social realism. Although he never explicitly exposed it, Durkheim adopted a realist perspective in order to demonstrate the existence of social realities outside the individual and to show that these realities existed in the form of the objective relations of society. As an epistemology of science, realism can be defined as a perspective that takes as its central point of departure the view that external social realities exist in the outer world and that these realities are independent of the individual's perception of them. This view opposes other predominant philosophical perspectives such as empiricism and positivism. Empiricists such as David Hume had argued that all realities in the outside world are products of human sense perception. According to empiricists, all realities are thus merely perceived: they do not exist independently of our perceptions and have no causal power in themselves. Comte's positivism went a step further by claiming that scientific laws could be deduced from empirical observations. Going beyond this, Durkheim claimed that sociology would not only discover "apparent" laws but would be able to discover the inherent nature of society.

(iii) Scholars also debate the exact influence of Jewish thought on Durkheim's work. The answer remains uncertain; some scholars have argued that Durkheim's thought is a form of secularized Jewish thought, while others argue that proving the existence of a direct influence of Jewish thought on Durkheim's achievements is difficult or impossible.\textsuperscript{254}

(b) \textbf{Establishing Sociology}: “Durkheim authored some of the most programmatic statements on what sociology is and how it should be practiced. His concern was to establish sociology as a science. Arguing for a place for sociology among other sciences he wrote: Sociology is, then, not an auxiliary of any other science; it is itself a distinct and autonomous science. To give sociology a place in the academic world and to ensure that it is a legitimate science, it must have an object that is clear and distinct from philosophy or psychology, and its own methodology. He argued, ‘There is in every society a certain group of phenomena which may be differentiated from .... those studied by the other natural sciences.’ ‘A fundamental aim of sociology is to discover structural “social facts.” Establishment of sociology as an independent, recognized academic discipline is amongst Durkheim's largest and most lasting legacies. Within sociology, his work has significantly influenced structuralism or structural functionalism.”\textsuperscript{255}

(c) \textbf{Methodology}: “In The Rules of Sociological Method (1895), Durkheim expressed his will to establish a method that would guarantee sociology's truly scientific character. One of the questions raised by the author concerns the objectivity of the sociologist: how may one study an object that, from the very beginning, conditions and relates to the observer? According to Durkheim, observation must be as impartial and impersonal as possible, even though a perfectly objective observation in this sense may never be attained. A social fact must always be studied according to its relationship with other social facts, never according to the individual who studies it. Sociology should therefore privilege comparison rather than the study of singular independent facts. Durkheim sought to create one of the first rigorous scientific approaches to social phenomena. Along with Herbert Spencer, he was one of the first people to explain the existence and quality of different parts of a society by reference to what function they served in maintaining the quotidian (i.e. by how they make society work). He also agreed with Spencer's organic analogy, comparing society to a living organism. Thus, his work is sometimes seen as a precursor to functionalism. Durkheim also insisted that society was more than the sum of its parts. Unlike his contemporaries Ferdinand Tönnies and Max Weber, he focused not on what motivates the actions of individuals, but rather on the study of social facts.”\textsuperscript{256}
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(d) **Social Facts**: “A social fact is every way of acting, fixed or not, capable of exercising on the individual an external constraint; or again, every way of acting which is general throughout a given society, while at the same time existing in its own right independent of its individual manifestations. Durkheim’s work revolved around the study of social facts, a term he coined to describe phenomena that have an existence in and of themselves, are not bound to the actions of individuals, but have a coercive influence upon them. Durkheim argued that social facts have, *sui generis*, an independent existence greater and more objective than the actions of the individuals that compose society. Only such social facts can explain the observed social phenomena. Being exterior to the individual person, social facts may thus also exercise coercive power on the various people composing society, as it can sometimes be observed in the case of formal laws and regulations, but also in situations implying the presence of informal rules, such as religious rituals or family norms. Unlike the facts studied in natural sciences, a 'social' fact thus refers to a specific category of phenomena: The determining cause of a social fact must be sought among the antecedent social facts and not among the states of the individual consciousness.”

“Such social facts are endowed with a power of coercion, by reason of which they may control individual behaviors. According to Durkheim, these phenomena cannot be reduced to biological or psychological grounds. Social facts can be material (physical objects) or immaterial (meanings, sentiments, etc.). The latter cannot be seen or touched, but they are external and coercive, and as such, they become real, gain facticity. Physical objects can represent both material and immaterial social facts; for example, a flag is a physical social fact that often has various immaterial social facts (the meaning and importance of the flag) attached to it. Many social facts, however, have no material form. Even the most individualistic or subjective phenomena, such as love, freedom or suicide, would be regarded by Durkheim as objective social facts. Individuals composing society do not directly cause suicide: suicide, as a social fact, exists independently in society, and is caused by other social facts (such as rules governing behavior and group attachment), whether an individual likes it or not. Whether a person leaves a society does not alter the fact that this society will still contain suicides. Suicide, like other immaterial social facts, exists independently of the will of an individual, cannot be eliminated, and is as influential – coercive – as physical laws such as gravity. Sociology’s task thus consists of discovering the qualities and characteristics of such social facts, which can be discovered through a quantitative or experimental approach.”

(e) **Society, collective consciousness and culture**: In *The Division of Labor in Society* (1893), “Durkheim attempted to answer the question of what holds the society together. He assumes that humans are inherently egoistic, but norms, beliefs and values (collective consciousness) form the moral basis of the society, resulting in social integration. Collective consciousness is of key importance to the society, its requisite function without which the society cannot survive. Collective consciousness produces the society and holds it together, and at the same time individuals produce collective consciousness through their interactions. Through collective consciousness human beings become aware of one another as social beings, not just animals…In particular, the emotional part of the collective consciousness overrides our egoism: as we are emotionally bound to culture, we act socially because we recognize it is the responsible, moral way to act. A key to forming society is social interaction, and Durkheim believes that human beings, when in a group, will inevitably act in such a way that a society is formed. The importance of another key social fact: the culture. Groups, when interacting, create their own culture and attach powerful emotions to it. He was one of the first scholars to consider the question of culture so intensely. Durkheim was interested in cultural diversity, and how the existence of diversity nonetheless fails to destroy a society. To that, Durkheim answered that any apparent cultural diversity is overridden by a larger, common, and more generalized cultural system, and the law.”
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“In a socio-evolutionary approach, Durkheim described the evolution of societies from mechanical solidarity to organic solidarity (one rising from mutual need). As the societies become more complex, evolving from mechanical to organic solidarity, the division of labor is counteracting and replacing collective consciousness. In the simpler societies, people are connected to others due to personal ties and traditions; in the larger, modern society they are connected due to increased reliance on others with regard to them performing their specialized tasks needed for the modern, highly complex society to survive. In mechanical solidarity, people are self-sufficient, there is little integration and thus there is the need for use of force and repression to keep society together. Also, in such societies, people have much fewer options in life. In organic solidarity, people are much more integrated and interdependent, and specialization and cooperation are extensive. Progress from mechanical to organic solidarity is based first on population growth and increasing population density, second on increasing morality density (development of more complex social interactions) and thirdly, on the increasing specialization in workplace. One of the ways mechanical and organic societies differ is the function of law: in mechanical society the law is focused on its punitive aspect, and aims to reinforce the cohesion of the community, often by making the punishment public and extreme; whereas in the organic society the law focuses on repairing the damage done and is more focused on individuals than the community.”

“One of the main features of the modern, organic society is the importance, sacredness even, given to the concept – social fact – of the individual. The individual, rather than the collective, becomes the focus of rights and responsibilities, the center of public and private rituals holding the society together – a function once performed by the religion. To stress the importance of this concept, Durkheim talked of the cult of the individual: ‘Thus very far from there being the antagonism between the individual and society which is often claimed, moral individualism, the cult of the individual, is in fact the product of society itself. It is society that instituted it and made of man the god whose servant it is.’ Durkheim saw the population density and growth as key factors in the evolution of the societies and advent of modernity. As the number of people in a given area increase, so does the number of interactions, and the society becomes more complex. Growing competition between the more numerous people also leads to further division of labor. In time, the importance of the state, the law and the individual increases, while that of the religion and moral solidarity decreases. In another example of evolution of culture, Durkheim pointed to fashion, although in this case he noted a more cyclical phenomenon. According to Durkheim, fashion serves to differentiate between lower classes and upper classes, but because lower classes want to look like the upper classes, they will eventually adapt the upper-class fashion, depreciating it, and forcing the upper class to adopt a new fashion.”

(f) Social Pathologies and Crimes: “As the society, Durkheim noted there are several possible pathologies that could lead to a breakdown of social integration and disintegration of the society: the two most important ones are anomie and forced division of labor; lesser ones include the lack of coordination and suicide. By anomie Durkheim means a state when too rapid population growth reduces the amount of interaction between various groups, which in turn leads to a breakdown of understanding (norms, values, and so on). By forced division of labor Durkheim means a situation where power holders, driven by their desire for profit (greed), results in people doing the work they are unsuited for. Such people are unhappy, and their desire to change the system can destabilize the society. Durkheim’s views on crime were a departure from conventional notions. He believed that crime is bound up with the fundamental conditions of all social life and serves a social function. He stated that crime implies, not only that the way remains open to necessary changes but that in certain cases it directly prepares these changes. Examining the trial of Socrates,
he argues that his crime, namely, the independence of his thought, rendered a service not only to humanity but to his country as it served to prepare a new morality and faith that the Athenians needed. As such, his crime was a useful prelude to reforms. In this sense, he saw crime as being able to release certain social tensions and so have a cleansing or purging effect in society. He further stated that the authority which the moral conscience enjoys must not be excessive; otherwise, no-one would dare to criticize it, and it would too easily congeal into an immutable form. To make progress, individual originality must be able to express itself...[even] the originality of the criminal...shall also be possible.”258 “In Suicide (1897), Durkheim explores the differing suicide rates among Protestants and Catholics, arguing that stronger social control among Catholics results in lower suicide rates. According to Durkheim, Catholic society has normal levels of integration while Protestant society has low levels. Overall, Durkheim treated suicide as a social fact, explaining variations in its rate on a macro level, considering society-scale phenomena such as lack of connections between people (group attachment) and lack of regulations of behavior, rather than individuals' feelings and motivations.”259

(g) Religion: “In The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life (1912), Durkheim's first purpose was to identify the social origin and function of religion as he felt that religion was a source of camaraderie and solidarity. His second purpose was to identify links between certain religions in different cultures, finding a common denominator. He wanted to understand the empirical, social aspect of religion that is common to all religions and goes beyond the concepts of spirituality and God. Durkheim defined religion as ‘A religion is a unified system of beliefs and practices relative to sacred things, i.e., things set apart and forbidden - beliefs and practices which unite in one single moral community called a Church, all those who adhere to them’.”

“In this definition, Durkheim avoids references to supernatural or God. Durkheim argued that the concept of supernatural is relatively new, tied to the development of science and separation of supernatural - that which cannot be rationally explained - from natural, that which can. Thus, according to Durkheim, for early humans, everything was supernatural. Similarly, he points out that religions that give little importance to the concept of god exist, such as Buddhism, where the Four Noble Truths are much more important than any individual deity. With that, Durkheim argues, we are left with the following three concepts: the sacred (the ideas that cannot be properly explained, inspire awe and are considered worthy of spiritual respect or devotion), the beliefs and practices (which create highly emotional states - collective effervescence - and invest symbols with sacred importance), and the moral community (a group of people sharing a common moral philosophy). Out of those three concepts, Durkheim focused on the sacred, noting that it is at the very core of a religion. He defined sacred things as: simply collective ideals that have fixed themselves on material objects... they are only collective forces hypothesized, that is to say, moral forces; they are made up of the ideas and sentiments awakened in us by the spectacle of society, and not of sensations coming from the physical world.”

“Durkheim saw religion as the most fundamental social institution of humankind, and one that gave rise to other social forms. It was the religion that gave humanity the strongest sense of collective consciousness. Durkheim saw the religion as a force that emerged in the early hunter and gatherer societies, as the emotions collective effervescence run high in the growing groups, forcing them to act in a new way, and giving them a sense of some hidden force driving them. Over time, as emotions became symbolized and interactions ritualized, religion became more organized, giving a rise to the division between the sacred and the profane. However, Durkheim also believed that religion was becoming less important, as it was being gradually superseded by science and the cult of an individual.”260
Sociology and Philosophy: “While Durkheim's work deals with a number of subjects, including suicide, the family, social structures, and social institutions, a large part of his work deals with the sociology of knowledge. While publishing short articles on the subject earlier in his career, Durkheim's definitive statement concerning the sociology of knowledge comes in his 1912 magnum opus The Elementary Forms of Religious Life. This book has as its goal not only the elucidation of the social origins and function of religion, but also the social origins and impact of society on language and logical thought. Durkheim worked largely out of a Kantian framework and sought to understand how the concepts and categories of logical thought could arise out of social life. He argued, for example, that the categories of space and time were not a priori. Rather, the category of space depends on a society's social grouping and geographical use of space, and a group's social rhythm that determines our understanding of time. In this Durkheim sought to combine elements of rationalism and empiricism, arguing that certain aspects of logical thought common to all humans did exist, but that they were products of collective life, and that they were not universal a priori's since the content of the categories differed from society to society.

Another key element to Durkheim's theory of knowledge is his concept of collective representations, which is outlined in The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life. Collective representations are the symbols and images that come to represent the ideas, beliefs, and values elaborated by a collectivity and are not reducible to individual constituents. They can include words, slogans, ideas, or any number of material items that can serve as a symbol, such as a cross, a rock, a temple, a feather etc. As Durkheim elaborates, collective representations are created through intense social interaction and are products of collective activity. As such these representations have the particular, and somewhat contradictory, aspect that they exist externally to the individual (since they are created and controlled not by the individual but by society as a whole), and yet simultaneously within each individual of the society (by virtue of that individual's participation within society). Arguably the most important représentation collective is language, which according to Durkheim is a product of collective action. And because language is a collective action, language contains within it a history of accumulated knowledge and experience that no individual would be capable of creating on their own. As Durkheim says, 'représentations collectives', and language in particular: add to that which we can learn by our own personal experience all that wisdom and science which the group has accumulated in the course of centuries. Thinking by concepts, is not merely seeing reality on its most general side, but it is projecting a light upon the sensation which illuminates it, penetrates it and transforms it. As such, language, as a social product, literally structures and shapes our experience of reality. This discursive approach to language and society would be developed by later French philosophers.

Morality: “Durkheim defines morality as a system of rules for conduct. His analysis of morality is strongly marked by Immanuel Kant and his notion of duty. While Durkheim was influenced by Kant, he was highly critical of aspects of the latter's moral theory and developed his own positions. Durkheim agrees with Kant that within morality, there is an element of obligation, a moral authority which, by manifesting itself in certain precepts particularly important to it, confers upon [moral rules] an obligatory character. Morality tells us how to act from a position of superiority. There exists a certain, pre-established moral norm to which we must conform. It is through this view that Durkheim makes a first critique of Kant in saying that moral duties originate in society and are not to be found in some universal moral concept such as the categorical imperative. Durkheim also argues that morality is characterized not just by this obligation but is also something that is desired by the individual. The individual believes that by adhering to morality, they are serving the common Good, and for this reason, the individual submits voluntarily to the moral commandment.”
Antoine Augustin Cournot (1801-77): As French economist and mathematician, “Cournot was the first economist who, with competent knowledge of both subjects, endeavored to apply mathematics to the treatment of economics. His main work in economics is *Researches into the Mathematical Principles of the Theory of Wealth* (1838). His primary concern was the analysis of partial market equilibrium, which he based on the assumption that participants in the process of exchange are either producers or merchants whose goal is the maximization of profit. He therefore ignored the concept of utility. His most important contributions were his discussions of supply-and-demand functions and of the establishment of equilibrium under conditions of monopoly, duopoly, and perfect competition; his analysis of the shifting of taxes, which he treated as changes in the cost of production; and his discussion of problems of international trade. Cournot was the first economist to define and draw a demand curve to illustrate the relationship between price of and demand for a given item. He proceeded to show that the profit-maximizing output for a producer is reached when the marginal cost (the cost of producing one additional unit) equals the marginal revenue (the revenue realized from selling one additional unit). This work was lost until its rediscovery by Joan Robinson almost a century later. Moreover, Cournot introduced the idea of elasticity of demand, though he did not use that phrase.”

“Cournot was not at all the man to think that philosophy could profitably pursue an isolated path of its own, without reference to the development of the sciences. Philosophy without science soon loses sight of our real relations with the Universe. Philosophy needs to feed, so to speak, on science. At the same time Cournot resolutely refused to regard philosophy either as a particular science or as a synthesis of the sciences. In his view science and philosophy were interrelated in a variety of ways; they were nonetheless distinguishable. And because they were distinct lines of inquiry, there was no good relation for thinking that the progress of science entailed the gradual disappearance of philosophy. While recognizing that innumerable meanings have been given to the term philosophy in popular usage and by philosophers themselves, Cournot regards philosophy as having two essential functions, on the one hand the study and investigation of the reason of things and, on the other hand, the study of the forms of thought and of the general laws and processes of the human mind. By the reason of things Cournot means, in general, rational or intelligible interconnection; and he makes a distinction between reason and cause.”

Consider, example, the Russian Revolution. Obviously, a multitude of causal actions were involved. But to understand the Russian revolution we have to find an intelligible structure connecting all these causes and events. And if we decide that the reason for the revolution was the unyielding autocratic constitution or regime, we are not talking about an efficient cause in the sense in which, for instance, a certain action by one man is the efficient cause of injury to other. The reason explains the series of causes. It answers the question why did these events take place? The reason of things is thus akin to Leibniz’s sufficient reason, though Cournot, who greatly admired Leibniz, remarks that the word sufficient is superfluous. An insufficient reason would not be the reason of things.” Subjective reason can reflect on its own activity, but subjective reason seeks to grasp the objective reason to the evaluation of certain regulative and fundamental ideas. “In fact, reason is guided by the idea of the perfection of order, inasmuch as it compares possible arrangements of phenomena and prefers that which best satisfies its idea of what constitutes order. At the same time, the mind does not simply impose order on phenomena: it discovers it. And it is in the light of such discovery that reason can evaluate its own regulative idea. Cournot likes...the effect that only reason can introduce order into things, and that order can be understood only by reason. When the two sides, the subjective and the objective, are in accord, there is knowledge.”
“According to Cournot, reason seeks and finds order in the world, even if its knowledge of the order or reason of things is not absolute. Cournot’s world however also contains fortuitous events, the result of the operation of chance. And this idea needs some explanation. By a chance event Cournot does not mean a rare or surprising event. It might of course be rare or surprising, but these characteristics are not included in the meaning of the term. Nor does Cournot means a causeless event. Everything that we call an event must have a cause. A chance event is on which is brought about by the conjunction of other events which belong to independent series.” He gave a simple example of the railway accident that occurred unexpectedly, in order to explain that accidental chance is an objective or real feature of the world. In other words, for Cournot, “contingency is a metaphysical reality, in the sense that there is in the universe an irreducible element of indeterminacy. Not even in principle could estimation of the probability of possible events in the future be converted into complete objective certitude.”

Though Cournot argues that there are certain basic concepts, he also insists that actual examination of and reflection on the sciences show us that different sciences have to introduce different basic concepts. “It is therefore impossible to reduce all sciences to one science, such as physics…This concept and its implications are not indeed altogether clear. We cannot suppose that life precedes organic structure and produces it. But neither can we suppose that organic-structure precede life. We have to assume that in organic and living beings organic structure and life play simultaneously the roles of cause and effect through a reciprocity of relations, which is sui generis. And though a term such as vital or plastic force does not give the mind an idea which can be clearly defined, it expresses a recognition of the irreducibility of the living to the non-living. This irreducibility implies “that in the process of evolution there is emergence of what is new, of what cannot be described simply in terms of that out of which it emerges. It does not follow however that evolution is for Cournot a continuous process, in the sense that it takes the form of a linear series of ascending levels of perfection. In Cournot’s view evolution takes the form of distinct creative impulses or movements, in accordance with a kind of rhythm of relative activity and rest…We have seen that for him the concept of order which regulates the mind’s inquiries is not simply a subjective form of thought which reason imposes on phenomenal but also represents what the mind discovers. Both order and chance are real factors in the universe. And reason is justified in extending the concept of order into the sphere of trans-rationalism, provided that it is not used in such a way as to be incompatible with the idea of chance. In Cournot’s view the reality of chance is not in conflict with the generally accepted idea of a supreme and providential direction, not at any rate if we avoid implying that all events are caused by God.”

“Cournot’s positive contribution to philosophical thought consists primarily in his critical inquiry into basic concepts, whether whose which he regards as common to the sciences or those which particular sciences find it necessary to introduce if they are to develop and to handle their subject-matter satisfactorily. It is this aspect of his thought which justifies treatment of it under the general heading of critical philosophy or neo-criticism. But though he approaches this theme through an inquiry into the sciences, we have seen that he insists on the distinction between science and philosophy. For one thing, the intuitions of the philosophers precede the organization of positive science. For another thing, the mind can let itself be guided by the presentiment of a perfection and harmony in the works of nature which is superior to anything discovered by the sciences. The mind can thus pass into the field of speculative philosophy, a field in which it crosses the boundaries of formal demonstration and of scientific testing and in which it has to rely on philosophical probability which is not amenable to mathematical treatment. This field of trans-rationalism is not excluded by science; and though it goes beyond science, we have to remember that scientific hypotheses themselves cannot be more than probably true.”
Charles Bernard Renouvier (1815-1903): “French neocritical idealist philosopher who rejected all necessary connection between universal laws and morality. Never an academic, Renouvier wrote prolifically and with great influence. He accepted Kant’s critical philosophy as a starting point but drew vastly different conclusions. He held, for example, that phenomena are appearances of themselves only, not of things in themselves that lie beyond or beneath appearances. Since relationship pervades all categories of knowledge, each phenomenon is apprehended in relation to other phenomena. Renouvier’s background in mathematics (Polytechnic School, 1834–36) prompted his law of numbers. He saw each number as unique, distinctly itself, irreducible, but related to all other numbers. By applying this principle of uniqueness to human beings, he thereby precluded their absorption into a group consciousness or absolute mind. Having rejected the notion of infinite numbers, he moved on to a denial of all infinity, including infinity of space and time. He viewed God not as a substance or an absolute but as the moral order itself, capable of limitless perfection. Renouvier identified human individuality with self-determination and free will, necessary postulates for morality and certitude in knowing.”

(a) Neocriticism: “Renouvier's general position is called neocriticism, because it took the method of Immanuel Kant's critical philosophy as its starting point. But though Renouvier started with Kant's method, he did not accept Kant's conclusions but used them rather as a basis from which to launch a set of ideas often critical of Kant. Renouvier laid down as an integral part of his philosophy what he called the law of numbers, according to which every cardinal number is an ultimate individual, finite and irreducible. Mathematics is the paradigm of thinking, and the law of contradiction is more clearly manifested in mathematical operations than anywhere else. But the term mathematics, as Renouvier used it, was restricted to arithmetic, and he derived the nature of numbers exclusively from the cardinal numbers. This led him to deny the existence of any infinite, for he maintained…that an infinite number was a contradiction in terms. Renouvier extended his criticism of the notion of infinity beyond numbers to deny the infinity of space and time as well. Renouvier recognized that knowledge is relative to its premises and to the person who laid down the premises; nevertheless, he could not accept the relativity of logical processes. There is a distinction involved here between logic and the psychology of thought. Just as each number is a distinct and separate entity, so is each human being. And just as the characteristics of each number - duality, triplicity, and so on - can never be reduced to, or reconciled with, the characteristics of any other number, so each human being is not exactly like any other and cannot be merged into a general group-consciousness or absorbed into an absolute mind. Knowledge is always the property of individual knowers, and the distinction between knowledge and belief disappears. What an individual knows is what seems reasonable to him, and his contribution to knowledge can never be subtracted. The subtraction can be made verbally, to be sure, but to do so is to alter the character of cognition, which is essentially judgment.”

(b) Phenomena: Renouvier also differed from Kant in his doctrine of phenomena. Phenomena are not the appearances of anything other than themselves. “They are neither illusions nor purely subjective beings. They are sui generis, being whatever, we perceive or whatever we make judgments about. He granted that the name is unfortunate except insofar as it indicates appearances. Because there are no things-in-themselves, Renouvier criticized Kant's antinomies, which hold good only if there are noumena. His attack on the first antinomy, for example, was based on its use of the concept of infinity. Since infinity is an inherently inconsistent idea, Renouvier asserted that the world must have had a beginning in time and that space is limited. The domination of the number concept as a conceptual model appears here in full force. For Renouvier, the numbers begin with one, since zero and negative numbers are not really numbers, and spaces are the spaces of individual discrete beings, there being no such entity as number-in-itself or space-in-itself.”
There exists within the number series the category of relation. For the numbers are ordered, and order is a kind of relation. All other categories are, for Renouvier, forms of relation, but of relation as discovered within the framework of an individual's consciousness. There turn out to be nine categories—relation, number, position, succession, quality, becoming, causality, purposiveness, and personality. Each has its thesis, antithesis, and synthesis; and all are rooted in the phenomenal world as judged by us. It is uncertain whether Renouvier attempted to derive his categories in the manner of Maine de Biran from personality—our acting as a cause, our seeking ends, our sensory discriminations (which might produce the separateness of quantity and quality), spatial positions, moments in time, and the intervals between them—or whether his assertion that personality is one of the categories is derived from his premise of the law of numbers. In any event, just as each number has its own distinctive quality, its own position in the numeral order, and its many relations to other numbers, determined not only by its own character but also by that of the other numbers, so the human being has his own personality and displays the other categories not only as a distinct entity but also as a perceptive consciousness. “The parallelism between the ways in which a man judges, perceives, and knows and the ways in which he as a person differs from other beings pervades Renouvier's writings. Thus, because one acts to achieve one's purposes, it follows that both causality and purposiveness exist within the human being and must likewise be combined in the phenomenal world. A cause determines the path of an event, but the direction of that event is determined by that which participates in it. Since no two events are exactly alike, the deterministic factor in nature is mitigated by chance. Renouvier probably got this argument from Cournot, who also insisted upon the probabilistic element in nature. To frame a law or a generalized description depends upon our ability to discover absolutely homogeneous phenomena or groups of phenomena. If this is impossible, then generalizations are at most only probable. But at the same time, each individual phenomenon contributes something to the events of which it is a part, and that contribution in the very nature of things cannot be predicted.”

(c) **Indeterminism**: “The problem of causation arises with regard to human beings in the form of the antithesis between free will and determinism. Since every act of consciousness is a relation between a perceiving subject and that which is perceptible, then as soon as a conscious act is formulated and made clear to the perceiving mind, it will be organized in terms of the categories. But there is a choice among the various categories to be applied, for we are not forced either to quantify or qualify, to count or to locate, to assign a date or to recognize a cause. The categories limit the possibilities of judgment but have no inherent order of predominance….The order of judgment is determined by us, and we are free, within the range of possible categories, to judge it as we will. The selection of a category or group of categories depends on our free choice in accordance with our interests at the moment of judging. Freedom cannot be proved, nor can determinism. Both are assumptions utilized in view of their consequences...But freedom itself rests upon the inherent individuality of the human will, an individuality which cannot be completely absorbed into any larger class of beings. Insofar as any being is unique, to that extent it is undetermined or self-determined. And insofar as it is identical with other beings, to that extent the homogeneity of its class accounts for the regularity of its behavior. In short, individuality and freedom are synonymous terms, and Renouvier even called freedom the principle of individuation. The consequence is that just as the personal equation enters into all judgments, so the only certainty we have is the certainty of our judgments. Renouvier put it as follows: Certitude is not and cannot be absolute. It is a condition and act of man—not an act and a condition in which he grasps immediately that which could not be immediate, i.e., facts and laws external and superior to present experience, but rather one in which he posits his awareness as it exists and as he maintains it. Strictly speaking, there is no certitude; there are only men who are certain.”
Chapter III. History of Philosophy

“But indeterminism is not limited to human judgments. It extends also to history. For since history is in part made up of human behavior, human decisions must be included in its scope, and there is no way of eliminating them. One can, of course, describe the environment of human life, its stability, and its mutability; but if it remains stable, that is because human beings have not changed it, and if it changes, that is due to human acts as much as to natural disasters. People modify their living conditions, not as a group acting as one person, but as a collection of individuals. Their reasons for doing so may vary, as is inevitable, and of course they are not able to modify their conditions completely. But Renouvier emphasized the importance of human decisions for the way in which individuals will live, since the ability of human beings to make choices makes it impossible to lay down either a law of universal progress toward the good or one of constant degeneration. Hence Renouvier rejected historical laws, such as those of Comte and G. W. F. Hegel, though he was attracted to meliorism. But indeterminism is not limited to human judgments. It extends also to history. For since history is in part made up of human behavior, human decisions must be included in its scope, and there is no way of eliminating them. One can, of course, describe the environment of human life, its stability, and its mutability; but if it remains stable, that is because human beings have not changed it, and if it changes, that is due to human acts as much as to natural disasters. People modify their living conditions, not as a group acting as one person, but as a collection of individuals. Their reasons for doing so may vary, as is inevitable, and of course they are not able to modify their conditions completely. But Renouvier emphasized the importance of human decisions for the way in which individuals will live, since the ability of human beings to make choices makes it impossible to lay down either a law of universal progress toward the good or one of constant degeneration. Hence Renouvier rejected historical laws, such as those of Comte and G. W. F. Hegel.”

(d) Ethics: “People make moral judgments and act so as to achieve what they believe to be right. Morals, then, are not the result of history, though what happens in history reflects our moral judgments. Morals are rather the source of historical changes, and if we are to appraise historical events, we shall have to do so in moral terms. This clearly requires a definition of good and evil, and in view of the radical individualism of Renouvier this might seem an insurmountable task. But he identified evil with conflict, conflict both between persons and between groups of persons. For warfare is in essence the prevention by one or more persons of the fulfillment of the volitions of others. Hence tyranny, slavery, and conquest are to be condemned. This assumes that it is possible for a group of enlightened people to respect the individuality of their fellows and for all to live in peace... Renouvier claimed that the secret of human happiness lies in our recognition of the individual's freedom. If at any epoch people had accepted individual freedom wholeheartedly, he argued, universal peace and harmony would have prevailed. Religious, economic, and national wars would have ended at once; for everyone would have taken it for granted that each person has a right to his own religious views, to the satisfaction of his own economic interests, and to his own national loyalties. Renouvier held that education alone could bring this about, though he had no illusions that proper education was ever likely to be instituted. The dogma of historical determinism has had too firm a hold on human will power and has brought about acquiescence, sloth, injustice, and ignorance... Their belief in freedom leads individuals to act for what they judge to be better, and their rationality guides them in their choice of ends. To act morally is to act rationally. By doing so we rise above the beasts; we recognize the humanity in our fellows and respect it. For this reason, Renouvier became a bitter opponent of the Catholic Church and of monarchy and urged his readers to turn to Protestantism as the religion of individual conscience. To him Protestantism was the religion of a personal God - not an absolute and unchanging Being, omniscient and omnipotent, but finite, limited, free, and the guarantor of our freedom.”
Octave Hamelin (1856-1907) was a French philosopher. He taught as a professor at the University of Bordeaux (1884-) and the University of Sorbonne (1905-). Hamelin was a close friend of the sociologist Émile Durkheim, with whom he shared an interest in the French philosopher Charles Renouvier. He is also known as a translator of classical Greek philosophers.

Renouvier attempted a dialectical deduction of the categories. In Hamelin’s opinion, however Renouvier’s procedure was insufficiently systematic. “Hamelin begin with the category of relation, which he tries to establish in this way. It is a primitive fact of thought that everything posited excludes an opposite, that every thesis leaves outside itself an antithesis, and that the two opposed factors have meaning only in so far as they are mutually exclusive. To this primitive fact however we must add another which completes it. As the opposed factors receive their meaning precisely through their mutual opposition, they form two parts of one whole. This synthesis is a relation. Thesis, antithesis and synthesis, here is the simplest law of things in its three phases. We shall call it by the single word relation.” Having established the basic category of relation, “Hamelin proceeds to deduce that of number. In what he describes as relation the two opposed factors, the thesis and anti-thesis, exist in mutual opposition. It can therefore be said that the one needs the other in order to exist. At the same time the inability of the one to exist without the other implies that in some way the one must exist without the other, in the manner, that is to say, which is compatible with, or indeed necessitated by, their mutual opposition. And number is the relation in which one posits that the one is without the other.”

“Hamelin’s approach to the deduction of the categories is, as he intended, much more a priori and rationalistic than Recouvier’s. And the influence of German idealism is clear. Hamelin presents us with a series of categories which are supposed to constitute a complete and self-contained system in which, in a real sense, beginning and end coincide. The two extremes of the hierarchy are doubtless demonstrated the one by the other, but not in the same manner. The more simple derives from the more complex by a series of analyses: the more complex super-imposes itself necessarily on the more simple by a series of syntheses. In other words, it is possible to start with self-consciousness or personality and proceed backwards, so to speak, by a more simple and abstract. And it is also possible to start with the most abstract and simple category and let the system develop itself towards the more complex and concrete through the dialectical process of thesis, antithesis and synthesis.”

The question arises whether Hamelin regards himself as concerned simply with the deduction of human forms of representation, with human way of conceiving things-in-themselves which are independent of consciousness. The answer is in the negative. The thing-in-itself can only be a fiction, because the idea of it is self-contradictory. The non-ego exists only in relations to the ego, for consciousness that is to say. If it seems to follow from this view that the world consists of relations, this does not deter Hamelin. The world is a hierarchy of relations…it is constituted not of things but of relations. Representation is not a mirror. It does not reflect an object and a subject which should exist without it; it is object and subject, it is reality itself. Representation is being and being is representation. In other words, mind or spirit is the Absolute. This last term would indeed be inappropriate, if it were understood as referring to an ultimate reality beyond all relations. But if y absolute one understands that which contains in itself all relations, we must say the Mind is the absolute. Hamelin does not of course intend to assert that the whole world is the content of my consciousness, in the sense that it exists solely in relation to myself as this particular subject. Some might wish to argue that from a logical point of view idealism of this kind cannot avoid solipsism. For him the subject-object relation falls within the Absolute. What he is claiming is that reality is the dialectical unfolding of thought or consciousness through a hierarchy of grades…Hamelin denies that consciousness must always mean clear consciousness.”
Leon Brunschvicg (1869-1944) was a French idealist philosopher. “From 1895–1900 he taught at the Lycée Pierre Corneille in Rouen. In 1897 he completed his thesis under the title La Modalité du jugement (The Modalities of Judgement). In 1909 he became professor of philosophy at the Sorbonne. He was married to Cécile Kahn, a major campaigner for women's suffrage in France, with whom he had four children. Forced to leave his position at the Sorbonne by the Nazis, Brunschvicg fled to the south of France, where he died at the age of 74. While in hiding, he wrote studies of Montaigne, Descartes, and Pascal that were printed in Switzerland. He composed a manual of philosophy dedicated to his teenage granddaughter entitled Héritage de Mots, Héritage d'Idées (Legacy of Words, Legacy of Ideas) which was published posthumously after the liberation of France. His reinterpretation of Descartes has become the foundation for a new idealism.”

“This idealism had already taken form in La modalité du jugement. Judgment is an action that defines the mind. Far from finding the concept already present, as an image or a quasi-thing - in any event, as a datum - as is supposed by conceptualists, especially Aristotle, the mind creates the concept through syntheses that form the basis of analysis. At times judgment asserts an intrinsic relationship between ideas, and it must then be classified at the level of necessity, in the modality of interiority. At times it repeatedly asserts a being as an externality, and then it must be classified at the level of the real, in the modality of exteriority. Finally, at times, knowing that it does not produce sensation, judgment discovers that it alone can produce at least all intelligible reality, and it must then be classified at the level of the possible in a mixed modality. This means that in the immanence of the mind, the only valuable knowledge is that which unites the interiority of thought with the exteriority of experience. Going from theory to practice, judgment again turns to necessity when the activity of the mind includes the conditions of its satisfaction, to reality when it does not include them, and to possibility when it feels in harmony with the external world.”

“Of all the mind’s works, is not science, especially mathematics, the best expression of its rationality? Consequently, Brunschvicg began by following the developments of mathematical philosophy in Les étapes de la philosophie mathématique. This was not the history of mathematics, but the underlining of its essential innovations: (1) Pythagorean dogmatism, which was shattered by the discovery of irrationals; (2) with Plato, the consciousness of operative dynamism; (3) with Aristotle, the appearance of formal logic; (4) the sinking of mathematics in the Middle Ages into syllogistic deduction; (5) the renaissance of Platonism with Descartes and the invention of analytical geometry; (6) the crisis brought about by infinitesimal calculus; (7) the revolution brought on by non-Euclidean geometries, symbolic logic, renewed intuitionism, and relativity.

“L’expérience humaine et la causalité physique redisovers, throughout the history of the accepted concepts of nature, the stages corresponding to those of mathematical philosophy, from the most primitive to the most recent, proceeding through Platonism, Aristotelianism, Scholasticism, Cartesian mechanism, and Hegelianism. “There is only one Universe” should be the only correct statement concerning causality for anyone who would defend the value of rational experience against the scorn of empiricism; the constantly unforeseen progress, always free and yet always linked, of physics. Once more the thesis of critical idealism is confirmed.

The lesson drawn from the history of science in Les étapes and L’expérience humaine, and from the studies on Pascal, Spinoza, and Descartes, was completed by the history of philosophy in Brunschvicg’s third masterwork, Le progrès de la conscience dans la philosophie occidentale. Raymond Aron has shown how Brunschvicg, by depending on science without falling into positivism, by turning to historical development without losing timelessness, reached an ethics of creative man, free and rational - man at his highest, “equal to his own idea of himself. Brunschvicg’s influence is easily recognized in all types of thinkers: such moralists as René Le Senne and Georges Bastide, such aestheticians as Joseph Segond and Valentin Feldmann…”
5-3. The Spiritualist Movement in Philosophy

“In philosophy, spiritualism is the notion, shared by a wide variety of systems of thought, that there is an immaterial reality that cannot be perceived by the senses. This includes philosophies that postulate a personal God, the immortality of the soul, or the immortality of the intellect or will, as well as any systems of thought that assume a universal mind or cosmic forces lying beyond the reach of purely materialistic interpretations. Generally, any philosophical position, be it dualism, monism, atheism, theism, pantheism, idealism or any other, is compatible with spiritualism as long as it allows for a reality beyond matter. Theism is an example of a dualist spiritualist philosophy, while pantheism is an example of monist spiritualism.”

Felix Ravaisson-Mollien (1813-1900): “Ravaisson was born at Namur. After a successful course of study at the Collège Rollin, he went to Munich in autumn 1839, where he attended the lectures of Schelling, and took his degree in philosophy in 1836. In the following year he published the first volume of his famous work *Essay on the Metaphysics of Aristotle*, to which in 1846 he added a supplementary volume. This work not only criticizes and comments on the theories of Aristotle and the Peripatetics, but also develops from them a modern philosophical system. In 1838 he received his doctorate, his thesis entitled *On Habit*, which was to become a classic text (a metaphysical poem on nature in general apprehended through an intuitive analysis of acquired habit as a particular manifestation of its essential being, much admired by Bergson and Heidegger), and became professor of philosophy at Rennes. From 1840 he was inspector-general of public libraries, and in 1860 became inspector-general in the department of higher education. He was also a member of the Academy of Moral and Political Sciences, and curator of the Department of Antiquities at the Louvre (from 1870). He died in Paris. In philosophy, he was one of the schools of Victor Cousin, with whom he was at issue in many important points. The act of consciousness, according to him, is the basis of all knowledge. Acts of consciousness are manifestations of will, which is the motive and creative power of the intellectual life. The idea of God is a cumulative intuition given by all the various faculties of the mind, in its observation of harmony in nature and in man. This theory had considerable influence on speculative philosophy in France.”

In his *Rapport sur la philosophie en France au XIXe siècle* (1867) published by the request of the imperial government, Ravaisson was “to show that there was a continuity in the French philosophical tradition and that French philosophers had always presupposed metaphysical principles that implied what he called spiritualism. This tradition, he maintained, always swung between sensationalism, phenomenalism, and materialism, on the one hand, and idealism, on the other. But spiritualism really began in the nineteenth century with Maine de Biran, who used as his starting point the human will and who held that the will is independent both of sensations and of ideas. This viewpoint, Ravaisson argued, was not only the proper beginning of a philosophy but also the only one that could unify the opposing tendencies of empiricism and idealism. Such a conclusion was in clear contradiction to the tenets of Cousin’s eclecticism, which aspired to fuse the best in each philosopher. Ravaisson tried to show that such a fusion in reality consists in refuting those philosophies which displease the eclectic and retaining those which please him. In classifying all philosophies under the headings of sensualism, idealism, mysticism, and skepticism, Cousin accepted only that philosophy which he called idealism but which, said Ravaisson, was really a simple mixture of the Scottish philosophy of common sense with a few ideas from Maine de Biran. The eclectics, moreover, failed to understand these ideas. Ravaisson claimed for himself the credit of introducing the true thought of Maine de Biran to his contemporaries.” This informed that philosophy of the French universities was not only a foreign importation but also untrue.
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“Ravaisson was not satisfied with undermining eclecticism. He also felt it important to point out the weaknesses of positivism. These weaknesses, he claimed, arose from the identification of philosophical method with the methods of science. Science, which admittedly studies the external world, can never tell us anything about the internal world of thoughts, aspirations, desires, and dreams; and when it attempts to do so, it transforms them into quasi-external objects. This inevitably leads to materialism, for the laws of matter are the only laws that science can formulate. Science’s basic categories are space and quantity, and its basic method is analysis. But the phenomena of consciousness are never spatial or quantitative, and to attempt to categorize them in these terms is to change their essential nature.” His report reviewed all the contemporary schools of thought and all the contemporary philosophers. It was a thorough investigation and has become the primary source of information about individuals…It did not stop at professional philosophers but looked into the presuppositions of scientists, such as the physiologist Claude Bernard and the psychiatrist Albert Lemoine. In every case, Ravaisson found either too strong an emphasis on the dependence of the spirit upon material causes or an identification of ideas with strictly logical, hence analytical, reason. Whereas one set of philosophers tried to explain the mind in terms that were inappropriate, the other failed to ask the central question of why the mind operated as it did.”

His De l’habitude is devoted to a special topic; but his treatment of the theme exhibits a general philosophical outlook. According to him, in habit voluntary movement is transformed into instinctive movement, the conscious tending to become unconscious. “Inhabit the spontaneous activity of life submits, as it were, to its material conditions, to the sphere of mechanism, and in so doing provides a basis for the further activity of will, of the voluntary movement and effort of which, as Maine de Biran argued, we are conscious in ourselves. This can be seen in the formation of physical habits, which form the foundation and background of purposeful action…More generally, Ravaisson sees in the world two basic factors, space as the condition of performance or stability, time as the condition of change…The former is the sphere of necessity and mechanism, the latter of the spontaneous activity which is manifested in living organisms and which in man rises to the level of freedom of the understanding. The point of intersection between the two spheres is habit, which combines in itself the mechanism of matter and the dynamic finality of life. If, however, habit presuppose voluntary movement and effort and is…intelligence which has gone to sleep or has entered an infra-conscious state, and if it provides the basis for further activity by the will, this shows the priority, from the finalistic point of view, of the upward movement of life. Between the lower limit of Nature and the highest point of reflective freedom there is an infinity of degrees which measure the development of one and the same power. Habit re-descends the line of descent and can be described as an intuition in which the real and the ideal are one.”

Ravaisson combines the psychology of Maine de Biran with the metaphysics of Schelling, “whereas in the discourse to which reference has been made above Bergson remarks that Schelling’s influence on Ravaisson should not be exaggerated and that the vision of the universe as the manifestation of an ultimate reality which gives of itself in liberality was to be found among the German philosophers. Bergson prefers to emphasize the influence of the development of biological studies…Though however there is doubtless a good deal of truth in what Bergson says, the influence of Schelling cannot be discounted. Ravaisson’s view of Nature clearly has some affinity with Schelling’s picture of Nature as slumbering spirit, even if in his Report he refers more to contemporary psychological ideas and theories. Further, Ravaisson’s tendency to regard creation as a kind of cosmic Fall and his emphasis on the idea of a return to God justifies reference to the influence of the German philosopher. In any case we can see in Ravaisson’s distinction between the activity of the analytic intelligence on the one hand and, on the other, an intuitive grasp of the movement of life an anticipation of central themes in the philosophy of Bergson.”
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Jules Lachelier (1832-1918): “Jules Lachelier, the French idealist, was born at Fontainebleau and studied at the École Normale Supérieure in Paris. He received his docteur ès lettres in 1871 and held various professorial and administrative positions in the French educational system until his retirement from the post of inspecteur général in 1900. Lachelier joined with his teacher Jean Gaspard Félix Ravaissin-Mollien in founding the neo-spiritualist movement in French philosophy, a movement opposed to what seemed to be the naive acceptance of science and the scientific attitude in all phases of life...Lachelier advanced a number of skeptical arguments that tend to reduce objects to phenomena, phenomena to sensations, and, more generally, to resolve the external world into thought. Nevertheless, he retained the conviction that we live in a common, objective world. Accordingly, his philosophy is directed toward the conclusion that the objectivity of our knowledge and experience is derived from mind.”

In 1871 he published a work on induction, Du fondement de l'induction, which was his French thesis for the doctorate, the Latin thesis being on the syllogism. He also published a number of essays, the best known of which deal with psychology and metaphysics (Psychologie et metaphysique, 1885) and with Pascal’s wager (Notes sur le pari de Pascal, 1901). But his Works, which include interventions during discussions at the French Society of Philosophy and annotations on draft entries for Lalande’s Vocabulaire, from only two modest volumes. When Lachelier retired from the Ecole Normale in 1875, he was appointed inspector of the Academy of Paris; and in 1879 he became inspector general of public education. In 1896 he was elected a member of the Academy of Moral and Political Science.

In general, deductive reasoning is a basic form of valid reasoning. Deductive reasoning, or deduction, starts out with a general statement, or hypothesis, and examines the possibilities to reach a specific, logical conclusion. Syllogisms are considered a good way to test deductive reasoning to make sure the argument is valid. However, inductive reasoning is the opposite of deductive reasoning. It makes broad generalizations from specific observations. Basically, there is data, then conclusions are drawn from the data. In inductive inference, we go from the specific to the general. We make many observations, discern a pattern, make a generalization, and infer an explanation or a theory. In science, there is a constant interplay between inductive inference (based on observations) and deductive inference (based on theory), until we get closer and closer to the truth, which we can only approach but not ascertain with complete certainty.

“To avoid the pitfalls of both the empiricism and the spiritualism of his day, Lachelier attempted to provide a basis for induction in a philosophy of nature. His procedure consisted of a Kantian reflection upon the necessary conditions for the existence of the world as we know it. He began by observing that, if knowledge is to be possible, sensations must exhibit the same unities that are found in phenomena. By eliminating competing hypotheses, he found that the unifying element within any phenomenon, as well as the unifying element among phenomena, is established by the necessary relations operative in them and is expressed by the law of efficient causes. The necessity of this law cannot be discovered in sensations alone, in phenomena as such, or in their mere juxtaposition; nor can it be isolated in any locus from which mind is separated. It must be regarded, rather, as a kind of unconscious but logical thought diffused throughout nature. The mechanical linkages among events in nature reflect the logical relations in thought. Lachelier concluded that the unity of thought and the formal unity of nature are inverses of each other. Given a series of phenomena, the law of efficient cause is sufficient to account for their organization in a mechanically interrelated series. But the questions remain: Why do whole phenomena occur? How are several series of mechanically ordered individual phenomenal objects coordinated into groups in order to form complex and recurrent phenomena? The question of recurrence involves the problem of induction and indicates that some principle - in addition to the law of efficient causes - must be found to explain the recurrence of phenomena. If we are neither to stretch the
principle of efficient causes beyond reasonable bounds nor to supplement it with some occult principle ex machina, then we must suppose that the whole phenomenon...contains the reasons for its unity and recurrence. Lachelier, like Immanuel Kant, recognized a whole to be an end when the whole contained the reason for the organization of its parts. 284

“Thus, in view of the fact that we indisputably are aware of phenomena which are harmonious and recurring complexes or wholes of this sort, Lachelier arrived at a second principle: The law of final causes. By its operation, sensa are grouped into perceptions of which we are actually aware, and thus they provide content and reality for the necessary but empty form of the universal mechanism. This law is to the matter of phenomena what the law of efficient causes is to their form. In these terms the distinction is drawn between the abstract existence of mechanical nature and the concrete existence of teleo-logically unified but contingent individuals. Since all actual objects are complex, they all presuppose the operation of the law of final causes. This law is, then, prior to the law of efficient causes in respect to actual existence. These two laws are not on the same logical footing. Lachelier regards the law of efficient causes as proved. The proof is of the Kantian type. Given coherent experiences, this law, which is logic projected into phenomena, expresses the condition under which they cohere and are intelligible. The law of final causes, however, is not reached in the same way. Presumably, simple phenomena might remain logically ordered while being grouped in different ways. Their actual grouping into the harmonious and persistent unities that we experience is the consequence of a law which operates more like an act of will than like a formal or logical requirement. Thus...The twin laws of efficient and final causes provide the foundation for induction. Induction is thereby founded in the sense that it is partly proved or derived from the conditions for experience and partly justified as expressing a teleology of nature. The practice of induction, therefore, may be expected to be partly the logical deduction of events from previous events, and partly a divining that natural phenomena will cooperate with each other in a given way under given circumstances.” 285

“This foundation, however, is not ultimate. It does not explain why these two laws alone are the ordering principles of our existent world. Lachelier, in considering this point, observed that some organisms realize to a higher degree than others that harmony toward which nature moves. In fact, the law of final causes entails a whole hierarchy of beings that increase in order and harmony. The more complexly unified organisms in nature are not the chance products of accidentally unified simpler organisms. Rather, the simpler organisms, implicit in the more complex ones, are separated from them by a kind of division and refraction. The human being can free himself in thought from the particular mechanical conditions of phenomena. He has the capacity to separate some perceptions from others and, using them as symbols, to represent general properties of things. In his ability to abstract and generalize, the human being, although distinguished from all other things by this capacity, can be said to be in contact with the whole universe. The universe can be discovered again in thought but under a new condition, freedom. In addition, man is free because he can select the means and ends of his activity by reference to ideas. Hence, through man, the realm of final causes and the freedom that is its condition penetrate the organic and mechanical realms. Furthermore, without freedom it would be impossible to conceive of either mechanism or finality. Thus, the laws of efficient and final causality, upon which induction is founded, are themselves founded upon freedom - and freedom is the essential property of thought. The process of founding induction within a philosophy of nature, therefore, consists partly in a demonstration and partly in a discovery of regulative rules. Finally, the process terminates in a metaphysics that affirms the basic reality of thought. This metaphysics is intended to found the philosophy of nature in the sense of providing a reason for belief in the unity of its laws and in its idealistic source.” 286 His metaphysics is further developed in his later studies.
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Émile Toutroux (1845-1921) was born on 21 July 1845 in Montrouge near Paris. “He received his secondary education at lycée Napoléon (now lycée Henri IV), where in 1865 he graduated to the École Normale Supérieure. While engaged in tertiary education, Boutroux was influenced by the philosophy of Maine de Biran, whose work in the early nineteenth century laid the metaphysical foundations for modern French psychology. Here also Boutroux encountered Biran's follower J. Lachelier, whose writings in logic and the philosophy of science proved particularly important to Boutroux's own work in the same. From 1869 to 1870, Boutroux continued his studies at Heidelberg University where he was introduced to German philosophy by his teacher Hermann von Helmholtz. While completing the two dissertations required by his doctorate at Heidelberg (De la contingence des lois de nature), Boutroux took the post of philosophy instructor at the lycée in Caen. Also, in 1874 De la Contingence was published and Boutroux took up a lectureship at the University of Montpelier. Directly after he secured tenure at Montpelier, Boutroux was offered and accepted a two-year appointment as Lecturer in Philosophy in the Faculty of Letters at the University of Nancy. While at Nancy, he married Aline Poincaré, the sister of scientist and mathematician Henri Poincaré. In 1880 Aline gave birth to their son, Pierre Boutroux, who himself became a distinguished mathematician and historian of science. From 1877 to 1885 Boutroux lectured in philosophy at École Normale Supérieure, and in 1888 he was made professor of history of modern philosophy at the Sorbonne in Paris. Among his other honours, Boutroux was elected a member of the Academy of the Moral and Political Sciences in 1898 and in 1902 he became Director of the Thiers Foundation. In 1912 he was elected to the Académie française, where he was a member from 1914.”

“In his preface to the English translation of De la contingence de lois de la nature, Boutroux remarks that philosophical systems seen to him to belong to three main types, the idealist, the materialist and the dualist or parallelist types. All three have a common feature, namely that they represent the laws of nature as necessary. In rationalist systems of philosophy, the mind tries to reconstruct reality by means of a logical deduction of its structure from what it takes to be self-evidently true propositions. When the mind abandons this dream and turns to phenomena known through sense-perception in order to ascertain their laws, it imports the idea of logical necessity into that of natural law and depicts the world as an endless variety of facts, linked together by
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necessary and immutable bonds. The question arises however whether the concept of a necessary relation is actually exemplified in the relations between phenomena; and Boutroux proposes to argue that natural laws are contingent and that they are bases which enable us constantly to rise towards a higher life.” Boutroux starts, very properly, by inquiring what is meant in this context by a necessary relation. Absolute necessity, the necessity, that is to say, which eliminates all conditions and is reducible to the principle of identity (A=A), can be left out of account. For the laws of nature are not simply tautologies. What we are concerned with is not absolute but relative necessity, the existence of a necessary relation between two things. In other words, when we inquire into the alleged necessity of the laws of nature, we are looking not for purely analytic truth, but for necessarily true synthetic propositions. But here again we must make a distinction. If the laws of nature are necessarily true synthetic propositions, they cannot be a posteriori propositions. For while experience can reveal to us constant relations, it does not by itself reveal necessity. Nor can it do so. Hence the aim of our inquiry is to discover whether the laws of nature can properly be described as a priori synthetic propositions. If they can, then they must assert necessary causal relations. The question therefore comes down to this. Are there a priori causal syntheses?”

“It will be noted that Boutroux’s use of terminology is based on that of Kant. Moreover, he does not deny that the principle of causality can be stated in such a form that it is necessarily true. At the same time he maintains that this is not the sense in which the principle is actually used in the sciences. In reality, the word cause, when used scientifically means immediate condition. For scientific purposes, it is quite sufficient, for the formulation of laws, that relatively invariable relations exist between the phenomena. The idea of necessity is not required. In other words, the principle of causality, as actually employed in science, is derived from experience, not imposed a priori by the mind. It is a very general and abstract expression of observed relations; and we do not observe necessity, though we can of course observe regular sequences. True, if we restrict our attention simply and solely to quantity, to the measurable aspects of phenomena, it may be in conformity with experience to assert an absolute equivalence between cause and effect. In point of fact, however, we find qualitative changes, a qualitative heterogeneity, which excludes the possibility of showing that the cause (immediate condition) must contain all that is required to produce the effect. And if the effect can be disproportionate to the cause from the qualitative point of view, it follows that nowhere in the real concrete world can the principle of causality be rigidly applied. To be sure, it can serve as a practical maxim for the scientist. But the development of the sciences themselves suggest that the laws of nature do not express objectively necessary relations and that they are not irreformable or un-revisable in principle. Our scientific laws enable us to deal successfully with a changing reality. It would be absurd to question their utility.”

“In his later work, De l’idée de loi naturelle (1895, From the Idea of Natural Law), Boutroux carried the matter further. In pure mathematics there are of course necessary relations, depending on certain postulates. But pure mathematics is a formal science. It is obviously true that a natural science such as astronomy makes use of mathematics and could not have advanced without it. Indeed, in certain sciences we can see clearly enough the attempt to fit Nature, as it were, to mathematics and to formulate the relations between phenomena in a mathematical manner. But there always remains a gap between Nature as it exists and mathematics; and this gap becomes more manifest as we shift our attention from the inorganic sphere to that of life. The scientist is justified in emphasizing the connection between biological and even mental phenomena on the one hand and physio-chemical processes on the other. But it we assume the reducibility of the laws governing biological evolution to the more general laws of physics and chemistry, it becomes impossible to explain the appearance of novelty. Despite their admitted utility, all-natural laws are of the nature of compromises, approximations to an equation between reality and mathematics;
and the more we proceed from the very general laws of physics to the spheres of biology, psychology and sociology, the clearer does this characteristic of approximation become. For we have to allow for creativeness and the emergence of novelty. For the matter of that, it is not certain that even on the purely physical level there is no variability, no breach in determinism."

"Nowadays the idea that the structure of reality can be deduced a priori from basic propositions which are indemonstrable but self-evidently true can hardly be described as fashionable. While we could not reasonably claim that there is universal agreement about the proper use of the term law of nature or about the logical status of scientific laws, it is at any rate a common enough view that scientific laws are descriptive generalizations with predictive force and that they are synthetic propositions and therefore contingent. Further, we are all aware of the claim, based on Heisenberg’s principle of uncertainty, that universal determinism has been disproved on the sub-atomic level. To be sure, it is not everyone who would admit that all propositions which are informative about reality are contingent. Nor would everyone agree that universal determinism has in fact been disproved. The relevant point however is that a good deal of what Boutroux says about the contingency of the laws of nature represents lines of thought which are common enough today. For the matter of that, his anti-reductionsim and his claim that there are qualitatively different kinds or levels of being do not appear startling. Obviously, talk about lower and higher levels of being is likely to elicit the comment that judgements of value are being made. But when Bouroux maintains that science takes the form of the sciences and that we cannot reduce all the other sciences to mathematical physics, most people would agree with him."

In *Science and Religion*, Boutroux asserts that “science is an ensemble of symbols imagined by the mind in order to interpret things by means of pre-existent notion. Science in its developed state does not presuppose a metaphysics, but it does presuppose the creative activity of the mind or spirit of reason.” Boutroux does not see that metaphysics is science, but means that metaphysics, an original activity of spirit, is spirit’s reflection on its own life.

"In his general view of universe, Boutroux sees the world as a series of levels of being. A higher level is not deducible from a lower level: there is the emergence of novelty, of qualitative difference. At the same time, heterogeneity and discontinuity are not the only features of the world. There is also continuity. For we can see a creative teleological process at work, a striving upwards towards an ideal. Thus, Boutroux does not assert a rigid distinction between the inanimate and animate levels. There is spontaneity even at the level of so-called dead matter. Moreover, in a manner reminiscent of Ravaisson, Boutroux suggests that animal instinct, life, physical and mechanical forces are, as it were, habits that have penetrated more and more deeply into the spontaneity of being. Hence these habits have become almost unconquerable. Seen from without, they appear as necessary laws. At the human level we find conscious love and pursuit of the ideal, a love which is at the same time a drawing or attracting by the divine ideal which in this way manifests its existence. Religion, a synthesis – or, rather, a close and spiritual union – of instinct and intellect, offers man a richer and deeper life that the life of mere instinct or routine or imitation or the life of the abstract intellect. It is not so much a case of reconciling science and religion, considered as sets of theories or doctrines, as of reconciling the scientific and the religious spirits. For even if we can show that religious doctrines do not contradict scientific laws or hypotheses, this may leave unaffected the impression of an irreconcilable conflict between the scientific and religious spirits and attitudes. Reason however can strive to bring them together and to fashion, form their union, a being richer and more harmonious than either of them taken apart. This union remains an ideal goal; but we can see that the religious life which, in its intense form, is always mysticism, has a positive value inasmuch as it lies at the heart of all the great religious, moral, political and social movements of humanity.”
**Chapter II. History of Philosophy**

Alfred Fouillee (1838-1912): “Fouillée was born at La Pouëze, Maine-et-Loire. He held several minor philosophical lectureships, and from 1864 was professor of philosophy at the lycées of Douai, Montpellier and Bordeaux successively. In 1867 and 1868 he was crowned by the Academy of Moral Science for his work on Plato and Socrates. In 1872 he was elected master of conferences at the Ecole Normale and was made Doctor of Philosophy in recognition of his two treatises, *Platonis Hippias Minor sine Socratica contra liberum arbitrium argumenta* and *La Liberté et le déterminisme*. The strain of the next three years' continuous work undermined his health and his eyesight, and he was compelled to retire from his professorship. During these years he had published works on Plato and Socrates and a history of philosophy (1875); but after his retirement he further developed his philosophical position, a speculative eclecticism through which he endeavored to reconcile metaphysical idealism with the naturalistic and mechanical standpoint of science. In *L’Evolutionnisme des idées-forces* (1890), *La Psychologie des idées-forces* (1893), and *La Morale des idées-forces* (1907), is elaborated his doctrine of idées forces, or of mind as efficient cause through the tendency of ideas to realize themselves in appropriate movement. Ethical and sociological developments of this theory succeed its physical and psychological treatment, the consideration of the antinomy of freedom being especially important.”

We find him “adopting a more eclectic attitude and envisaging a harmonization between the valuable and true ideas in the positivist and naturalist line of thought on the one hand and the idealist and spiritualist traditions on the other.” But we place within the spiritualist movement.

“In spite of this ecumenical attitude, recalling Leibniz’s notion that all systems were right in what they affirmed and wrong in what they denied, Fouillee was polemically inclined. In particular he attacked the philosophy of evolution as presented by Herbert Spencer and the epi-phenomenalist theory of consciousness defended by T. H. Huxley. Fouillee did not attack the idea of evolution as such. On the contrary, he accepted it. What he objected to was Spencer’s attempt to account for the movement of evolution in purely mechanistic terms, which seemed to him very limited and one-sided view of the matter. For the mechanistic conception of the world was, in Fouillee’s opinion, a human construction; and the concept of force on which Spencer laid such emphasis was a projection of man’s inner experience of effort and volitional activity. As for the epi-phenomenalist theory of consciousness, this was irreconcilable with the active power of the mind and the evident fact of its ability to initiate movement and actions. It was not necessary to follow idealists in regarding thought as the one reality in order to see that.”

“In his work on freedom and determinism (*La liberte et le determinisme*, 1872), he uses the theory of idées-forces in an attempt to effect a reconciliation between the partisans of freedom and the determinists. At first he gives the impression of alloying himself with the determinists, inasmuch as he subjects to criticism the views defended by such defenders of human liberty as Cournot, Renouvier and Lachelier. He rejects liberty of indifference as a misguided notion, refuses to associate freedom with the idea of chance, dismisses Renouvier’s contention that determinism implies the human being’s passivity, and expresses agreement with Taine’s questioning of the theory that determinism deprives moral values of all significance. In Fouillee’s opinion determinism does not necessarily imply that because something is all that it can be, it is thereby all that it should be.” The idea of freedom is certainly effective in life. “It can obviously be objected that Fouillee reconciles determinism with libertarianism by the simple expedient of equating freedom with the idea or feeling of freedom. And he does indeed speak as though the two were the same. But he seems to mean that when we act in the consciousness of freedom, for example, in striving after the realization of moral ideals, our actions express our personalities as human beings, and that this is the real significance of freedom. With the idea of freedom, we act in a specific way; and there can be no doubt that such action can be effective.”
Jean-Marie Guyau (1854-1888): Guyau was first exposed to Plato and Kant, as well as the history of religions and philosophy in his youth through his stepfather, the noted French philosopher Alfred Fouillée. With this background, he was able to attain his Bachelor of Arts at only 17 years of age, and at this time, translated the Handbook of Epictetus. At 19, he published his 1300-page Mémoire that, a year later in 1874, won a prize from the French Academy of Moral and Political Sciences and helped to earn him a philosophy lectureship at the Lycée Condorcet. However, this was short-lived, as he soon began to suffer from pulmonary disease. Following the first attacks of his disease, he went to southern France where he wrote philosophical works and poetry. He remained there until his early death at 33 years of age.[297]

“Guyau's works primarily analyze and respond to modern philosophy, especially moral philosophy. Largely seen as an Epicurean, he viewed English utilitarianism as a modern version of Epicureanism. Although an enthusiastic admirer of the works of Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill, he did not spare them a careful scrutiny of their approach to morality. In his Esquisse d'une morale sans obligation ni sanction, probably his most important work on moral theory, he begins from Fouillée, maintaining that utilitarian and positivist schools, despite admitting the presence of an unknowable in moral theory, wrongly expel individual hypotheses directed towards this unknowable. He states that any valid theory of ethics must consider the moral sphere as consisting not merely of moral facts (the utilitarian approach) but also, and more importantly, of moral ideas. On the other hand, in contrast to Fouillée, he does not see this unknowable itself as able to contribute a principle practically limiting and restricting conduct, i.e. of mere justice which, he states, comes too close to Kantian notions of duty; for this, in turn, would bring us back to a theory of moral obligation, which, as the title suggests, he wishes to free moral theory from. Much of his treatise is dedicated to arguing what moral theory can be based upon that relieves moral theorists from relying on e.g. duty, sanctions, and obligations. For example, The only admissible equivalents or substitutes of duty, to use the same language as the author of La Liberté et le Détérminisme appear to us to be: (1) The consciousness of our inward and superior power, to which we see duty practically reduced. (2) The influence exercised by ideas over actions. (3) The increasing fusion of the sensibilities, and the increasingly social character of our pleasures and sorrows. (4) The love of risk in action, of which we will show the importance hitherto ignored. (5) The love of metaphysical hypothesis, which is a sort of risk of thought.[298]

“Guyau also took interest in aesthetic theory, particularly its role in society and social evolution. Primarily, Guyau's theories of aesthetics refute Immanuel Kant's idea that aesthetic judgment is disinterested, and accordingly, partitioned off from the faculties of mind responsible for moral judgement. In Les Problèmes de l'esthétique contemporaine, Guyau argues that beauty in fact activates all dimensions of the mind—the sensual, the intellectual, and the moral. Aesthetic sensations are fully integrated with life and morality. They are also the mark of man's self-actualization. Contrary to Herbert Spencer's theory that the development of the arts is an indicator of the decline of society at large, Guyau maintains that as society continues to evolve, life will become increasingly aesthetic. In L'Art au point de vue sociologique, Guyau argues the purpose of art is not merely to produce pleasure, but to create sympathy among members of a society. By extension, he contends that art has the power to reform societies as well as to form them anew.”

“Though Guyau is now a relatively obscure philosopher, his approach to philosophy earned him much praise from those who knew of him and his philosophy. He is the original source of the notion of anomie, which found much use in the philosophy of Guyau's contemporary Émile Durkheim, who stumbled upon it in a review of ‘Irréligion de l'avenir’. Petr Kropotkin devotes an entire chapter to Guyau in his Ethics: Origin and Development, describing Guyau's moral teaching as so carefully conceived, and expounded in so perfect a form.”[299]
Henri-Louis Bergson (1859-1941) was a French philosopher, influential especially in the first half of the 20th century and after WWII in continental philosophy. Bergson is known for his influential arguments that processes of immediate experience and intuition are more significant than abstract rationalism and science for understanding reality. He is also known for having engaged in a debate with Albert Einstein about the nature of time, a debate which eventually contributed to a partial diminishment of Bergson’s reputation, until most of his fundamental contributions to French Philosophy were vindicated by the discovery of Quantum Physics. “He was awarded the 1927 Nobel Prize in Literature in recognition of his rich and vitalizing ideas and the brilliant skill with which they have been presented. In 1930 France awarded him its highest honor, the Grand-Croix de la Legion d’honneur. Bergson was born in the Rue Lamartine in Paris, not far from the Palais Garnier in 1859. His father, the pianist Michał Bergson, was of a Polish Jewish background. His great-grandmother, Temerl Bergson, was a well-known patroness and benefactor of Polish Jewry, especially those associated with the Hasidic movement. His mother, Katherine Levison, daughter of a Yorkshire doctor, was from an English and Irish Jewish background. The Bereksohns were a famous Jewish entrepreneurial family of Polish descent…Henri Bergson's family lived in London for a few years after his birth, and he obtained an early familiarity with the English language from his mother. Before he was nine, his parents settled in France, Henri becoming a naturalized French citizen. Henri Bergson married Louise Neuberger, a cousin of Marcel Proust (1871–1922), in 1891. Henri and Louise Bergson had a daughter, Jeanne, born deaf in 1896. Bergson lived the quiet life of a French professor, marked by the publication of his four-principal works: Time and Free Will (1889, Essai sur les données immédiates de la conscience); Matter and Memory (1896, Matière et mémoire); Creative Evolution (1907, L’Évolution créatrice); and The Two Sources of Morality and Religion (1932, Les deux sources de la morale et de la religion). In 1900 the College of France selected Bergson to a Chair of Greek and Roman Philosophy, which he held until 1904. He then replaced Gabriel Tarde in the Chair of Modern Philosophy, which he held until 1920. The public attended his open courses in large numbers.\"300

Education and Career: “Bergson attended the Lycée Fontanes in Paris from 1868 to 1878. He had previously received a Jewish religious education. Between 14 and 16, however, he lost his faith. According to Hude (1990), this moral crisis is tied to his discovery of the theory of evolution, according to which humanity shares common ancestry with modern primates, a process sometimes construed as not needing a creative deity. While at the lycée Bergson won a prize for his scientific work and another, in 1877 when he was eighteen, for the solution of a mathematical problem. His solution was published the following year in Annales de Mathématiques. It was his first published work. After some hesitation as to whether his career should lie in the sphere of the sciences or that of the humanities, he decided in favor of the latter, to the dismay of his teachers. When he was nineteen, he entered the École Normale Supérieure. During this period, he read Herbert Spencer. He obtained there the degree of licence ès lettres, and this was followed by that of agrégation de philosophie in 1881 from the University of Paris. The same year he received a teaching appointment at the lycée in Angers, the ancient capital of Anjou. Two years later he settled at the Lycée Blaise-Pascal in Clermont-Ferrand, capital of the Puy-de-Dôme département.\"301

“The year after his arrival at Clermont-Ferrand Bergson displayed his ability in the humanities by the publication of an edition of extracts from Lucretius, with a critical study of the text and of the materialist cosmology of the poet (1884), a work whose repeated editions attest to its value in promoting Classics among French youth. While teaching and lecturing in this part of his country
(the Auvergne region), Bergson found time for private study and original work. He crafted his dissertation *Time and Free Will*, which was submitted, along with a short Latin thesis on Aristotle, for his doctoral degree which was awarded by the University of Paris in 1889. The work was published in the same year by Félix Alcan. He also gave courses in Clermont-Ferrand on the Pre-Socratics, in particular on Heraclitus. Bergson dedicated *Time and Free Will* to Jules Lachelier (1832–1918), then public education minister, a disciple of Félix Ravaission (1813–1900) and the author of a philosophical work *On the Founding of Induction* (Du fondement de l'induction, 1871). Lachelier endeavored ‘to substitute everywhere force for inertia, life for death, and liberty for fatalism’. (Bergson owed much to both of these teachers of the École Normale Supérieure).”

“Bergson settled again in Paris in 1888, and after teaching for some months at the municipal college, known as the College Rollin, he received an appointment at the Lycée Henri-Quatre, where he remained for eight years. There, he read Darwin and gave a course on his theories. Although Bergson had previously endorsed Lamarckism and its theory of the heritability of acquired characteristics, he came to prefer Darwin's hypothesis of gradual variations, which were more compatible with his continual vision of life. In 1896 he published his second major work, entitled *Matter and Memory*. This rather difficult work investigates the function of the brain and undertakes an analysis of perception and memory, leading up to a careful consideration of the problems of the relation of body and mind. Bergson had spent years of research in preparation for each of his three large works. This is especially obvious in *Matter and Memory*, where he showed a thorough acquaintance with the extensive pathological investigations which had been carried out during the period. In 1898 Bergson became maître de conférences at his alma mater, École Normale Supérieure, and later in the same year received a promotion to a Professorship. The year 1900 saw him installed as Professor at the Collège de France, where he accepted the Chair of Greek and Roman Philosophy in succession to Charles Lévêque.”

“At the first International Congress of Philosophy, held in Paris during the first five days of August 1900, Bergson read a short, but important, paper, ‘Psychological Origins of the Belief in the Law of Causality’. In 1900 Felix Alcan published a work which had previously appeared in the Revue de Paris, entitled *Laughter* (Le rire), one of the most important of Bergson’s minor productions. This essay on the meaning of comedy stemmed from a lecture which he had given in his early days in the Auvergne. The study of it is essential to an understanding of Bergson’s views of life, and its passages dealing with the place of the artistic in life are valuable. The main thesis of the work is that laughter is a corrective evolved to make social life possible for human beings. We laugh at people who fail to adapt to the demands of society if it seems their failure is akin to an inflexible mechanism. Comic authors have exploited this human tendency to laugh in various ways, and what is common to them is the idea that the comic consists in there being something mechanical encrusted on the living. In 1901 the Académie des sciences morales et politiques elected Bergson as a member, and he became a member of the Institute. In 1903 he contributed to the Revue de métaphysique et de morale a very important essay entitled *Introduction to Metaphysics*, which is useful as a preface to the study of his three large books. He detailed in this essay his philosophical program, realized in the Creative Evolution.”

“On the death of Gabriel Tarde, the sociologist and philosopher, in 1904, Bergson succeeded him in the Chair of Modern Philosophy. From 4 to 8 September of that year he visited Geneva, attending the Second International Congress of Philosophy, when he lectured on The Mind and Thought: A Philosophical Illusion (Le cerveau et la pensée: une illusion philosophique). An illness prevented his visiting Germany from attending the Third Congress held at Heidelberg. His third major work, *Creative Evolution*, the most widely known and most discussed of his books, appeared in 1907. Pierre Imbart de la Tour remarked that *Creative Evolution* was a milestone of
new direction in thought. By 1918, Alcan, the publisher, had issued twenty-one editions, making an average of two editions per annum for ten years. Following the appearance of this book, Bergson's popularity increased enormously, not only in academic circles but among the general reading public. At that time, Bergson had already made an extensive study of biology including the theory of fecundation (as shown in the first chapter of the Creative Evolution), which had only recently emerged, ca. 1885 – no small feat for a philosopher specializing in the history of philosophy, in particular Greek and Roman philosophy. He also most certainly had read, apart from Darwin, Haeckel, from whom he retained his idea of a unity of life and of the ecological solidarity between all living beings, as well as Hugo de Vries, from whom he quoted his mutation theory of evolution (which he opposed, preferring Darwin's gradualism). He also quoted Charles-Édouard Brown-Séquard, the successor of Claude Bernard at the Chair of Experimental Medicine in the Collège de France, etc. Bergson served as a juror with Florence Meyer Blumenthal in awarding the Prix Blumenthal, a grant given between 1919 and 1954 to painters, sculptors, decorators, engravers, writers, and musicians.\textsuperscript{302}

**Later Years:** “In 1914 the Scottish universities arranged for Bergson to give the famous Gifford Lectures, planning one course for the spring and another for the autumn. Bergson delivered the first course, consisting of eleven lectures, under the title of The Problem of Personality, at the University of Edinburgh in the spring of that year. The course of lectures planned for the autumn months had to be abandoned because of the outbreak of war. Bergson was not, however, silent during the conflict, and he gave some inspiring addresses. As early as 4 November 1914, he wrote an article entitled *Wearing and Nonwearing forces* (La force qui s'use et celle qui ne s'use pas), which appeared in that unique and interesting periodical of the poilus, *Le Bulletin des Armées de la République Française*. A presidential address, The Meaning of the War, was delivered in December 1914, to the Académie des sciences morales et politiques.”

“Bergson contributed also to the publication arranged by The Daily Telegraph in honor of King Albert I of the Belgians, King Albert's Book (Christmas, 1914). In 1915 he was succeeded in the office of President of the Académie des Sciences morales et politiques by Alexandre Ribot, and then delivered a discourse on ‘The Evolution of German Imperialism’. Meanwhile, he found time to issue at the request of the Minister of Public Instruction a brief summary of French Philosophy. Bergson did a large amount of traveling and lecturing in America during the war. He participated in the negotiations which led to the entry of the United States in the war. He was there when the French Mission under René Viviani paid a visit in April and May 1917, following upon America's entry into the conflict. Viviani's book *La Mission française en Amérique* (1917), contains a preface by Bergson. Early in 1918 the Académie française received Bergson officially when he took his seat among ‘The Select Forty’ as successor to Emile Ollivier. A session was held in January in his honour at which he delivered an address on Ollivier. In the war, Bergson saw the conflict of Mind and Matter, or rather of Life and Mechanism; and thus, he shows us the central idea of his own philosophy in action. To no other philosopher has it fallen, during his lifetime, to have his philosophical principles so vividly and so terribly tested.”\textsuperscript{303}

“While living with his wife and daughter in a modest house in a quiet street near the Porte d'Auteuil in Paris, Bergson won the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1927 for having written *The Creative Evolution*. He completed his new work, *The Two Sources of Morality and Religion*, which extended his philosophical theories to the realms of morality, religion, and art, in 1935. It was respectfully received by the public and the philosophical community, but all by that time realized that Bergson's days as a philosophic luminary were passed.” Inclined to convert to Catholicism, on 3 January 1941 Bergson died in occupied Paris from bronchitis.
Overview of Writings:  

**Time and Free Will** (1889) is “primarily an attempt to establish the notion of duration, or lived time, as opposed to what Bergson viewed as the spatialized conception of time, measured by a clock, that is employed by science. He proceeded by analyzing the awareness that man has of his inner self to show that psychological facts are qualitatively different from any other, charging psychologists in particular with falsifying the facts by trying to quantify and number them. Fechner’s Law, claiming to establish a calculable relation between the intensity of the stimulus and that of the corresponding sensation, was especially criticized. Once the confusions were cleared away that confounded duration with extension, succession with simultaneity, and quality with quantity, he maintained that the objections to human liberty made in the name of scientific determinism could be seen to be baseless.”

**Matter and Memory** (1896): He did not proceed by general speculation and was not concerned with elaborating a great speculative system. He began in this, as in each of his books, with a particular problem, which he analyzed by first determining the empirical (observed) facts that are known about it according to the best and most up-to-date scientific opinion. Thus, for *Matière et mémoire* he devoted five years to studying all of the literature available on memory and especially the psychological phenomenon of aphasia, or loss of the ability to use language. According to the theory of psychophysiological parallelism, a lesion in the brain should also affect the very basis of a psychological power. The occurrence of aphasia, Bergson argued, showed that this is not the case. The person so affected understands what others have to say, knows what he himself wants to say, suffers no paralysis of the speech organs, and yet is unable to speak. This fact shows, he argued, that it is not memory that is lost but, rather, the bodily mechanism that is needed to express it. From this observation Bergson concluded that memory, and so mind, or soul, is independent of body and makes use of it to carry out its own purposes.”

**Creative Evolution** (1907): “In examining the idea of life, Bergson accepted evolution as a scientifically established fact. He criticized, however, the philosophical interpretations that had been given of it for failing to see the importance of duration and hence missing the very uniqueness of life. He proposed that the whole evolutionary process should be seen as the endurance of an élan vital (vital impulse) that is continually developing and generating new forms. Evolution, in short, is creative, not mechanistic. In this developing process, he traced two main lines: one through instinct, leading to the life of insects; the other through the evolution of intelligence, resulting in man; both of which, however, are seen as the work of one vital impulse that is at work everywhere in the world. The final chapter of the book…presents a review of the whole history of philosophical thought with the aim of showing that it everywhere failed to appreciate the nature and importance of becoming, falsifying thereby the nature of reality.”

**The Two Sources of Morality and Religion** (1932) “As in the earlier works, he claimed that the polar opposition of the static and the dynamic provides the basic insight. Thus, in the moral, social, and religious life of men he saw, on the one side, the work of the closed society, expressed in conformity to codified laws and customs, and, on the other side, the open society, best represented by the dynamic aspirations of heroes and mystical saints reaching out beyond and even breaking the strictures of the groups in which they live. There are, thus, two moralities, or, rather, two sources: the one having its roots in intelligence, which leads also to science and its static, mechanistic ideal; the other based on intuition, and finding its expression not only in the free creativity of art and philosophy but also in the mystical experience of the saints. Bergson in *The Two Sources* had come much closer to the orthodox religious notion of God than he had in the vital impulse of the *Creative Revolution*. He acknowledged in his will of 1937, ‘My reflections have led me closer and closer to Catholicism, in which I see the complete fulfillment of Judaism.’ Yet, although declaring his moral adherence to Catholicism, he never went beyond that.”
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Creativity: Bergson considers the appearance of novelty as a result of pure undetermined creation, instead of as the predetermined result of mechanistic forces. His philosophy emphasizes pure mobility, unforeseeable novelty, creativity and freedom; thus, one can characterize his system as a process philosophy. It touches upon such topics as time and identity, free will, perception, change, memory, consciousness, language, the foundation of mathematics and the limits of reason. Criticizing Kant's theory of knowledge exposed in the Critique of Pure Reason and his conception of truth – which he compares to Plato's conception of truth as its symmetrical inversion (order of nature/order of thought) – Bergson attempted to redefine the relations between science and metaphysics, intelligence and intuition, and insisted on the necessity of increasing thought's possibility through the use of intuition, which, according to him, alone approached a knowledge of the absolute and of real life, understood as pure duration. Because of his (relative) criticism of intelligence, he makes a frequent use of images and metaphors in his writings in order to avoid the use of concepts, which (he considers) fail to touch the whole of reality, being only a sort of abstract net thrown on things. For instance, he says in The Creative Evolution (chap. III) that thought in itself would never have thought it possible for the human being to swim, as it cannot deduce swimming from walking. For swimming to be possible, man must throw itself in water, and only then can thought consider swimming as possible. Intelligence, for Bergson, is a practical faculty rather than a pure speculative faculty, a product of evolution used by man to survive. If metaphysics is to avoid false problems, it should not extend the abstract concepts of intelligence to pure speculation, but rather use intuition.

"The Creative Evolution in particular attempted to think through the continuous creation of life, and explicitly pitted itself against Herbert Spencer's evolutionary philosophy. Spencer had attempted to transpose Charles Darwin's theory of evolution in philosophy and to construct a cosmology based on this theory (Spencer also coined the expression survival of the fittest). Bergson disputed what he saw as Spencer's mechanistic philosophy. Bergson's Lebensphilosophie (philosophy of life) can be seen as a response to the mechanistic philosophies of his time, but also to the failure of finalism. Indeed, he considers that finalism is unable to explain duration and the continuous creation of life, as it only explains life as the progressive development of an initially determined program – a notion which remains, for example, in the expression of a genetic program; such a description of finalism was adopted, for instance, by Leibniz. It clearly announces Alfred North Whitehead's. Bergson regarded planning beforehand for the future as impossible, since time itself unravels unforeseen possibilities. Indeed, one could always explain a historical event retrospectively by its conditions of possibility. But, in the introduction to the Pensée et le mouvant, he explains that such an event created retrospectively its causes, taking the example of the creation of a work of art, for example a symphony: it was impossible to predict what would be the symphony of the future, as if the musician knew what symphony would be the best for his time, he would realize it. In his words, the effect created its cause. Henceforth, he attempted to find a third way between mechanism and finalism, through the notion of an original impulse, the élan vital, in life, which dispersed itself through evolution into contradictory tendencies (he substituted to the finalist notion of a teleological aim a notion of an original impulse)."

Thus, “Bergson accepted evolution as a scientifically established fact. He criticized, however, the philosophical interpretations that had been given of it for failing to see the importance of duration and hence missing the very uniqueness of life. He proposed that the whole evolutionary process should be seen as the endurance of an élan vital (vital impulse) that is continually developing and generating new forms. Evolution, in short, is creative, not mechanistic. In this developing process, he traced two main lines: one through instinct, leading to the life of insects; the other through the evolution of intelligence…as the work of one vital impulse.”
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**Duration**: “The foundation of Henri Bergson's philosophy, his theory of Duration, he discovered when trying to improve the inadequacies of Herbert Spencer's philosophy. Bergson introduced Duration as a theory of time and consciousness in his doctoral thesis *Time and Free Will*: An Essay on the Immediate Data of Consciousness as a response to another of his influences: Immanuel Kant. Kant believed that free will (better perceived as The Will) could only exist outside of time and space, indeed the only non-determined aspect of our private existence in the universe, separate to water cycles, mathematics and mortality. However, we could therefore not know whether or not it exists, and that it is nothing but a pragmatic faith. Bergson responded that Kant, along with many other philosophers, had confused time with its spatial representation. In reality, Bergson argued, Duration is unextended yet heterogeneous, and so its parts cannot be juxtaposed as a succession of distinct parts, with one causing the other. Based on this he concluded that determinism is an impossibility and free will pure mobility, which is what Bergson identified as being the Duration.”**306

**Intuition**: “Duration, as defined by Bergson, then is a unity and a multiplicity, but, being mobile, it cannot be grasped through immobile concepts. Bergson hence argues that one can grasp it only through his method of intuition. Two images from Henri Bergson's *An Introduction to Metaphysics* may help one to grasp Bergson's term intuition, the limits of concepts, and the ability of intuition to grasp the absolute. The first image is that of a city. Analysis, or the creation of concepts through the divisions of points of view, can only ever give us a model of the city through a construction of photographs taken from every possible point of view, yet it can never give us the dimensional value of walking in the city itself. One can only grasp this through intuition; likewise, the experience of reading a line of Homer. One may translate the line and pile commentary upon commentary, but this commentary too shall never grasp the simple dimensional value of experiencing the poem in its originality itself. The method of intuition, then, is that of getting back to the things themselves.”**307

**Élan Vital**: “Élan vital ranks as Bergson's third essential concept, after Duration and intuition. An idea with the goal of explaining evolution, the élan vital first appeared in 1907's *Creative Evolution*. Bergson portrays élan vital as a kind of vital impetus which explains evolution in a less mechanical and more lively manner, as well as accounting for the creative impulse of mankind. This concept led several authors to characterize Bergson as a supporter of vitalism - although he criticized it explicitly in *The Creative Evolution*, as he thought, against Driesch and Johannes Reinke (whom he cited) that there is neither purely internal finality nor clearly cut individuality in nature: Hereby lies the stumbling block of vitalist theories (...) It is thus in vain that one pretends to reduce finality to the individuality of the living being. If there is finality in the world of life, it encompasses the whole of life in one indivisible embrace.”**308

**Laughter**: “In Laughter: An Essay on the Meaning of the Comic, Bergson develops a theory not of laughter itself but of how laughter can be provoked. He describes the process of laughter, used in particular by comics and clowns, as caricature of the mechanistic nature of humans (habits, automatic acts, etc.), one of the two tendencies of life (degradation towards inert matter and mechanism, and continual creation of new forms). However, Bergson warns us that laughter's criterion of what should be laughed at is not a moral criterion and that it can in fact cause serious damage to a person's self-esteem. This essay made his opposition to the Cartesian theory of the animal-machine obvious.”**309
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Chapter II

I. History of Philosophy


6. From Bergson to Sartre, Camus, and Levi-Strauss

6-1. Philosophy and Christian Apologetics

“Apologetics is the religious discipline of defending the truth of religious doctrines through systematic argumentation and discourse. Early Christian writers (c. 120-220) who defended their beliefs against critics and recommended their faith to outsiders were called Christian apologists. In 21st century usage, apologetics is often identified with debates over religion and theology.”

“Christian apologetics is a field of Christian theology that aims to present historical, reasoned, and evidential bases for Christianity, defending it against objections. Christian apologetics have taken many forms over the centuries.”

On the other hand, “A theist believes there is a God who made and governs all creation; but does not believe in the doctrine of the Trinity, nor in a divine revelation. A deist believes there is a God who created all things but does not believe in His superintendence and government. He thinks the Creator implanted in all things certain immutable laws, called the Laws of Nature, which act per se, as a watch acts without the supervision of its maker. Like the theist, he does not believe in the doctrine of the Trinity, nor in a divine revelation. The atheist disbelieves even the existence of a God. He thinks matter is eternal, and what we call “creation” is the result of natural laws. The agnostic believes only what is knowable. He rejects revelation and the doctrine of the Trinity as past human understanding. He is neither theist, deist, nor atheist, as all these are past understanding.”

“During the eighteenth-century Enlightenment Christian apologetics tended to follow a rationalistic pattern. The arguments of atheists were countered by philosophical proofs of the existence of God as cause of the world and as responsible for order in the universe, while the deists’ attacks on revealed religion, were met by arguments to prove the trustworthiness of the New Testament accounts of the life of Christ, including the accounts of miracles, and the fact of revelation. In the Age of Reason, that is to say, the arguments of rationalists, whether atheists or deists, had as their counterpart a kind of Christian rationalism.”

“As the revolution apologetics in France underwent a change. The general influence of the Romantic Movement showed itself in a turning away from rationalistic philosophy of the Cartesian type and in an emphasis on the way in which the Christian religion fulfilled the needs of man and society. As we have seen, Chateaubriand explicitly stated the need for a new type of apologetics and appealed to the beauty or aesthetic qualities of Christianity, maintaining that it is the intrinsic excellence of Christianity which shows that it comes from God rather than that it must be judged excellent because it has been proved to have come from God. The Traditionalists, such as de Maistre and de Bonald, appealed to the transmission of a primitive divine revelation rather than to metaphysical arguments for the existence of God. Lamennais, while making some use of traditional apologetics, insisted that religious faith requires a free consent of the will and is far from inference. He also laid emphasis on the benefits conferred by religion on individuals and societies as evidence for its truth. The Dominican preacher Henri-Dominique Lacordaire (1802-61), who was for a time associated with Lamennais, tried to show the truth of Christianity by exhibiting the content and implications of the Christian faith itself and showing how it fulfills man’s needs and the legitimate demands of human society.”

“It was obviously a strong point in the new line of apologetics in France in the first half of the nineteenth century that it tried to show the relevance of Christian faith by relating it to man’s needs and aspirations both as an individual and as a member of society, rather than by proceeding simply on the plane of abstract metaphysical proofs and historical arguments. At the same time appeals to aesthetic considerations, as with Chateaubriand, or to the actual or possible beneficial social
effects of Christianity could easily give the impression of attempts to stimulate the will to believe. That is to say, in so far as persuasive arguments were substituted for the traditional proofs, the substitution might be seen as expressing a tacit admission that religious faith rested on the will rather than on the reason. Unless however Christian faith was to be regarded as being of the same nature as intellectual assent to the conclusion of a mathematical demonstration, some role had to be attributed to the will. After all, even those who were convinced of the demonstrative character of traditional metaphysical and apologetic arguments could hardly maintain that the unbeliever’s withholding of his assent was always and exclusively due to his failure to understand them. It was natural therefore that the role of the will in religious belief should be explored, and that an attempt should be made to combine recognition of this role with avoidance of a purely pragmatic or voluntarist interpretation of Christian faith. Thus, the question was raised, can there be a legitimate certitude, legitimate from the rational point of view, in which the will plays an effective role?"

**Leon Olle-Laprune** (1839-98): “Under the influence of the philosopher Elme Marie Caro and of Père Gratry's book *Les Sources*, Ollé-Laprune, after exceptionally brilliant studies at the Ecole Normale Supérieure (1858 to 1861), devoted himself to philosophy. His life was spent in teaching, first in the lycées and then in the Ecole Normale Supérieure from 1875. As Frédéric Ozanam had been a Catholic professor of history and foreign literature in the university, Ollé-Laprune's aim was to be a Catholic professor of philosophy there. Theodore de Regnon, the Jesuit theologian, wrote to him: ‘I am glad to think that God wills in our time to revive the lay apostolate, as in the times of Justin and Athenagoras; it is you especially who give me these thoughts.’ The Government of the Third Republic was now and then urged by a certain section of the press to punish the clericalism of Ollé-Laprune, but the repute of his philosophical teaching protected him. For one year only (1881–82), after organizing a manifestation in favor of the expelled congregations, he was suspended from his chair by Jules Ferry, and the first to sign the protest addressed by his students to the minister on behalf of their professor was the future socialist deputy Jean Jaurès, then a student at the Ecole Normale Supérieure. The Academy of Moral and Political Sciences elected him a member of the philosophical section in 1897, to succeed Vacherot. Some months after his death William P. Coyne called him "the greatest Catholic layman who has appeared in France since Ozanam".

“Ollé-Laprune’s first important work was *La Philosophie de Malebranche* (1870). Ten years later to obtain the doctorate he defended before the Sorbonne a thesis on moral certitude. As against Cartesian rationalism and positivistic determinism, he investigated the part of the will and the heart in the phenomenon of belief. This work resembles in many respects John Henry Newman's *Grammar of Assent*. In his ‘Essai sur la morale d’Aristote’ (1881) Ollé-Laprune defended the ‘Eudaemonism’ of the Greek philosopher against the Kantian theories; and in ‘La philosophie et le temps présent’ (1890) he vindicated, against deistic spiritualism, the right of the Christian thinker to go beyond the data of natural religion and illuminate philosophy by the data of revealed religion. One of his most influential works was the ‘Prix de la vie’ (1894), wherein he shows why life is worth living. The advice given by Pope Leo XIII to the Catholics of France found in Ollé-Laprune an active champion. His brochure ‘Ce qu’on va chercher à Rome’ (1895) was one of the best commentaries on the papal policy. His articles and conferences attest his growing influence in Catholic circles. He became a leader of Christian activity, consulted and heard by all until his premature death when he was about to finish a book on Jouffroy (Paris, 1899). Many of his articles have been collected by Goyau under the title ‘La Vitalité chrétienne’ (1901). Here will also be found a series of his unedited meditations, ‘Omnia instaurare in Christo’. Professor Delbos published in 1907 the course which Ollé-Laprune had given.”
Maurice Blondel (1861-1949): Born in Dijon, France, “Blondel entered the École Normale Supérieure in 1881, and passed the aggregation in 1886. He was profoundly affected by the tensions in French life, particularly between the French academic establishment and Catholicism. After two failures, he obtained the aggregation in 1886 and was appointed to teach philosophy in the lycée at Montauban. In the same year he was transferred to Aix-en-Provence. In 1893 his thesis, L’Action was submitted to the Sorbonne. His thesis, which argues for the inescapability of the religious problem, brought him into the heart of theological and philosophical controversy of his time. His application for a university post was at first refused, on the ground that his thought was not properly philosophical. He was then offered a chair of history. But in 1944 then the minister of education, Raymond Poincare, appointed him professor of philosophy in the University of Aix-en-Provence. Blondel held this position until 1927, when he retired because of failing eyesight. The original edition of L’Action appeared in 1893. This was also the date of Blondel’s Latin thesis on Leibniz. What is generally known as Blondel’s Trilogy appeared in 1934-7. It consists of Thought (La Pensee, 2 vols., 1934), Being and Beings (L’etre et les etres, 1935) and Action (2 vols., 1936-7), which of the last should not be confused with his first L’Action. Blondel published Philosophy and the Christian Spirit (2 vols., 1944-6). Philosophical Requirements of Christianity was published posthumously in 1950. “In addition, Blondel published a considerable number of essays, such as his Letter on the Requirements of Contemporary Thought in the Matter of Apologetics and History and Dogma. The correspondence between Blondel and the Jesuit philosopher Auguste Balensin (1879-1953) was published in three volumes at Paris in 1957-65, while Blondel’s Philosophical Correspondence with Laberthonniere, edited by C. Tresmontant, appeared on 1962.” There is also a collection of his philosophical letters.315

“Blondel has often been described as a Catholic apologist. So indeed, he was, and so he saw himself. In the project for his thesis L’Action, he referred to the work as philosophical apologetics. In a letter to Delbos he stated that for him philosophy and apologetics were basically one. From the start he was convinced of the need for a Christian philosophy. But in his opinion there was never yet been, strictly speaking, any Christian philosophy. Blondel aspired to meet this need, or at any rate to point out the way to do so. Further, he spoke of trying to do for the Catholic form of thought what Germany has long since done and continues to do for the Protestant form. But there is no need to multiply references to justify the description of Blondel as Catholic apologist. Though however the description is justifiable, it can be extremely misleading. For it suggests the idea of the heteronomous philosophy, a philosophy, that is to say, which is used to support certain theological positions or to prove certain preconceived conclusions which are considered to be both philosophically demonstrable and an essential propaedeutic to or theoretical basis for Christian belief. In other words, the description of a philosophy as Christian apologetics suggests the idea of philosophy as a handmaid or servant of theology. And in so far as the business of Christian philosophy is conceived to be that of proving certain theses dictated by theology or by ecclesiastical authority, the conclusion is likely to be drawn that Christian philosophy is not philosophy at all but theology in disguise.”

“Blondel recognized of course that philosophical concepts could be used in the explication of the content of Christian faith. But he insisted, rightly, that the process was internal to theology. Philosophy itself, he was convinced, should be autonomous, in fact and not simply in theory. Christian philosophy too should therefore be autonomous. But an autonomous Christian philosophy did not, in his opinion, exist. It was something to be created. It would be Christian in the sense that it would exhibit man’s lack of self-sufficiency and his opening to the Transcendent. In the process it would exhibit its own limitations as human thought and its lack of omni-competence. Blondel was convinced that autonomous philosophical reflection, consistently and
rigorously pursued, would in fact reveal in man an exigency for the supernatural, for that which is inaccessible to human effort alone. It would open the horizon of the human spirit to the free self-communication of the divine, which answers indeed to a profound need in man, but which cannot be given through philosophy. In brief, Blondel envisaged a philosophy which would be autonomous in its reflection but, through this reflection, self-limiting, in the sense that it pointed to what lay beyond itself. He was considerably influenced by Pascal, but he had a greater confidence in systematic philosophy. Perhaps we can say that Blondel aimed at creating the philosophy which was demanded by the thought of Pascal. But it must be philosophy. Thus, in one place Blondel asserts that apologetic philosophy ought not to become a philosophical apologetics. That is to say, philosophy ought to be a process of autonomous rational reflection, not simply a means to an extra-philosophical end.  

**Immanence and Transcendence:** “Immanence refers to those philosophical and metaphysical theories of divine presence in which the divine encompasses or is manifested in the material world. Immanence is usually applied in monotheistic, pantheistic, pan deistic, or panentheistic faiths to suggest that the spiritual world permeates the mundane.”  

“In religion, transcendence refers to the aspect of a god’s nature and power which is wholly independent of the material universe, beyond all physical laws. This is contrasted with immanence, where a god is said to be fully present in the physical world and thus accessible to creatures in various ways.”  

The central theme of his work is the complex relationship between immanence and transcendence. “For each order of phenomena, it is possible to carry out an analysis simply at the level of those phenomena…within certain limits. Such an analysis, while revealing the relative sufficiency and structures of one level, for instance, those of affectivity and the body on the one hand, or of political association, on the other, has as its goal the indication at what points at what degree these levels are not self-sufficient and must make recourse, either overtly or covertly to something transcendent to that level and order, for example, intentional and voluntary action as transcendent to affectivity, or humanity and morality as transcendent to political association. This type of analysis does not nullify the reality of the phenomena treated as immanent, but rather exhibits their necessary co-structuring relationship with the orders of phenomena transcendent to them.”  

This relationship is often figured in terms of adequacy and self-sufficiency. The goal of Blondel's analyses is to show that the order of phenomena treated as immanent from within the scope of that particular investigation is not sufficient unto itself, that is, that at least another order of phenomena, an order transcendent to the order under investigation. Philosophical, religious, and scientific doctrines function, never simply as representations of reality, simply within the range of speculation or theory, but also serve to orient the life, practices, and action of human subjects, and it is in this respect that adequacy as a criterion comes into play. A doctrine about the reality in which human beings live which does not sufficiently take into account and provide a reflective basis for action, by which a subject can come to understand their role and destiny within that life, a life shared by others, mediated historically and materially, and ultimately oriented towards transcendence, cannot but prove to be inadequate to the demands of the problem of action.  

The goal of Blondel's life-work was three-fold: “First, to examine the exigencies of human action in order to delineate the too-often neglected structures of this vital dimension of human existence. Second, to examine the doctrines of thinkers, texts, and movements, in order to assess the adequacy of their positions and to expose the inadequacies of their positions and practices. What Blondel carried out in his own time is what has come to be called, in certain circles, as set of "philosophical interventions; Finally, the development of a more fully articulated philosophy of insufficiency, which would comprehensively treat the relationship of action to thought and being for the human subject oriented historically, socially, and in relation to the Absolute.”
Lucien Laberthonnière (1860-1932), the French philosopher of religion and a leading figure in the modernist movement in the Roman Catholic Church, was born at Chazelet (Indre). He studied for the priesthood and was ordained as an Oratorian in 1886. He then taught in various institutions, mainly in the college at Juilly, where he became rector in 1900. In 1902 he went to live in Paris. He Essays in Religious Philosophy (1903), Christian Realism and Greek Idealism (1904), Positivism and Catholicism (1911), and in 1913 he was prohibited to write.

“Laberthonnière was influenced by philosophies of life and action; he mentions Maine de Biran and Étienne Boutroux as the two philosophers who had most impressed him. Maurice Blondel’s philosophy of action was another important formative factor, although Laberthonnière later found it moving too far toward intellectualism. He himself not only advocated a pragmatic point of view but also had an intense distaste for intellectualism and speculative philosophy. In particular, he had no sympathy for the attempted Thomist synthesis of faith and reason, believing that the task is not to conciliate these two but to choose between them. His teachings brought him into conflict with ecclesiastical authorities, and his principal writings were put on the Index in 1906. In 1913 he was prohibited from further publication. Laberthonnière was not concerned with merely speculative philosophy that is constructed apart from life. He believed that the purpose of all philosophy is to give sense to life, and this motivation underlies even metaphysics, whether or not the metaphysician is aware of it. In the long run, the test of a philosophy must be its viability or its aptness for life, and the criterion of philosophical truth is a pragmatic one. We mistake the character of philosophy if we think of it as a theoretical enterprise resulting in a system of propositions linked together by abstract logical principles. A philosophical doctrine has a moral as well as an intellectual character, so that a worthwhile philosophy has to be worked out by living. The test of its truth is whether it can be illuminating when brought to bear on the problems of life.”

“Though Laberthonnière apparently held that all philosophy has a pragmatic or existential motivation, even if this remains unconscious, he also believed that some philosophies have been much more successful than others in relating to life. The theme of one of his principal writings, Le réalisme chrétien et l'idéalisme grec (Paris, 1904), is the contrast between two supposedly extreme cases, Greek philosophy and Christian thought. Greek philosophy was concerned with abstract essences, conceived God as static and immutable, and proposed the life of pure contemplation as its ideal for man. In contrast to such idealism or intellectualism, Christianity is presented as a realism. Its concern is with the concrete life of action, and God himself is conceived as active, the living God of the Bible. Hence, the truth of Christianity cannot be reached by intellectual contemplation, as if it were something external to us. Such truth as Christianity teaches is concrete and intrinsic to life, so that we grasp it only in living and in re-creating this truth in ourselves. These ideas about religious truth had already found expression in Laberthonnière’s Essais de philosophie religieuse (Paris, 1903), where it is maintained that the doctrines of religion are to be understood not as general truths of the same kind as scientific truths but as concrete truths that must be brought into experience and realized if we are to understand them and know their value. Although these views lean strongly toward pragmatism, Laberthonnière did not think that religion could be reduced to a purely practical affair or that it could be adequately explicated in naturalistic terms. It is significant that in spite of the harsh treatment that he received from the Roman Catholic Church, he remained devoted to it and believed his philosophical views to be compatible with its teaching. If he went far toward abolishing the traditional distinction between the natural and the supernatural, this is not to be understood as the reduction of the latter to the former. Rather, it was Laberthonnière’s conviction that the natural is itself already permeated by divine grace. Thus, we should look for God not in some upper or outer realm but in the immediate world, where he is active, and especially in the depth of human life itself.”
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Modernism refers to “a reforming movement in art, architecture, music, literature and the applied arts during the late 19th Century and early 20th Century. There is no specifically Modernist movement in Philosophy, but rather Modernism refers to a movement within the arts which had some influence over later philosophical thought. The later reaction against Modernism gave rise to the Post-Modernist movement both in the arts and in philosophy. Modernism was essentially conceived of as a rebellion against 19th Century academic and historicist traditions and against Victorian nationalism and cultural absolutism, on the grounds that the traditional forms of art, architecture, literature, religious faith, social organization and daily life (in a modern industrialized world) were becoming outdated. The movement was initially called avant-garde, descriptive of its attempt to overthrow some aspect of tradition or the status quo. The term modernism itself is derived from the Latin modo, meaning just now.”

“Modernism, in general, includes the activities and creations of those who felt the traditional forms of art, architecture, literature, religious faith, philosophy, social organization, activities of daily life, and even the sciences, were becoming ill-fitted to their tasks and outdated in the new economic, social, and political environment of an emerging fully industrialized world. The poet Ezra Pound's 1934 injunction to ‘Make it new!’ was the touchstone of the movement's approach towards what it saw as the now obsolete culture of the past….A notable characteristic of modernism is self-consciousness and irony concerning literary and social traditions, which often led to experiments with form, along with the use of techniques that drew attention to the processes and materials used in creating a painting, poem, building, etc. Modernism explicitly rejected the ideology of realism and makes use of the works of the past.”

“It called for the re-examination of every aspect of existence, from commerce to philosophy, with the goal of finding that which was holding back progress, and replacing it with new, progressive and better ways of reaching the same end. Modernists believed that by rejecting tradition they could discover radically new ways of making art, and at the same time to force the audience to take the trouble to question their own preconceptions. It stressed freedom of expression, experimentation, radicalism and primitivism, and its disregard for conventional expectations often meant startling and alienating audiences with bizarre and unpredictable effects (e.g. surrealism in art, atonality in music, stream-of-consciousness literature). Some Modernists saw themselves as part of a revolutionary culture that also included political revolution, while others rejected conventional politics as well as artistic conventions, believing that a revolution of political consciousness had greater importance than a change in actual political structures.”

“The first wave of Modernism as an artistic umbrella movement broke in the first decade or two of the 20th Century, with ground-breaking works by people like Arthur Schoenberg and Igor Stravinsky in music; Gustav Klimt, Pablo Picasso, Henri Matisse, Marcel Duchamp, Wassily Kandinsky and Piet Mondrian in art; Le Corbusier, Walter Gropius and Mies van der Rohe in architecture; and Guillaume Apollinaire, James Joyce, T. S. Eliot and Virginia Woolf in literature; to mention just a few. The movement came of age in the 1920s, with Bauhaus, Surrealism, Cubism, Fauvism, Futurism and, perhaps the most nihilistic of all, Dada. After World War II, the focus moved from Europe to the United States, and Abstract Expressionism (led by Jackson Pollock) continued the movement's momentum, followed by movements such as Geometric Abstraction, Minimalism, Process Art, Pop Art and Pop Music. By the time Modernism had become so institutionalized and mainstream that it was considered post avant-garde, indicating that it had lost its power as a revolutionary movement, it generated in turn its own reaction, known as Post-Modernism, which was both a response to Modernism and a rediscovery of the value of older forms of art. Modernism remains much more a movement in the arts than in philosophy, although Post-Modernism has a specifically philosophical aspect in addition to the artistic one.”
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“In general, the modernists tended to assume that modern philosophy had shown that the human mind cannot transcend the sphere of consciousness. In one sense the course this is a truism, in so far, that is to say, as it means that we cannot be conscious of anything without being conscious of it or think of anything without thinking of it. But immanentism was understood as excluding any proof of God’s existence, for example, a causal argument. What is give in man is a need for the divine which, rising into consciousness, takes the form of a religious feeling or sense which is equivalent to faith. Revelation is man’s interpretation of his religious experience. This interpretation is expressed of course in conceptual or intellectual forms. But these can become antiquated and stifling, so that new forms of expression have to be sought. Revelation in a general sense can be considered as the work of God, even if from another point of view, it is man’s work. But the idea of God revealing absolute truths from outside, as it were, truths which are promulgated by the Church in the form of unchangeable statements of unchanging truths is incompatible with the concept of evolution, when applied to man’s cultural and religious life, and with the accompanying relativistic view of religious truth.”

“The foregoing remarks are of course a partial summary of views expressed in writings by different authors. But they may suffice to show how Catholic philosophers such as Blondel and Edouard Le Roy could be accused of modernism or of modernist leanings. For Blondel, as we have seen, pursued what he called the method of immanence and approached Good in terms of the human spirit’s basic orientation as manifested in its activity, while Le Roy, through his acceptance and application of the Bergsonian views of intelligence and intuition, appeared to attribute to religious dogmas a purely pragmatic value. Blondel however never accepted immanentism as a doctrine. Nor could be, as he tried, by means of the method of immanence, to open the mind to the transcendent divine really and lead it to the stage at which there was a point of insertion, so to speak, for God’s self-revelation. As for Le Roy, he certainly expounded a pragmatic interpretation of scientific truth and applied it also to religious dogmas. But he defended his position and was never separated from the Church, either by his own action or by that of ecclesiastical authority. According to Laberthonniere, who was given to such remarks, what Le Roy did was to reduce Christianity to Bergsonism but Bergsonism to Christianity.”

The main theme of this section has been philosophy as apologetics. “The new approach in apologetics was represented by Olle-Laprune, Blondel and Laberthonniere. Their thought had indeed some points in common with views expressed by the modernists. But they were primarily concerned with philosophical approaches to Christianity, whereas the modernists were primarily concerned with reconciling Catholic faith and beliefs with freedom in historical, biblical and scientific research. While therefore Blondel, as a professional philosopher, was careful not only to stop short of pronouncements about revelation but also to justify this stopping short in terms of his own concept of the nature and scope of philosophy, the modernists were naturally compelled to reconsider the nature of revelation and of Catholic dogma. In other words, they occupied themselves with theological topics in a way in which Blondel did not. And as their idea of what was demanded by modern historical and biblical research was a radical one, they naturally fell afoul of ecclesiastical authorities who were convinced that the modernists were undermining the Christian faith. Looking back, we may think that the authorities were so much concerned with the conclusions at which the modernist arrived that they failed to consider whether or not the modernistic movement expressed recognition of genuine problems. But we have to see things in their historical perspective. Given the actual situation, including the attitude of the authorities on the one hand and the concept of modern scholarship and knowledge on the other hand, one could hardly expect events to be other than what they were. Moreover, from the philosophical point of view the thought of Blondel is of considerably more value that the ideas of the modernists.”
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6-2. Thomism in France

“Thomism is the philosophical school that arose as a legacy of the work and thought of Thomas Aquinas (1225–1274), philosopher, theologian, and Doctor of the Church. In philosophy, Aquinas' disputed questions and commentaries on Aristotle are perhaps his most well-known works. In theology, his Summa Theologica is one of the most influential documents in medieval theology and continues to be the central point of reference for the philosophy and theology of the Catholic Church. In the encyclical Doctoris Angelici Pope Pius X cautioned that the teachings of the Church cannot be understood without the basic philosophical underpinnings of Aquinas' major theses: The capital theses in the philosophy of St. Thomas are not to be placed in the category of opinions capable of being debated one way or another, but are to be considered as the foundations upon which the whole science of natural and divine things is based; if such principles are once removed or in any way impaired, it must necessarily follow that students of the sacred sciences will ultimately fail to perceive so much as the meaning of the words in which the dogmas of divine revelation are proposed by the magistracy of the Church. The Second Vatican Council described Aquinas' system as the Perennial Philosophy.”

“In order to understand the importance of the Thomistic revival under Pope Leo XIII (reigned 1878-1903), one must appreciate two significant facts concerning the development of Catholic thought since the Reformation. The first fact is that Catholic universities and seminaries were greatly influenced by modern philosophers, non-scholastic thinkers, many of whom were non-Catholic. The second fact is that many nineteenth century Catholic intellectuals had a sincere, ardent desire to defend Catholic doctrine against its adversaries and to render this doctrine acceptable in an age of rationalism, skepticism, naturalism and liberalism. This last fact produced what is called “nineteenth century apologetics. Modern philosophical thought, even in Catholic circles, goes back to the French Catholic philosopher and scientist, René Descartes (1596-1650). Descartes was taught an unsatisfying form of scholasticism by the Jesuits at La Flèche. After discovering analytic geometry in 1619, Descartes wanted to reconstruct the whole of speculative philosophy, which at that time still included the natural sciences. Rejecting outright all previous thinkers, he elaborated a new philosophy, which he hoped would be acceptable to Catholic schools. To win over the theologians of his day, he dedicated a Latin exposition of his basic philosophical principles to the Dean and Faculty of Theology of the Sorbonne in 1641. The theologians were unimpressed. As might have been expected, some resented this innovation by a layman; others were antagonistic to the un-scholastic character of Descartes’ philosophy. Although spurned by the Sorbonne, Descartes’ philosophy became widely popular after his death both in the vernacular and in the scholastic tongue. Not only was Cartesian philosophy taught in French, Belgian, Dutch and English universities, but his principle of rejecting all previous, that is, pre-seventeenth century, thought became universal. Protestants welcomed the rejection of scholasticism, and even Catholics rejoiced in the downfall of Aristotelianism. Catholic colleges and seminaries in France, Belgium and Italy taught Cartesian philosophy or some form of it, as late as 1850, and it became customary to ridicule the Middle Ages, scholasticism, and the peripatus in books and lectures, even without bothering to explain what the peripatus was supposed to be.”

“Isaac Newton’s definitive rejection of Cartesian physics (1713), Voltaire’s popularization of Newtonian physics in France (1738), Clarke’s Newtonian annotations to the standard Cartesian textbook, and the growing acceptance of universal gravitation and the new system of the world had their effect on seminary textbooks. Henceforth Newtonian physics was fitted into Cartesian metaphysics, and the whole ensemble was adjusted to the schema of Christian Wolff’s concept of philosophy. Christian Wolff (1679-1754), a disciple of Leibniz, systematized his master’s
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philosophy for use in schools. Wolff’s fifteen volume course in philosophy was widely used in Germany, and highly influential in Italy, France, Spain and the Low Countries. The influence of Wolff can easily be recognized by the separation of experimental science from rational philosophy, the identification of philosophy with metaphysics and ethics, and the subdivision of metaphysics into ontology and special metaphysics.”

“In the eighteenth and nineteenth century countless Catholic textbooks were produced which presented a Christian philosophy based on the Scriptures, Descartes, Newton and Wolff. Just to take two random examples, there was the standard textbook in Spanish seminaries during the first half of the nineteenth century written by Fr. Andrea de Guevaray Basoazabal, Institutionum elementarium philosophiae, in six volumes. Here the latest theories and principles of physics were taught with Cartesian metaphysics and psychology. Gravitational forces attracting bodies at a distance, for example, were presented as highly conducive to theism and religion. Then there was the anonymous Institutiones philosophicae which was published by authority of the Archbishop of Lyons for his own diocese (5 vols., Lyons 1788), but which was widely used in other dioceses as well. In the volume on metaphysics, the anonymous author copiously quotes from Sacred Scripture, St. Jerome, St. Augustine, Cicero, Seneca, Bossuet, Fénélon, French poets and contemporary philosophers, but St. Thomas is scarcely mentioned. Discussing the Molinist controversy, the author explains: Thomistae sic dicti qui divum Thomarn se ducem sequi gloriantur docent…Fortunately in this question the anonymous author sides with Bossuet and the Thomists against Molina and the Calvinists!”

“Catholic philosophy books in this period were frankly apologetical in character, venturing to defend the possibility of revelation, miracles, the Incarnation, the Eucharist, and other supernatural mysteries. Historically speaking, it must be admitted that Catholic textbooks in philosophy produced during the eighteenth and early nineteenth century were very much up to date in the sense of being modern. The latest findings of modern science were incorporated; the Bible and post Cartesian philosophers were generously quoted, while Aristotle and scholastic philosophers were rarely mentioned, except in an historical survey. Thus modern science and modern philosophers were used to defend the ancient religion. At the beginning of the nineteenth century, however, a number of Catholic thinkers did not consider this endeavor modern enough. For our purpose it will be sufficient to consider only two of the most distinguished Catholic philosophers of the early nineteenth century, George Hermes and Anton Günther.”

George Hermes (1775-1831) was “the most distinguished and the most influential Catholic thinker in Germany. His own study of Kant and Fichte at the University of Münster produced many religious doubts, but these Hermes put to one side temporarily until he could work out an over-all solution to the problem of religion. Eventually he worked out a new rationalist introduction to religion which “demonstrated” from within the Kantian system the truth of Catholicism. Since Kantianism was widely popular in Germany at the time, Hermes theological rationalism was enthusiastically received by many. His distinguished physical appearance, his extraordinary professorial ability, and his exemplary priestly life earned him unusual respect and devotion in western Germany. Having received many academic honors from innumerable universities, even Lutheran universities, he was appointed Rector Magnificus of the Catholic University of Bonn in the diocese of Cologne. During the 1820’s all the leading professors of Bonn, Cologne, Breslau Münster, Braunsberg, Trier, countless cathedral chapters and smaller colleges were Hermesians. Even the Archbishop of Cologne, Baron von Spiegel, was an advocate of Hermes against the suspicions of Rome. The inevitable controversy became sharp and bitter between Hermesians and non-Hermesians. No action, however, was taken against George Hennes, during his lifetime. After Hermes’ death, Pope Gregor condemned the Hermesian system on 26
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September 1835 as subversive of Catholic faith,” and the major writings of George Hermes were placed on the Index. The most stubborn Hermesians did not submit to the Church until 1860, twenty-five years after the condemnation. But the First Vatican Council found it necessary to express the traditional Catholic teaching more clearly because of him. Out of priestly zeal for Church George Hermes had developed a Christian Kantian philosophy which claimed to demonstrate the necessity of supernatural mysteries.

“More significant, in a way, was the philosophical system of Anton Günther (1783-1863), a Bohemian priest and writer who lived much of his life in Vienna. Günther’s writings were directed primarily against the Pantheism of Hegel, whose influence in Germany was supplanting that of Kant. Rejecting scholasticism completely, Anton Günther elaborated a Christian Hegelianism to prove the transcendence of God, the Trinity of Persons (thesis-antithesis-synthesis), creation from nothing and the supernatural destiny of man. Although never a professor, this zealous and holy priest started a far-reaching movement which included some of the most distinguished Catholics of mid-nineteenth century Germany. At the zenith of this movement many of the outstanding Catholic professors of philosophy were Güntherians. Günther’s Catholic Hegelianism was taught at Salzburg, Prague, Krems, Graz, Tübingen, Trier, Augsburg, Bonn, Breslau, and many other German universities. Günther himself was offered professorships at Munich, Bonn, Breslau and Tübingen, but he refused all of these in the hope of receiving an offer from the University of Vienna, which never came. He was a friend of St. Clement Mary Hofbauer, Cardinals Shwarzenberg and Diepenbrock, and many other eminent clerics. However, after much careful examination and amicable interrogation in Rome, the Holy Office decided to place the works of Günther on the Index on 8 January 1857. Pope Pius IX explained in a letter to the Archbishop of Cologne, Card. von Geissel, that Günther’s handling of Christian dogmas was not consistent with the teaching of the Church, and the pontiff listed the reasons. This came as a terrible blow to Günther, who submitted. But the followers of Günther refused to submit. After the First Vatican Council most of the living Güntherians left the Church to join the Old Catholics.”

“Here it is not necessary to add the better-known attempts of the Abbé de Lammenais and Padre Antonio Rosmini to create a new philosophy in the name of apologetics and modernity. All of these eminent and zealous priests were motivated by the highest Catholic ideals. But they did not have a solid enough philosophical foundation to save them from heretical and dangerous expressions of Catholic doctrine. What was needed was a sounder philosophy to apply to current problems. This sounder philosophy was soon seen by many to lie in the principles of St. Thomas.”

Revival of Thomism in Italy: “First it must be recognized that Thomism was always alive in the Dominican Order, small as it was after the ravages of the Reformation, the French Revolution, and the Napoleonic occupation. Repeated legislation of the General Chapters, beginning after the death of St. Thomas, as well as the Constitutions of the Order, required all Dominicans to teach the doctrine of St. Thomas both in philosophy and in theology. However, as early as 1748 the General Chapter meeting at Bologna felt that it was necessary to emphasize the ancient obligation, In 1757 the Master General, John Thomas Boxadors, observed that some, not sufficiently versed in Thomistic doctrine, were proposing non-Thomistic novelties. He reviewed the Order’s legislation and insisted that all return immediately to the solid teaching of the Angelic Doctor. This long letter was included in the acts of the General Chapter which met in Rome in 1777. That same year (1777) Salvatore Roselli, O.P., published a six volume Summa philosophica, which he dedicated to Boxadors, who had been created a Cardinal and allowed to remain Master General. In his dedication to Card. Boxadors, Roselli noted, ‘There are some men in the Order, very few indeed, who, not knowing well the doctrine of St. Thomas, have dared to depart from it,
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and to embrace some other, novel opinions.’ Roselli sincerely wanted to renew Thomism in the Order. Actually, his influence extended beyond the Order, and everyone who had anything to do with the revival of Thomism in Italy, Spain and France was directly influenced by Roselli’s monumental work. There were three editions of this work, each of which was quickly exhausted. In 1837 a four-volume compendium was published at Rome. The editor of this compendium remarked: Although young philosophers accuse the Rosellian philosophy of extreme Aristotelianism, it is so highly esteemed that even though there have been many editions, scarcely or never at all can a copy of this work be found.”

“For the beginnings of Italian Thomism outside the Dominican Order five men are generally singled out for their substantial contribution - Canon Buzzetti, the two Sordi brothers who became Jesuits, the Jesuit Liberatore, and the diocesan priest Sanseverino.”

“Canon Vincenzo Buzzetti (1777-1824) of Piacenza was taught the philosophy of Locke and Condillac by the Vincentian Fathers of the Collegio Alberoni, but at the Collegio di San Pietro he did have one Spanish Jesuit teacher, Fr. Baltasar Masdeu, who occasionally lamented the abandonment of scholastic philosophy. Buzzetti discovered St. Thomas by reading the scholarly six volume work of Roselli and a smaller, simpler text by Antoine Goudin, O.P., which was first published in Milan in 1675. Buzzetti taught philosophy in the diocesan seminary at Piacenza from 1804 to 1808, during which time he wrote an unpublished Institutiones logicae et metaphysicae iuxta Divi Thomae atque Aristotelis inconcussa dogmata’. This fundamentally Thomistic work suffers somewhat from the influence of Christian Wolff. In 1808 Buzzetti was promoted to the chair of theology, and six years later he was appointed a Canon of the Cathedral. During a visit to Rome in 1818, Buzzetti revealed to the Holy Father his desire to enter the Society of Jesus, but Pope Pius VII discouraged the idea, saying that the 41-year-old Canon was more valuable to the diocese of Piacenza. Among his disciples were two Sordi brothers, who later became Jesuits, and Joseph Pecci, brother of the future Leo XIII.”

“Domenico Sordi (1790-1880) followed his younger brother into the Society of Jesus, but he was a hot-tempered individual who made many enemies. Among his disciples was Luigi Taparelli, S.J. When Taparelli became Provincial of the Naples Province, he wanted to secure Domenico Sordi for the Jesuit College in Naples. Taparelli wrote to Sordi saying that he had already managed to get into the college many copies of Goudin’s work. Finally, in 1831 Sordi began teaching philosophy in Naples. At the college Fr. Sordi formed a kind of “secret society,” which met in his room to discuss the revival of scholasticism. Within two years rumors of this intellectual underground movement had reached Rome. In 1833 a Visitor General with full powers, Fr. Giuseppe Ferrari, came from Rome and dissolved the revolutionary clique. Fr. Sordi was deprived of all teaching and sent into pastoral work; Fr. Taparelli was discharged and sent to Palermo as teacher of French and music.”

“Matteo Liberatore (1810-1892) was appointed to succeed Domenico Sordi as professor of philosophy at the Naples College, because he had not belonged to Sordi’s secret circle. Although Liberatore published his famous Institutiones at Naples in 1840, it was not until 1853 that he became convinced of Thomism. By 1855 he was completely won over to the Thomist cause, largely through the influence of Civiltà Cattolica, which was founded in Naples in 1850 by Fr. Carlo Maria Curci, S.J., with editorial assistance from Fathers Taparelli and Liberatore.”

Gaetano Sanseverino (1811-1865) was a diocesan priest of Naples. As a young man he was a convinced Cartesian, but around 1840 he seems to have been influenced by Roselli’s book, and possibly by a visit from Domenico Sordi. In 1841 Sanseverino obtained the cooperation of Taparelli and Liberatore for his periodical Scienza e Fede, which systematically criticized current rationalism, idealism and liberalism. By 1849 Sanseverino had learned a great deal about St.
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Thomas and by 1853 he was a thoroughly convinced Thomist. In his renowned Philosophia Christiana of 1853 (5 vols.) Sanseverino wrote: After many years of exclusive philosophical studies, I finally arrived at the conclusion that for a restoration of philosophy it was absolutely necessary to go back to the doctrine of the Fathers and Doctors of the Church. The importance of Sanseverino’s work in the Thomistic revival was clearly recognized by the Dominican, Zeferino Gonzàles, who later became Cardinal. Ironically, Gonzàles criticized Sanseverino for being too Thomistic. Writing in 1865, the year of Sanseverino’s death, Gonzàles noted two shortcomings in Sanseverino’s Philosophia Christiana: first, it is too verbose, and second, it is too narrowly attached to the philosophy that it defends; Sanseverino accepts St. Thomas’ conclusions even in the minutest details and despises modern thought as altogether vain and worthy of contempt. Nevertheless, Sanseverino contributed substantially to the revival of Thomism in Naples, and his work was continued by his disciple, Fr. Nunzio Signoriello, a diocesan priest.

“During the pontificate of Leo XIII, the doctrines of St. Thomas were promulgated by the Holy See in every way possible. In his great encyclicals on social problems, government, human liberty, the religious question, Sacred Scripture, Catholic Action and education, Leo XIII employed the teaching of St. Thomas to solve modern problems. Outstanding Catholic scholars directed their ability to promulgating the philosophy and theology of the Angelic Doctor. Editions of his works multiplied, organizations were formed to promulgate his teaching, and Catholic institutes were founded in Italy, France, Belgium, Germany and the United States to foster and disseminate a Thomistic approach to modern problems.”

Thomist Revival in France: (a) Desire Joseph Mercier (1851-1926): He was “a Belgian cardinal of the Roman Catholic Church and a noted scholar. A Thomist scholar, he had several of his works translated into other European languages. He was known for his book, Les origines de la psychologie contemporaine (1897). His scholarship gained him recognition from the Pope and he was appointed as Archbishop of Mechelen, serving from 1906 until his death, and was elevated to the cardinalate in 1907. Mercier is noted for his staunch resistance to the German occupation of 1914–1918 during the Great War. After the invasion, he distributed a strong pastoral letter, Patriotism and Endurance, to be read in all his churches, urging the people to keep up their spirits. He served as a model of resistance.” “In 1877 Mercier began teaching philosophy at Mechelen's minor seminary, of which he also became spiritual director. His comprehensive knowledge of Saint Thomas Aquinas earned him the newly erected chair of Thomism at Louvain's Catholic university in 1882. It was in this post, which he retained until 1905, that he forged a lifelong friendship with Dom Columba Marmion, an Irish Thomist. Raised to the rank of Monsignor on 6 May 1887, Mercier founded the Higher Institute of Philosophy at the Louvain University in 1899, which was to be a beacon of Neo-Thomist philosophy. He founded in 1894 and edited until 1906 the Revue Néoscholastique, and wrote in a scholastic manner on metaphysics, philosophy, and psychology. Several of his works were translated into English, German, Italian, Polish, and Spanish. His most important book was Les origines de la psychologie contemporaine (1897).”

“Mercier recognized the mathematical talent of Georges Lemaître as a young seminarian and urged him to study Einstein's theories of relativity. Lemaître became an early expert in general relativity as it applied to cosmological questions. He went on to propose an expanding model of the universe, based on both Einstein's and de Sitter's models. Abbé Georges Lemaître developed his Primeval Atom hypothesis, together with researchers of the University of Louvain, and Gamow, Alpher and Herman into the better-known Big Bang theory of the origin of the universe.” From 1921 to 1926 he held regular conversations with Anglican theologians, foreshadowing the Church's future dialogue with the Anglicans. He believed must be united, not absorbed.
(b) **Jacques Maritain** (1882–1973) was a Roman Catholic philosopher, “respected both for his interpretation of the thought of St. Thomas Aquinas and for his own Thomist philosophy. Reared a Protestant, Maritain attended the Sorbonne in Paris, where he was attracted by teachers who claimed that the natural sciences alone could resolve human questions about life and death. There, however, he also met Raïssa Oumansoff, a Russian-Jewish student, who began to share his quest for truth. Both became disillusioned with the Sorbonne’s scientism and began to attend lectures by the intuitionist philosopher Henri Bergson. From him, they came to realize their need for “the Absolute,” and in 1906, two years after their marriage, they converted to Catholicism. After studying biology at Heidelberg (1906–08) Maritain studied Thomism at Paris and in 1913 began teaching at the **Institut Catholique**, serving as professor of modern philosophy (1914–39). From 1932 he also taught annually at the Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies in Toronto and was a visiting professor at Princeton (1941–42) and Columbia (1941–44). He returned as professor of philosophy at Princeton (1948–60) after serving as French ambassador to the Vatican (1945–48). In 1958, at the University of Notre Dame, Ind., the Jacques Maritain Center was established to further studies along the lines of his philosophy.³³³

Maritain’s thought, which is based on Aristotelianism and Thomism, incorporates features from other classical and modern philosophers and draws upon anthropology, sociology, and psychology. The dominant themes in his more than 50 books include the contentions that (1) science, philosophy, poetry, and mysticism are among many legitimate ways of knowing reality; (2) the individual person transcends the political community; (3) natural law expresses not only what is natural in the world but also what is known naturally by human beings; (4) moral philosophy must take into account other branches of human knowledge; and (5) people holding different beliefs must cooperate in the formation and maintenance of salutary political institutions. Referring to Thomism as Existentialist Intellectualism, Maritain believed that to exist is to act. His philosophy contained elements of humanism; he emphasized the importance of the individual as well as the Christian community. Some critics have regarded Maritain as the most important modern interpreter of St. Thomas. A man of acute sensibility and known as a friend of numerous painters, poets, and other artists, Maritain devoted much attention to developing a philosophy of the arts. Among his major works are *Art et scolastique* (1920; 4th ed., 1965; Art and Scholasticism, 1930); *Distinguer pour unir, ou les degrés du savoir* (1932; The Degrees of Knowledge, 1937); *Frontières de la poésie et autres essais* (1935; Art and Poetry, 1943); *Man and the State* (1951); and *La Philosophie morale ...* (1960; Moral Philosophy, 1964).³³⁵

Frederick Copleston points out two points of attention. “In the first place, though Maritain is the last man to despise the activity of the discursive reason and though he criticizes what he regards as Bergson’s exaggerated depreciation of the intelligence and of the cognitive value of concepts, he has always been ready to recognize other ways of knowing than those exemplified in the sciences. For example, he claims that there can be a con-conceptual, pre-reflective knowledge. Thus, there can be an implicit knowledge of God which is not recognized by the person who has it as knowledge of God. In virtue of the internal dynamism of the will choice of the good, as against evil, involves an implicit affirmation of God, the Good itself, as the ultimate goal of human existence. This is a purely practical, non-conceptual and non-conscious knowledge of God which can co-exist with a theoretical ignorance of God. Again, Maritain has written about what he calls knowledge by connaturality. This is found, for example, in religious mysticism. But it also plays a part in our knowledge of persons. And another form of it, distinct from mysticism, is poetic knowledge, arising through the instrumentality of emotion, which, received in the preconscious life of the intellect, becomes intentional and intuitive, and tends by its nature to expression and creation. Knowledge by connaturality is also prominent in moral experience. For though moral
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philosophy belongs to the conceptual, discursive, rational use of reason, it by no means follows that a man actually arrives at his moral convictions in this way. On the contrary, moral philosophy presupposes moral judgements which express a knowledge by connaturality, a conformity between the practical reason and the essential inclinations of human nature.”

“In the second place, Maritain has tried to develop Thomist social and political philosophy, applying its principles to modern problems. If Aquinas had lived in the time of Galileo and Descartes, he would, according to Maritain, have freed Christian philosophy from the mechanics and astronomy of Aristotle, while remaining faithful to the principles of Aristotelian metaphysics. If he were living in the modern world, he would free Christian thought from the images and fantasies of the sacrum imperium and from worn-out temporal system. In outlining a philosophical basis for the fulfilment of such a task Maritain has recourse to the distinction, also encountered in the personalism of Mounier, between individual and person. Accepting the Aristotelian-Thomist theory of matter as the principle of individuation, he describes individuality as that which excludes from oneself all other men and as the narrowness of the ego, forever threatened and forever eager to grasp for itself. Personality is the subsistence of the spiritual soul as communicated to the composite human being and as characterized by self-giving in freedom and love. In the concrete human being individuality and personality are of course combined, as man is a unity. But there can be societies which disregard man as a person and consider him simply as an individual. They emphasize individuals precisely as distinct particulars, neglecting the universal, as in bourgeois individualism, which corresponds, philosophically, to nominalism. Or they may emphasize the universal to such an extent that the particulars are completely subordinated to it. This happens in totalitarian societies of various kinds, which correspond, philosophically, to ultra-realism, for which the universal is a subsistent reality. The moderate realism of St. Thomas would be expressed, in the social-political sphere, in a society of persons, which would indeed satisfy the needs of human beings as biological individuals but would at the same time be grounded on respect for the human person as transcending the biological level and, indeed, any temporal society. Manis by no means for the State. The State is for man. It may be added that during the Spanish Civil War, Maritain supported the Republic and thus incurred a good deal of opprobrium in certain circles. Politically speaking, he has been on the left rather than on the right.”

(c) Etienne Henri Gilson (1884-1978) was French Christian philosopher and historian of medieval thought, one of the most eminent international scholars of the 20th century. “Gilson was born into a Roman Catholic family and owed his early education to Catholic schools in Paris. He began the study of philosophy in 1902 at the Lycée Henri IV and received his baccalaureate in 1906 from the Sorbonne (the University of Paris). For the next six years he taught philosophy in various lycées. In 1913 he took his doctoral degree, for which he had investigated René Descartes and Scholasticism, the subject that first led him to the study of medieval thought. In 1913, at the Battle of Verdun, he was wounded and taken prisoner. During the two years of his imprisonment, he devoted himself to, among other things, the study of the Russian language and of the thought of St. Bonaventure. He was later awarded the Croix de Guerre for bravery in action. From 1919 Gilson was professor of the history of philosophy at the University of Strasbourg; in 1921 he returned to the University of Paris as professor of the history of medieval philosophy, a post he continued to hold until 1932, when he inaugurated the first chair in the history of medieval philosophy at the Collège de France. In 1926 he made the first of what later became his annual visits to the United States and Canada, lecturing at the universities of Montreal, Harvard, and Virginia. Three years later, at the invitation of the Congregation of the Priests of St. Basil, he established the Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies in conjunction with St. Michael’s College at the University of Toronto. From then on he divided his academic year between Paris and
Gilson soon came to profess himself a disciple of St. Thomas Aquinas, but, as he freely acknowledged, his own understanding of Aquinas’s thought underwent considerable development. He taught his first course on Thomism in 1914, and his first book on the subject was *Le Thomisme: introduction au système de Saint Thomas d’Aquin* (1919; *The Christian Philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas*). Many of his best-known books resulted from lectureships. Among these are *L’Esprit de la philosophie médiévale* (1932; *The Spirit of Mediæval Philosophy*), his exposition and defense of the idea of a Christian philosophy; *The Unity of Philosophical Experience* (1937) and *Being and Some Philosophers* (1949), perhaps the best examples of his use of the history of philosophy as though it were a laboratory for investigating ideas; and *Reason and Revelation in the Middle Ages* (1938). Gilson made important studies of all the great medieval thinkers, including St. Bernard de Clairvaux and St. Bonaventure, the results of which were summed up in *History of Christian Philosophy in the Middle Ages* (1955). Among his most charming books is *L’École des muses* (1951; *The Choir of Muses*), a study of writers whose works were inspired by love for a woman. Gilson was a lover and collector of painting, on which he wrote *Painting and Reality* (1957) and *The Art of the Beautiful* (1965). His last published book was *Dante et Béatrice: études dantesques* (1974; *Dante and Beatrice: Dantesque Studies*).339

One of the features of his philosophical outlook is his rejection of the primacy of the so-called critical problem. If we cancel out, as it were, all our actual knowledge and then try to decide a priori whether knowledge is possible, we create for ourselves a pseudo-problem. For we could not even raise the question unless we knew what knowledge is. And we know this through actually knowing something. In other words, it is in and through the act of knowing something that the mind becomes aware of its capacity to know. In Golson’s opinion Aquinas’s attitude on this matter was far superior to that of those modern philosophers who have believed that the proper way of starting philosophy was to wrestle with the question whether we can know anything at all outside the subjective contents of our own minds. Golson’s realism is also evident in this criticism of what he describes as essentialist philosophy. If we try to reduce reality to clear and distinct concepts, universal by their nature, we omit the act of existence which is an act of singular or individual things. According to Gilson, this act is not conceptualizable, as existence is not an essence but the act by which an essence exists. It can be grasped only in and through essence, as its act, and it is affirmed in the existential judgment. Thomism, as concerned with existing reality, is the authentic existentialism. It does not, like the philosophies which are nowadays described as existentialist, interpret existence narrowly, in the sense of something peculiar to man. Nor does it exclude essence. But it is primarily concerned with reality as existing and with the relation between received or participated existence and the infinite act in which essence and existence are identical. One of the chief representatives of essentialist philosophy, in Gilson’s eyes, was Christian Wolff; but he traced the origin of this line of thought back into the Middle Ages, where Aquinas is for him the chief exponent of existential philosophy.340

Another feature of Gilson’s thought is his refusal to extract a purely self-contained Thomist philosophy from the total thought of Aquinas. He does not indeed deny that the distinction made by St. Thomas between philosophy and theology is a valid distinction. But he insists on the artificiality of tearing from its theological setting a philosophy in which the selection and ordering of themes is determined by theological ends or by their theological context. Further, it seems clear to Gilson that a great influence on philosophical speculation, and that whatever some Thomists my say, they do in fact philosophize in the light of their Christian beliefs.341
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(d) Pierre Rousselot (1878-1915): “Born at Nantes, France, he entered the Society of Jesus in October 1895. He was ordained priest on 24 August 1908 at Hastings. The same year he had obtained a doctorate for two theses presented to the Sorbonne: L’intellectualisme de saint Thomas and Pour l’histoire du probleme de l’amour au Moyen Age. In November 1909 he entered the Institut Catholique at Paris; he was given the chair of dogmatic theology in the following year, which he occupied till he was called to military service in 1914, apart from a year (1912–13) spent in England. He was killed in battle at Éparges, on 25 April 1915, aged 37. Rousselot’s L’intellectualisme de saint Thomas drew attention to the continuing vitality in Thomas’ synthesis of Christian Platonism. Rousselot suggested a new concept of revelation: that revelation be conceived not as a sum total of distinct truths, propositions, judgments, but as a kind of knowledge that is indefinitely cashable (monnayable) in distinct ideas and propositions which explicitate it without being able to exhaust it, and without claiming to supplement it. Revelation, he proposed, was the living and loving knowledge that the apostles had of Jesus. The mode in which the many dogmas are precontained in the single changeless knowledge which is the apostolic deposit is not logical, but Christological. De Lubac’s contribution to the question of doctrinal development is largely a restatement of that of Rousselot, whose papers he studied and published.”

He writes, “By intellectualism I understand a doctrine that places everything of worth, all of life’s intensity, and the very essence of the good, identical with being, in the act of intelligence: everything else can be good only by participation in it. When in current usage we hear talk of intellectualism people often mean only a naive confidence in intelligence and particularly in deductive reasoning. A more technical meaning, one that tends to prevail over the popular one, characterizes intellectualism by the primacy of static definitions and discursive reason. The essentially metaphysical doctrine in question here is quite different: beyond the theory that all being is capable of being explained, it is the complete opposite of a system that would conceive the life of the spirit on the model of human discursive reasoning. Accordingly, to the extent that the usual meaning of the term is developed and pushed to its ultimate consequences, the meaning here adopted would cease to coincide with it and would end up diametrically opposed to it.”

“With these words Pierre Rousselot, the first and most original genius of what has come to be called transcendent Thomism, took on the rationalism of his day and proceeded to prove beyond doubt that the intellectualism of Thomas Aquinas was a completely different philosophy. In an emerging departure from the faculty psychology dominant in his day, he showed that Aquinas’s ratio meant a lower performance of intelligence—his preferred translation of intellectus, and that intellectus named the fullness of intelligent life enjoyed by the angels and God, in which we participate as the lowest in this hierarchy of intelligences. Reason is not the best we can do, because it is but the first of a series of substitutes we use for intelligence, which is a synthesis of cognition and affection in the service of action, a synthesis experienced in connaturality, a much neglected but central Thomist concept that Rousselot retrieved, practically single-handedly, in a masterly study of the complete Thomist corpus.”

(e) Garrigou-Lagrange (1877–1964) was a French Catholic theologian. He has been noted as a leading neo-Thomist of the 20th century, along with Jacobus Ramírez, Édouard Hugon, and Martin Grabmann. He taught at the Dominican Pontifical University of St. Thomas Aquinas, the Angelicum, in Rome from 1909 to 1960. Here he wrote his magnum opus, The Three Ages of the Interior Life in 1938. On the other hand, Joseph Maréchal (1878-1944) “was a Belgian Jesuit priest, philosopher, theologian and psychologist. He taught at the Higher Institute of Philosophy of the University of Leuven and was the founder of the school of thought called Transcendental Thomism, which attempted to merge the theological and philosophical thought of St. Thomas Aquinas with that of Immanuel Kant.”
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The Modernist Crisis in the Catholic Church: After the death of Leo XIII in 1903, a younger generation of clerics felt that scholasticism was not modern enough. Particularly in Italy and France a number of young clerics, devoid of a Thomistic formation, wished to live in harmony with the spirit of the age. “The desire to be modern stemmed mainly from the impact of German Higher Criticism on Catholic biblical scholars, historians and apologists. The Abbé Loisy of the Institute Catholique in Paris, perhaps the most distinguished of the so-called Modernists, summed up the situation: The avowed modernists form a fairly definite group of thinking men united in the common desire to adapt Catholicism to the intellectual, moral and social needs of today. Actually, Modernism was not a single body of doctrine; it had no founder; the name itself is unfortunate and ambiguous. Rather it was an intellectual movement simultaneously evoked in many countries of Europe by zealous clerics who wished to be up-to-date and non-isolationist in a world that was liberal, rationalist and evolutionistic. Modernists such as Loisy, Laberthonniére, Le Roy, Tyrell, Minocchi and Murri dealt mainly with the nature, source and promulgation of Catholic dogma. They insisted on the evolutionary, or developmental character of Catholic dogma and on modern man’s ability to demonstrate these truths rationally and historically. There can be no doubt that the Modernists did not have the necessary philosophical and theological formation.”

In 1905 and 1906 many Italian bishops warned against the modernismo nel clero in their pastoral letters. Toward the end of 1906 Abbate Cavallanti collected material which he published as Modernismo e Modernisti. On 6 May 1907 Pope Pius X issued a letter to archbishops, bishops and the Catholic Institute of Paris, urging in no uncertain terms that sacred studies and scholastic philosophy be restored, and that the training of the clergy be guarded most carefully. Two months later (3 July) the Holy Office published the decree Lamentabili, listing 65 Modernist errors taken mainly from the writings of Alfred Loisy. This was followed (8 September) by the famous encyclical Pascendi of Pius X on the doctrine of the Modernists. During the next three years there were at least ten important decrees, injunctions and letters from the Holy See, the Biblical Commission, the Holy Office, and other authoritative sources on the question of Modernism and the proper training of the clergy. By a Motu proprio of St. Pius X, issued on 1 September 1910, all candidates for higher orders, newly appointed confessors, preachers, parish priests, canons, the beneficed clergy, the bishop’s staff, Lenten preachers, superiors and all professors in religious congregations were required to take an oath against Modernism.”

“Many historians and theologians believe that the philosophical basis of Modernism was neo-Kantianism. However, I suspect that it was more intimately connected with Hegelianism and the spirit of Anton Günther than with Kantianism and the spirit of George Hermes. Hegelianism, after all, in one form or another had already won the day in European philosophy. In any case, early twentieth century Modernism was linked in large measure with the new Catholic biblical movement, which was then feeling, the impact of Protestant Higher Criticism and Source Criticism. The Modernist crisis between 1904 and 1914 was most unfortunate. It presented a great danger to the Church, which had to act quickly and forcefully, but it need not have happened if Aeterni Patris had been taken seriously in 1879. The Belgian biblical scholar Levie has noted: As it developed after 1900 Modernism constituted for the Church a very great danger which could only be warded off by radical action, generally and speedily applied. The decree Lamentabili and the encyclical Pascendi were necessary and eminently salutary measures which cut down the evil at its roots. That certain special steps taken during what was in a sense a state of siege unfortunately affected some leading personalities who were above all suspicion cannot be denied, nor that a narrow and short-sighted society, organized by narrow-minded reactionaries for the purpose of delation to the Holy Office was at work for years….But it remains true that the speed and firmness of the repression of Modernism by Pius X saved the Church.”
Pius X himself fully realized, as his own letters show, that a fundamental cause of Modernism was the failure to return to St. Thomas in the intellectual formation of the clergy. At least one modern scripture scholar has recognized that the lack of theological and philosophical training was one of the causes of the eventual Modernism of several Catholic scripture scholars of that time. Pius X himself remarked concerning the Modernists: \textit{idcirco philosophia in ac theologiam scholasticam derideant passim atque contemnunt}. St. Pius X was understandably upset by the various attempts to evade the decree of Leo XIII concerning Thomism. Many wished to teach an eclectic type of scholasticism, while many others made no attempt whatever to return either to St. Thomas or to scholasticism. In a \textit{Motu proprio} of 29 June 1914 St. Pius X explicitly stated that by scholasticism is meant the principal teachings of St. Thomas Aquinas. Lest there be any doubt about his meaning, Pius X said: We desired that all teachers of philosophy and sacred theology should be warned that if they deviated so much as an iota from Aquinas, especially in metaphysics, they exposed themselves to grave risk. – We now go further and solemnly declare that those who in their interpretations misrepresent or affect to despise the principles and major theses of his philosophy are not only not following St. Thomas, but are even far astray from the saintly Doctor. If the doctrine of any writer or Saint has ever been approved by Us or Our Predecessors with such singular commendation and in such a way that to that commendation were added an invitation and order to propagate and defend it, it may easily be understood that it was commended to the extent that it agreed with the principles of Aquinas or was in no way opposed to them.”

“Pius X went on to insist that all institutions granting pontifical degrees must use the Summa theologiae as a textbook in theology, and he declared that any such institution failing to comply with these directives within three years shall be deprived of all right to grant pontifical degrees. One month later (29 July 1914) the Congregation of Studies clarified the meaning of “principal teachings of St. Thomas” by issuing a list of twenty-four fundamental theses in philosophy, twenty-three of which were denied by Francesco Suárez. On 7 March 1916 the Congregation of Seminaries and Universities confirmed this list as essential and insisted that the Summa theologiae be used as a textbook or at least as a major reference work for speculative theology. This posed a problem of conscience for many Jesuits who could not accept the twenty-four theses. Therefore Fr. Wlodimir Ledóchowski, General of the Society, submitted a letter, intended for the members of the Society, to Pope Benedict XV for his approval or revision on 18 January 1917. The letter emphasized the traditional place of St. Thomas in the Society as well as the mind of Leo XIII and Pius X. As for the twenty-four theses, the letter argued that although the essentials of Thomism are found therein, one cannot be called un-Thomistic, if for grave reasons he thinks that one or other need not necessarily be defended. Therefore, the General concluded, the prescriptions of Pius X are sufficiently satisfied, even though not all the theses are held, as long as they are proposed as safe directive norms. This reasonable interpretation of the Church’s mind was approved by Benedict XV on 19 March 1917.”

“The Code of Canon Law issued under Benedict XV (1917) required that all professors of philosophy and theology hold and teach the method, doctrine and principles of the Angelic Doctor. Pope Pius XI reiterated the mind of his predecessors in \textit{Studiorum ducem}, issued on the sixth centenary of the canonization of St. Thomas (29 June 1923). In it he said: We so heartily approve the magnificent tribute of praise bestowed upon this most divine genius that We consider that Thomas should be called not only the Angelic, but also the Common or Universal Doctor of the Church, for the Church has adopted his philosophy for her very own, as innumerable documents of every kind testify. The Apostolic Constitution \textit{Deus scientiarum dominus} (24 May 1931) presented a detailed curriculum of studies for all seminaries, and this was imposed with the fullest apostolic authority.” Now let’s extend this to the modern scene.348
Since 1934, there has been a movement in France, a kind of theological underground, which rejects Thomism and scholasticism outright as wholly unsuitable for our day. These French philosophers and theologians simultaneously insist on the importance of returning to the simplicity, sanctity and vitality of the early Fathers of the Church, and on the importance of creating a new theology, a new philosophy, and a new cosmology for our age based on the Hegelian experience of reality. This théologie nouvelle, as it is called, is influenced mainly by modern philosophies of evolutionism, historicism and existentialism coupled with a sincere desire to revitalize a world shaken by two World Wars and threatened by another. This new theology is more biblical, patristic and liturgical in approach than the sterile approach of modern scholasticism, such as is frequently taught in seminaries. As a philosophical preparation for this new theology, many French theologians claim that a Hegelian philosophical experience is the best means today of attaining a vital, meaningful theology. The point is that for them, scholasticism in general and Thomism in particular is too systematic, too essentialist and dry for a vital capable of moving modern man to spiritual heights. Aristotle may have been suitable for St. Thomas, but he is of no use today. Even St. Thomas, they maintain, cannot give modern man a vital experience of a living Christianity. Hegelianism, on the other hand, particularly as it was developed by Kierkegaard, Bergson, Marcel and Blondel, is concrete, existentialist and universal in its spiritual perception of the misery and the greatness of man in this world redeemed by Christ.  

Many of these ideas were circulated in mimeograph form during and after the Second World War, particularly in the works of Henri Bouillard and Teilhard de Chardin. Garrigou-Lagrange, who has read many of these unpublished works, asserted that many of these articles contained fantastic opinions, ranging from apologetics and dogmatic theology to philosophy and extreme views on evolution. The works of Teilhard de Chardin are recognized as pre-eminent examples of the new cosmology. Henri De Lubac’s Surnaturel of 1946 is generally considered a part of this movement, and many would consider the earlier views of Danielou and Msgr. de Solages as typical of the new theology. The growing concern of Roman authorities, who had watched this movement for a long time, culminated in Pope Pius XII’s theological masterpiece, Humani generis, of 12 August 1950. In it, Pope Pius XII not only condemned the fundamental errors of the théologie nouvelle, but he also emphasized the importance of returning to the doctrine of St. Thomas in our own day…Unfortunately these advocates of novelty easily pass from despising scholastic theology to the neglect of and even contempt for the teaching authority of the Church itself…This is one of the sad features of misguided zeal - the zealot can easily alienate himself from the very source of his zeal. Fortunately, none of the so-called new theologians has cut himself from communion with the Church, and none wishes to do so. The encyclical Humani generis fell like an unexpected bomb on French theologians, but it did not eliminate the movement”

In conclusion I would like to make three remarks. First, historically speaking, the program of Pope Leo XIII has never been universally implemented in Catholic colleges, universities and seminaries. Not even the ardent efforts of St. Pius X were able to effect this. Until this program is really attempted in a thorough manner, there will always be zealous priests who react to what they only half understand. Reactions against Thomism in the past half century have always been to a pseudo-Thomism, a half-understood St. Thomas. Second, we must realize that many important things have been discovered in recent decades, and that many valuable insights have been re-captured by modern thinkers. One need, only consider the magnificent growth of history and the refinement of historical method, the extraordinary insights of psychology and psycho-analysis, the intriguing suggestions of demography, the fascinating discoveries of archeology, philology, comparative religion, to say nothing of the discoveries of modern physics, genetics, anthropology and paleontology to realize what tremendous advances have been made in the past century. 

6-3. Philosophy of Science

Introduction: "Philosophy of science is a sub-field of philosophy concerned with the foundations, methods, and implications of science. The central questions of this study concern what qualifies as science, the reliability of scientific theories, and the ultimate purpose of science. This discipline overlaps with metaphysics, ontology, and epistemology, for example, when it explores the relationship between science and truth. There is no consensus among philosophers about many of the central problems concerned with the philosophy of science, including whether science can reveal the truth about unobservable things and whether scientific reasoning can be justified at all. In addition to these general questions about science as a whole, philosophers of science consider problems that apply to particular sciences (such as biology or physics). Some philosophers of science also use contemporary results in science to reach conclusions about philosophy itself. While philosophical thought pertaining to science dates back at least to the time of Aristotle, philosophy of science emerged as a distinct discipline only in the middle of the 20th century in the wake of the logical positivism movement, which aimed to formulate criteria for ensuring all philosophical statements' meaningfulness and objectively assessing them. Thomas Kuhn's landmark 1962 book *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* was also formative, challenging the view of scientific progress as steady, cumulative acquisition of knowledge based on a fixed method of systematic experimentation and instead arguing that any progress is relative to a paradigm, the set of questions, concepts, and practices that define a scientific discipline in a particular historical period. Karl Popper and Charles Sanders Peirce moved on from positivism to establish a modern set of standards for scientific methodology."351

"Subsequently, the coherentist approach to science, in which a theory is validated if it makes sense of observations as part of a coherent whole, became prominent due to W. V. Quine and others. Some thinkers such as Stephen Jay Gould seek to ground science in axiomatic assumptions, such as the uniformity of nature. A vocal minority of philosophers, and Paul Feyerabend (1924–1994) in particular, argue that there is no such thing as the "scientific method", so all approaches to science should be allowed, including explicitly supernatural ones. Another approach to thinking about science involves studying how knowledge is created from a sociological perspective, an approach represented by scholars like David Bloor and Barry Barnes. Finally, a tradition in continental philosophy approaches science from the perspective of a rigorous analysis of human experience. Philosophies of the particular sciences range from questions about the nature of time raised by Einstein's general relativity, to the implications of economics for public policy. A central theme is whether one scientific discipline can be reduced to the terms of another. That is, can chemistry be reduced to physics, or can sociology be reduced to individual psychology? The general questions of philosophy of science also arise with greater specificity in some particular sciences. For example, the question of the validity of scientific reasoning is seen in a different guise in the foundations of statistics. The question of what counts as science and what should be excluded arises as a life-or-death matter in the philosophy of medicine...the philosophies of biology, of psychology, and of the social sciences explore whether the scientific studies of human nature can achieve objectivity or are inevitably shaped by values and by social relations."352

Definition of Science: “Distinguishing between science and non-science is referred to as the demarcation problem. For example, should psychoanalysis be considered science? How about so-called creation science, the inflationary multiverse hypothesis, or macroeconomics? Karl Popper called this the central question in the philosophy of science. However, no unified account of the problem has won acceptance among philosophers, and some regard the problem as unsolvable or uninteresting. Martin Gardner has argued for the use of a Potter Stewart standard (I know it when..."
I see it) for recognizing pseudoscience. Early attempts by the logical positivists grounded science in observation while non-science was non-observational and hence meaningless. Popper argued that the central property of science is falsifiability. That is, every genuinely scientific claim is capable of being proven false, at least in principle. An area of study or speculation that masquerades as science in an attempt to claim a legitimacy that it would not otherwise be able to achieve is referred to as pseudoscience, fringe science, or junk science. Physicist Richard Feynman coined the term cargo cult science for cases in which researchers believe they are doing science because their activities have the outward appearance of it but actually lack the kind of utter honesty that allows their results to be rigorously evaluated.

**Scientific Explanation:** “A closely related question is what counts as a good scientific explanation. In addition to providing predictions about future events, society often takes scientific theories to provide explanations for events that occur regularly or have already occurred. Philosophers have investigated the criteria by which a scientific theory can be said to have successfully explained a phenomenon, as well as what it means to say a scientific theory has explanatory power. One early and influential theory of scientific explanation is the deductive-nomological model. It says that a successful scientific explanation must deduce the occurrence of the phenomena in question from a scientific law. This view has been subjected to substantial criticism, resulting in several widely acknowledged counterexamples to the theory. It is especially challenging to characterize what is meant by an explanation when the thing to be explained cannot be deduced from any law because it is a matter of chance, or otherwise cannot be perfectly predicted from what is known. Wesley Salmon developed a model in which a good scientific explanation must be statistically relevant to the outcome to be explained. Others have argued that the key to a good explanation is unifying disparate phenomena or providing a causal mechanism.”

**Justifying Science:** “Although it is often taken for granted, it is not at all clear how one can infer the validity of a general statement from a number of specific instances or infer the truth of a theory from a series of successful tests. For example, a chicken observes that each morning the farmer comes and gives it food, for hundreds of days in a row. The chicken may therefore use inductive reasoning to infer that the farmer will bring food every morning. However, one morning, the farmer comes and kills the chicken. How is scientific reasoning more trustworthy than the chicken’s reasoning? One approach is to acknowledge that induction cannot achieve certainty but observing more instances of a general statement can at least make the general statement more probable. So, the chicken would be right to conclude from all those mornings that it is likely the farmer will come with food again the next morning, even if it cannot be certain. However, there remain difficult questions about what precise probability any given evidence justifies putting on the general statement. One way out of these particular difficulties is to declare that all beliefs about scientific theories are subjective, or personal, and correct reasoning is merely about how evidence should change one’s subjective beliefs over time. Some argue that what scientists do is not inductive reasoning at all but rather abductive reasoning, or inference to the best explanation. In this account, science is not about generalizing specific instances but rather about hypothesizing explanations for what is observed. As discussed in the previous section, it is not always clear what is meant by the best explanation…In other words, there appear to be as many different measures of simplicity as there are theories themselves, and the task of choosing between measures of simplicity appears to be every bit as problematic as the job of choosing between theories.”

**Observation Inseparable from Theory:** “When making observations, scientists look through telescopes, study images on electronic screens, record meter readings, and so on. Generally, on a basic level, they can agree on what they see, e.g., the thermometer shows 37.9 degrees C. But, if these scientists have different ideas about the theories that have been developed to explain these
basic observations, they may disagree about what they are observing. For example, before Albert Einstein's general theory of relativity, observers would have likely interpreted the image at left as five different objects in space. In light of that theory, however, astronomers will tell you that there are actually only two objects, one in the center and four different images of a second object around the sides... All observation involves both perception and cognition. That is, one does not make an observation passively, but rather is actively engaged in distinguishing the phenomenon being observed from surrounding sensory data. Therefore, observations are affected by one's underlying understanding of the way in which the world functions, and that understanding may influence what is perceived, noticed, or deemed worthy of consideration... all observation is theory-laden.”

The Purpose of Science: “Should science aim to determine ultimate truth, or are there questions that science cannot answer? Scientific realists claim that science aims at truth and that one ought to regard scientific theories as true, approximately true, or likely true. Conversely, scientific anti-realists argue that science does not aim (or at least does not succeed) at truth, especially truth about un-observables like electrons or other universes. Instrumentalists argue that scientific theories should only be evaluated on whether they are useful. In their view, whether theories are true or not is beside the point, because the purpose of science is to make predictions and enable effective technology. Realists often point to the success of recent scientific theories as evidence for the truth (or near truth) of current theories. Antirealists point to either the many false theories in the history of science, epistemic morals, the success of false modeling assumptions, or widely termed postmodern criticisms of objectivity as evidence against scientific realism. Antirealists attempt to explain the success of scientific theories without reference to truth. Some antirealists claim that scientific theories aim at being accurate only about observable objects and argue that their success is primarily judged by that criterion.”

Values and Science: “Values intersect with science in different ways. There are epistemic values that mainly guide the scientific research. The scientific enterprise is embedded in particular culture and values through individual practitioners. Values emerge from science, both as product and process and can be distributed among several cultures in the society. If it is unclear what counts as science, how the process of confirming theories works, and what the purpose of science is, there is considerable scope for values and other social influences to shape science. Indeed, values can play a role ranging from determining which research gets funded to influencing which theories achieve scientific consensus. For example, in the 19th century, cultural values held by scientists about race shaped research on evolution, and values concerning social class influenced debates on phrenology (considered scientific at the time). Feminist philosophers of science, sociologists of science, and others explore how social values affect science.”

History: “A number of philosophers has concerned themselves with reflection on the natural sciences. Reference has been made for example, to Comte and to writers belonging more or less to the positivist line of thought, such as Bernard and Taine, to the neo-critical philosophers Cournot and Renouvier, and to thinkers such as Ravasson, Lachelier and Boutroux, who belong to the spiritualist movement. We can now brief glance at the ideas of a few writers who can more easily be described as philosophers of science.” “The origins of philosophy of science trace back to Plato and Aristotle who distinguished the forms of approximate and exact reasoning, set out the threefold scheme of deductive, inductive, and analogical reasoning, and also analyzed reasoning by analogy. The eleventh century Arab polymath Ibn al-Haytham conducted his research in optics by way of controlled experimental testing and applied geometry, especially in his investigations into the images resulting from the reflection and refraction of light. Roger Bacon (1214–1294), an English thinker and experimenter heavily influenced by al-Haytham, is recognized by many to be

the father of modern scientific method. His view that mathematics was essential to a correct understanding of natural philosophy was considered to be 400 years ahead of its time."356

"Francis Bacon was a seminal figure in philosophy of science at the time of the Scientific Revolution. In his work Novum Organum (1620)...Bacon outlined a new system of logic to improve upon the old philosophical process of syllogism. Bacon's method relied on experimental histories to eliminate alternative theories. In 1637, René Descartes established a new framework for grounding scientific knowledge in his treatise, Discourse on Method, advocating the central role of reason as opposed to sensory experience. By contrast, in 1713, the 2nd edition of Isaac Newton's Philosophiae Naturalis Principia Mathematica argued that...hypotheses...have no place in experimental philosophy. In this philosophy, propositions are deduced from the phenomena and rendered general by induction. This passage influenced a later generation of philosophically-inclined readers to pronounce a ban on causal hypotheses in natural philosophy. In particular, later in the 18th century, David Hume would famously articulate skepticism about the ability of science to determine causality and gave a definitive formulation of the problem of induction. The 19th century writings of John Stuart Mill are also considered important in the formation of current conceptions of the scientific method...anticipating later accounts of scientific explanation."357

"Instrumentalism became popular among physicists around the turn of the 20th century, after which logical positivism defined the field for several decades. Logical positivism accepts only testable statements as meaningful, rejects metaphysical interpretations, and embraces verificationism (a set of theories of knowledge that combines logicism, empiricism, and linguistics to ground philosophy on a basis consistent with examples from the empirical sciences). Seeking to overhaul all of philosophy and convert it to a new scientific philosophy, the Berlin Circle and the Vienna Circle propounded logical positivism in the late 1920s...Logical positivism is commonly portrayed as taking the extreme position that scientific language should never refer to anything unobservable - even the seemingly core notions of causality, mechanism, and principles - but that is an exaggeration. Talk of such un-observables could be allowed as metaphorical - direct observations viewed in the abstract-or at worst metaphysical or emotional. Theoretical laws would be reduced to empirical laws, while theoretical terms would garner meaning from observational terms via correspondence rules. Mathematics in physics would reduce to symbolic logic via logicism, while rational reconstruction would convert ordinary language into standardized equivalents, all networked and united by a logical syntax. A scientific theory would be stated with its method of verification, whereby a logical calculus or empirical operation could verify its falsity or truth." Close in 1945 logical empiricism became dominant in America.358

"In the 1962 book The Structure of Scientific Revolutions, Thomas Kuhn argued that the process of observation and evaluation takes place within a paradigm, a logically consistent portrait of the world that is consistent with observations made from its framing. A paradigm also encompasses the set of questions and practices that define a scientific discipline. He characterized normal science as the process of observation and puzzle solving which takes place within a paradigm, whereas revolutionary science occurs when one paradigm overtakes another in a paradigm shift. Kuhn denied that it is ever possible to isolate the hypothesis being tested from the influence of the theory in which the observations are grounded, and he argued that it is not possible to evaluate competing paradigms independently. More than one logically consistent construct can paint a usable likeness of the world, but there is no common ground from which to pit two against each other, theory against theory. Each paradigm has its own distinct questions, aims, and interpretations. Neither provides a standard by which the other can be judged, so there is no clear way to measure scientific progress across paradigms. The choice between paradigms involves setting two or more portraits against the world and deciding which likeness is most promising."359
Chapter III. History of Philosophy

Jules Henri Poincaré (1845-1912) “was a French mathematician, theoretical physicist, engineer, and philosopher of science. He is often described as a polymath, and in mathematics as The Last Universalist by Eric Temple Bell, since he excelled in all fields of the discipline as it existed during his lifetime. As a mathematician and physicist, he made many original fundamental contributions to pure and applied mathematics, mathematical physics, and celestial mechanics. He was responsible for formulating the Poincaré conjecture, which was one of the most famous unsolved problems in mathematics until it was solved in 2002–2003 by Grigori Perelman. In his research on the three-body problem, Poincaré became the first person to discover a chaotic deterministic system which laid the foundations of modern chaos theory. He is also considered to be one of the founders of the field of topology. Poincaré made clear the importance of paying attention to the invariance of laws of physics under different transformations and was the first to present the Lorentz transformations in their modern symmetrical form. Poincaré discovered the remaining relativistic velocity transformations and recorded them in a letter to Dutch physicist Hendrik Lorentz (1853–1928) in 1905. Thus, he obtained perfect invariance of all of Maxwell's equations, an important step in the formulation of the theory of special relativity. In 1905, Poincaré first proposed gravitational waves (ondes gravifiques) emanating from a body and propagating at the speed of light as being required by the Lorentz transformations.”

His philosophical view was “opposite to those of Bertrand Russell and Gottlob Frege, who believed that mathematics was a branch of logic. Poincaré strongly disagreed, claiming that intuition was the life of mathematics. Poincaré gives an interesting point of view in his book Science and Hypothesis: For a superficial observer, scientific truth is beyond the possibility of doubt; the logic of science is infallible, and if the scientists are sometimes mistaken, this is only from their mistaking its rule. Poincaré believed that arithmetic is a synthetic science. He argued that Peano's axioms cannot be proven non-circularly with the principle of induction, therefore concluding that arithmetic is a priori synthetic and not analytic. Poincaré then went on to say that mathematics cannot be deduced from logic since it is not analytic. His views were similar to those of Immanuel Kant. He strongly opposed Cantorian set theory, objecting to its use of impredicative definitions. However, Poincaré did not share Kantian views in all branches of philosophy and mathematics. For example, in geometry, Poincaré believed that the structure of non-Euclidean space can be known analytically. Poincaré held that convention plays an important role in physics. His view came to be known as conventionalism. Poincaré believed that Newton's first law was not empirical but is a conventional framework assumption for mechanics. He also believed that the geometry of physical space is conventional. He considered examples in which either the geometry of the physical fields or gradients of temperature can be changed, either describing a space as non-Euclidean measured by rigid rulers, or as a Euclidean space where the rulers are expanded or shrunk by a variable heat distribution. However, Poincaré thought that we were so accustomed to Euclidean geometry that we would prefer to change the physical laws to save Euclidean geometry rather than shift to a non-Euclidean physical geometry.”

“It is certain that the combinations which present themselves to the mind in a kind of sudden illumination after a somewhat prolonged period of unconscious work are generally useful and fruitful combinations... all the combinations are formed as a result of the automatic action of the subliminal ego, but those only which are interesting find their way into the field of consciousness... A few only are harmonious, and consequently at once useful and beautiful, and they will be capable of affecting the mathematician's special sensibility I have been speaking of; which, once aroused, will direct our attention upon them, and will thus give them the opportunity of becoming conscious...In the subliminal ego, on the contrary, there reigns what I would call liberty, if one could give this name to the mere absence of discipline and to disorder born of chance.”
Chapter III. History of Philosophy

Pierre Maurice Marie Duhem (1861-1916) was a French physicist, mathematician, historian and philosopher of science. “He is best known for his work on chemical thermodynamics, for his philosophical writings on the indeterminacy of experimental criteria, and for his historical research into the science of the European Middle Ages. As a scientist, Duhem also contributed to hydrodynamics and to the theory of elasticity.” “Duhem's views on the philosophy of science are explicated in his 1906 work The Aim and Structure of Physical Theory. In this work, he opposed Newton's statement that the Principia's law of universal mutual gravitation was deduced from 'phenomena', including Kepler's second and third laws. Newton's claims in this regard had already been attacked by critical proof-analyses of the German logician Leibniz and then most famously by Immanuel Kant, following Hume's logical critique of induction. But the novelty of Duhem's work was his proposal that Newton's theory of universal mutual gravity flatly contradicted Kepler's Laws of planetary motion because the interplanetary mutual gravitational perturbations caused deviations from Keplerian orbits. Since no proposition can be validly logically deduced from any it contradicts, according to Duhem, Newton must not have logically deduced his law of gravitation directly from Kepler's Laws. 

“Duhem argues that physics is subject to certain methodological limitations that do not affect other sciences. In his The Aim and Structure of Physical Theory (1914), Duhem provided a devastating critique of Baconian crucial experiments. According to this critique, an experiment in physics is not simply an observation, but rather an interpretation of observations by means of a theoretical framework. Furthermore, no matter how well one constructs one's experiment, it is impossible to subject an isolated single hypothesis to an experimental test. Instead, it is a whole interlocking group of hypotheses, background assumptions, and theories that is tested. This thesis has come to be known as confirmation holism. This inevitable holism, according to Duhem, renders crucial experiments impossible... In the appendix to The Aim and Structure, entitled ‘Physics of a Believer’, Duhem draws out the implications that he sees his philosophy of science as having for those who argue that there is a conflict between physics and religion. He writes, metaphysical and religious doctrines are judgments touching on objective reality, whereas the principles of physical theory are propositions relative to certain mathematical signs stripped of all objective existence. Since they do not have any common term, these two sorts of judgments can neither contradict nor agree with each other. Nonetheless, Duhem argues that it is important for the theologian or metaphysician to have detailed knowledge of physical theory in order not to make illegitimate use of it in speculations.”

“Duhem is well known for his work on the history of science, which resulted in the ten volume Le système du monde: histoire des doctrines cosmologiques de Platon à Copernic (The System of World: A History of Cosmological Doctrines from Plato to Copernicus). Unlike many former historians (e.g. Voltaire and Condorcet), who denigrated the Middle Ages, he endeavored to show that the Roman Catholic Church had helped foster Western science in one of its most fruitful periods. His work in this field was originally prompted by his research into the origins of statics, where he encountered the works of medieval mathematicians and philosophers such as John Buridan, Nicole Oresme and Roger Bacon, whose sophistication surprised him. He consequently came to regard them as the founders of modern science, having in his view anticipated many of the discoveries of Galileo Galilei and later thinkers. Duhem concluded that the mechanics and physics of which modern times are justifiably proud to proceed, by an uninterrupted series of scarcely perceptible improvements, from doctrines professed in the heart of the medieval schools. Reason may be employed in two ways to establish a point: firstly, for the purpose of furnishing sufficient proof of some principle... Reason is employed in another way, not as furnishing a sufficient proof of a principle, but as confirming an already established principle...”
Chapter III. History of Philosophy

Gaston Milhaud (1858-1918) was a French philosopher and historian of science. “He studied mathematics with Gaston Darboux at the École Normale Supérieure. In 1881 he took a teaching post at the University of Le Havre. In 1891 he became professor of mathematics at Montpellier University, and in 1895 became professor of philosophy there. In 1909 a chair in the history of philosophy in its relationship to the sciences was created for him at the Sorbonne.” In his Essay on the Conditions and Limits of Logical Certitude (1894), Milhaud asserts that what we know of things are the sensationism which they arouse in us. At the same time, he is in emphasizing the mind’s activity in reflection on experience and in the development of scientific hypotheses.” He is less inclined to talk about conventions; but he insists on the spontaneity of the human reason.

“Milhaud was both a historian and an epistemologist. With Henri Poincaré, Pierre Duhem, and Édouard Le Roy he belongs to that group of French scholars who around 1900, following the path opened for them by Émile Boutroux, denounced scientific dogmatism, using as a basis the precise analysis of past and contemporary examples in history of science. They emphasized the role of spiritual initiative, and thus the element of contingency, in the construction of scientific theories. Milhaud himself generally avoided the dangerous words convention and commodité used by Le Roy and Poincaré. He spoke, rather, of free creations, of the activity of the mind, and of the spontaneity of reason (Le rationnel, Paris, 1898). In his thesis, Essai sur les conditions et les limites de la certitude logique (Paris, 1894), he maintained that certitude, which is founded on the principle of noncontradiction, is limited to the domain of pure mathematics. He believed that it was thus possible to establish a radical break between the realm of mathematical knowledge and the realm of knowledge of the real world.”

“However, almost immediately thereafter (2nd ed., 1897), he regretted having shown himself to be too much the logician: I see today that even in the extreme example of absolute rigor dreamed of by the mathematician, the living and dynamic identity of thinking always takes precedence over the static immobility of the principle of identity. The fundamental concepts and principles of all sciences result from rational decisions that simultaneously transcend both experience and logic, in the sense that they are not determined by either external or internal necessities. Positivism is, therefore, outmoded. A fourth stage consists of the liberation of thought from the obstacles imposed on it by the dogmatism of Auguste Comte (Le positivisme et le progrès de l’esprit, Paris, 1902). Nonetheless, scientific contributions are not arbitrary, and they have a universal value, in that they have matured on a basis of fact and have gradually imposed themselves upon the mind as a network of relations in which logical exigencies are composed and harmonized with the demands of a practical and aesthetic order.”

“At first Milhaud made a sharp distinction between pure mathematics, which rests on the principle of non-contradiction, and empirical science. But he soon came to emphasize the element of rational decision which is resent in all branches of science. But he soon came to emphasize the element of rational decision which is present in all branches of science. He had indeed no intention of suggesting that scientific hypotheses are purely arbitrary constructions. He saw them as based on or suggested by experience and as constructed in such a way as to satisfy logical demands of consistency and also practical and aesthetic requirements. But he refused to admit that scientific theories were necessitated either by logic or by experience. They express the creativity of the human mind, though this creative activity is guided in science by rational decision and not by caprice. Further, we can never say that scientific knowledge has attained its final form. We cannot exclude radical transformations in advance. There is indeed an ideal goal, but it is an ever-receding goal, even though progress is real. If we think of Comtean positivism are representing the third stage of human thought, we must add that this stage has to be transcended, as it constitutes an obstacle to the mind’s creative activity.”

Chapter III. History of Philosophy

Emile Mayerson (1859-1933): “Meyerson was educated in Germany, where he studied from the ages of twelve to twenty-three and passed his Abitur. Interested in Chemistry he followed the usual practice of spending time at several universities distinguished for research laboratories; Göttingen, Heidelberg, and Berlin. He also worked in Paul Schützenberger’s laboratory at the Collège de France after his arrival at Paris in 1882. His short career as an industrial chemist was blighted by his failure to develop a process for the synthetic manufacture of indigo based on a wrong reaction obtained by Baeyer. Meyerson’s excellent commend of several languages then led him to become foreign news editor at the Havas News Agency...In 1898 Meyerson left Havas to work for Edmond de Rothschild’s philanthropic organization that sought to settle Jews in Palestine and became the head of the Jewish Colonization Association for Europe and Asia Minor. He also collaborated on the famous report on the economic situation of Jews in the Russian Empire. Although not a practicing Jew, Meyerson retained an attachment to Zionism. Through the support of Harald Hoffding, a longtime friend and correspondent, he was elected to the Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters in 1926; that year he also became a correspondant étranger of the Académie des Sciences Morales et Politiques.”

“In the first place Meyerson is strongly opposed to a provisionist view of science as concerned simply with prediction and control or action. According to the positivist science formulates laws which represent the relations between phenomena or sensible appearances, laws which enable us to predict and so serve action and our control of phenomena. Though however Meyerson has no wish to deny that science does in fact enable us to predict and extend the area of control, he refuses to admit that it is governed solely by the desire of economy in this action. Science seeks also to make us understand Nature. It tends in fact, as M. Le Roy expresses it, to the progressive rationalization of the real. Science rests on the presupposition that reality is intelligible; and it hopes that this intelligibility will become ever more manifest. The mind’s drive towards understanding lies at the basis of all scientific inquiry and research. It is therefore a mistake to follow Francis Bacon, Hobbes and Comte in defining the goal of science in terms of prediction with a view to action. The positivist theory rests at bottom on a palpable error in psychology.”

“If science rests on the presupposition that Nature is intelligible and seeks to discover its intelligible character, we cannot legitimately maintain that scientific hypotheses and theories are simply intellectual constructions which are devoid of ontological import. Ontology is joined to science itself and cannot be separated from it. It is all very well to claim that science should be stripped of all ontological and metaphysics. The fact of the matter is that this very claim involves a metaphysics or theory about being. In particular, science cannot get away from the concept of things or substances. A positivist may claim that science is concerned simply with formulating laws and that the concept of things or substances which are independent of the mind can be thrown overboard; but the idea of law as expressing relations presupposes the idea of related things. If it is objected that the concept of things, existing independently of consciousness, belongs to the sphere of naïve common sense and must be abandoned at the level of science, the reply can be made that the hypothetical beings of science are really more things than the things of common sense...Common sense is thus shot through with ontology or metaphysics. We explain our sensations in terms of physical objects as causes of our sensations. On the level of common sense, we hypostatize our sensations as far as we can, attributing, for example, color and other qualities to objects, whereas science transforms the objects. But science has its point of departure in common sense, and it prolongs our use of the causal principle. The entities postulated by the scientist may differ from those of common sense; but physics can no more get along without the concept of things or substances or without causal explanation than common sense can. The concept of law, establishing relations between phenomena, is not enough by itself.”
6-4. Philosophy of Values and Personalism

“In ethics, value denotes the degree of importance of some thing or action, with the aim of determining what actions are best to do or what way is best to live (normative ethics), or to describe the significance of different actions. It may be described as treating actions themselves as abstract objects, putting value to them. It deals with right conduct and living a good life, in the sense that a highly, or at least relatively highly, valuable action may be regarded as ethically good (adjective sense), and an action of low in value, or somewhat relatively low in value, may be regarded as bad. What makes an action valuable may in turn depend on ethic values of the objects it increases, decreases or alters. An object with ethic values may be termed an ethic or philosophic good (noun sense). Values can be defined as broad preferences concerning appropriate courses of action or outcomes. As such, values reflect a person's sense of right and wrong or what ought to be. Equal rights for all, Excellence deserves admiration, and People should be treated with respect and dignity are representative of values. Values tend to influence attitudes and behavior. Types of values include ethical/moral values, doctrinal/ideological (religious, political) values, social values, and aesthetic values. It is debated whether some values that are not clearly physiologically determined, such as altruism, are intrinsic, and whether some, such as acquisitiveness, should be classified as vices or virtues.” Values have been studied in various disciplines: anthropology, behavioral economics, business ethics, corporate governance, moral philosophy, political sciences, social psychology, sociology and theology.

“Personal values exist in relation to cultural values, either in agreement with or divergence from prevailing norms. A culture is a social system that shares a set of common values, in which such values permit social expectations and collective understandings of the good, beautiful and constructive. Without normative personal values, there would be no cultural reference against which to measure the virtue of individual values and so cultural identity would disintegrate. Personal values provide an internal reference for what is good, beneficial, important, useful, beautiful, desirable and constructive. Values generate behavior and influence the choices made by an individual. Values may help common human problems for survival by comparative rankings of value, the results of which provide answers to questions of why people do what they do and in what order they choose to do them. Moral, religious, and personal values, when held rigidly, may also give rise to conflicts that result from a clash between differing world views. Over time the public expression of personal values that groups of people find important in their day-to-day lives, lay the foundations of law, custom and tradition. Recent research has thereby stressed the implicit nature of value communication. Individual cultures emphasize values which their members broadly share. One can often identify the values of a society by noting which people receive honor or respect. In the United States of America, for example, professional athletes at the top levels in some sports receive more honor (measured in terms of monetary payment) than university professors. Surveys show that voters in the United States would not willingly elect an atheist as president, suggesting belief in a God as a generally shared value. Values clarification differs from cognitive moral education: Value clarification consists of helping people clarify what their lives are for and what is worth working for. It encourages students to define their own values and to understand others' values. Cognitive moral education builds on the belief that students should learn to value things like democracy and justice as their moral reasoning develops.”

“Values relate to the norms of a culture, but they are more global and abstract than norms. Norms provide rules for behavior in specific situations, while values identify what should be judged as good or evil. While norms are standards, patterns, rules and guides of expected behavior, values are abstract concepts of what is important and worthwhile. Flying the national flag on a
holiday is a norm, but it reflects the value of patriotism. Wearing dark clothing and appearing solemn are normative behaviors to manifest respect at a funeral. Different cultures reflect values differently and to different levels of emphasis. Over the last three decades, traditional-age college students have shown an increased interest in personal well-being and a decreased interest in the welfare of others. Values seemed to have changed, affecting the beliefs, and attitudes of the students. Members take part in a culture even if each member's personal values do not entirely agree with some of the normative values sanctioned in that culture. This reflects an individual's ability to synthesize and extract aspects valuable to them from the multiple subcultures they belong to. If a group member expresses a value that seriously conflicts with the group's norms, the group's authority may carry out various ways of encouraging conformity or stigmatizing the non-conforming behavior of that member. For example, imprisonment can result from conflict with social norms that the state has established as law."

Furthermore, institutions in the global economy can genuinely respect values which are of three kinds based on a triangle of coherence. In the first instance, a value may come to expression within the World Trade Organization (WTO), as well as (in the second instance) within the United Nations – particularly in the Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) – providing a framework for global legitimacy through accountability. In the third instance, the expertise of member-driven international organizations and civil society depends on the incorporation of flexibility in the rules, to preserve the expression of identity in a globalized world. Nonetheless, in warlike economic competition, differing views may contradict each other, particularly in the field of culture. Thus, audiences in Europe may regard a movie as an artistic creation and grant it benefits from special treatment, while audiences in the United States may see it as mere entertainment, whatever its artistic merits. EU policies based on the notion of cultural exception can become juxtaposed with the policy of cultural specificity on the liberal Anglo-Saxon side. Indeed, international law traditionally treats films as property and the content of television programs as a service. Consequently, cultural interventionist policies can find themselves opposed to the Anglo-Saxon liberal position, causing failures in international negotiations. Values are generally received through cultural means, especially transmission from parents to children. Parents in different cultures have different values…parents in…surviving through subsistence agriculture value practical survival skills from a young age. Many such cultures begin teaching babies to use sharp tools, including knives, before their first birthdays. Italian parents value social and emotional abilities and having an even temperament. Spanish parents want their children to be sociable. Swedish parents value security and happiness. Dutch parents value independence, long attention spans, and predictable schedules. American parents are unusual for strongly valuing intellectual ability, especially in a narrow book learning sense. The Kipsigis people of Kenya value children who are not only smart, but who employ that intelligence in a responsible and helpful way...The reception of values can be regarded as a part of socialization."

"Relative values differ between people, and on a larger scale, between people of different cultures. On the other hand, there are theories of the existence of absolute values, which can also be termed noumenal values (and not to be confused with mathematical absolute value). An absolute value can be described as philosophically absolute and independent of individual and cultural views, as well as independent of whether it is known or apprehended or not. On the other hand, “Philosophic value may be split into instrumental value and intrinsic values. An instrumental value is worth having as a means towards getting something else that is good. An intrinsically valuable thing is worth for itself, not as a means to something else. It is giving value intrinsic and extrinsic properties. An ethic good with instrumental value may be termed an ethic mean, and an ethic good with intrinsic value may be termed an end-in-itself."
“Moral philosophy in one form or another has been a prominent feature of French thought from the time of the Renaissance. "Even Descartes, whose name is primarily associated with methodology, metaphysics and the view of the world as a machine, emphasized the practical value of philosophy and envisaged a science of ethics as its crown. The philosophers of the eighteenth-century Enlightenment were concerned with setting ethics on its own feet, separating it, that is to say, from theology and metaphysics. In the nineteenth century ethical themes were prominent in the writings of positivists such as Durkheim, of spiritualists such as Guyau and Bergson and of thinkers such as Renouvier who belong to the neo-critical movement. In spite however of this tradition of ethical thought, the philosophy of values was a comparative latecomer on the French scene, in comparison with Germany that is to say; and it met at first with some suspicion and resistance. Obviously, the concept of the good and of desirable ends had been familiar enough, and philosophers had discussed moral ideals as well as truth and beauty. In a sense ethical discussion has always included discussion of values. At the same time, the French moral philosophers had tended to focus their attention on ethical phenomena as an empirical or given point of departure for reflection; and there was some doubt about the utility of the abstract analysis of values, especially as this sort of language suggested the idea of subsistent essences out there. Besides, the explicit philosophy of values…was connected with phenomenology, which developed in Germany and at first had little impact in France.”

“From a phenomenological point of view, it can reasonably be argued that values are recognized or discovered. Consider, for example, the case of someone who judges that love is a value, something to be valued, whereas hatred is not. It is clearly arguable that his attitude is one of recognizing or seeing love as a value and hatred as a disvalue. Whatever his theory of value may be, it can be argued that as far as his immediate consciousness is concerned, love imposes itself on his mind as a value. Similarly, from the phenomenological point of view, it is reasonable to use the language of recognition or discovery in regard to truth and beauty considered as values. In other words, our experience of values provides a ground or basis for the idea of values as objective and as transcendent, in the sense that they do not depend simply on one’s own choice of them. In other words, our experience of values provides a ground or basis for the idea of values as objective and as transcendent, in the sense that they do not depend simply on one’s own choice of them. To be sure, one has to find room for different and even incompatible value-judgments. But we can always refer, as some phenomenologists have done, to the possibility of a blindness to values and of varying degrees of insight into the field of values. And these ideas can be applied both to societies and to individuals.”

“From an ontological or metaphysical point of view however, it seems absurd, to most people at any rate, to conceive values as existing in some ethical world of their own. We can of course substitute the word subsist for the word exist; but it is doubtful if this verbal change really improves the situation. If therefore we wish to assert the objectivity of values, and if at the same time we wish to avoid committing ourselves to the view that universals such as love or truth or beauty can exist or subsist in a Platonic world of their own, we can either regard values as objective qualities of things and actions in addition to other qualities, or we can try to work out some general metaphysics which will permit us to talk about the objectivity of values without committing ourselves to the concept of a realm of subsistent universal essences.

Human beings create values, which depend on and are relative to the human will and choice. If we adopt this line of thought, we have to account for the feeling of recognizing or discovering values. We can explain this feeling by referring it to the bearing of the collective consciousness. Or, if we wish to speak only in terms of individuals, we might adopt a line of thought represented by Sartre and see the individual’s particular value-judgments.”
Raymond Polin (1910-2001) was a French philosopher, who taught at the Paris University since 1961, and served the president of the University of Paris during 1976-81. His publications include The Creation of Values (1944), The Understanding of Values (1945), On the Ugly, the Evil and the False (1948), and Ethics and Politics (1968). He has also published works on Hobbes and Locke. “Phenomenology, Polin asserts, seems to offer the most adequate method for the study of values, inasmuch as for the consciousness which thinks or conceives them values coincide with their meaning. He envisages two steps, first a phenomenological reduction giving access to the pure axiological consciousness (the consciousness of value) with a view to defining the essence of values, and secondly a movement of liberation, freeing the mind, that is to say, both from the pressure exercises by received values and from the influence of all existing theories of value. In other words, he wishes to take a fresh and unprejudiced view of the matter. The mind should place itself in a position of neutrality in regard to any determinate hierarchy of values and in regard to all existing theories. It should prescind from all authority, including that of society.”

Polin’s talk about values is somewhat misleading. “He is really concerned with the act of evaluation, by which values are constituted. In his view evaluation cannot be understood apart from the concept of human action. Phenomenological inquiry into the essence of values is vain and futile unless it constitutes the introduction to a philosophy of action. Human action presupposes and expresses evaluation, which is an act of the free subject. The free subject outruns or transcends the empirically given, creating its own values with a view of action. The values created have of course a certain exteriority, in the sense that they are the objects of an intentional and teleological consciousness. But it is a mistake to think that there is an axiological reality or realm of values apart from the consciousness which creates them. The only given reality is empirical reality; but this is evaluated in relation to action. Values are grounded in the self-transcending creative subject. And this is the only foundation which they have or require.”

“According to Polin therefore values are not real objects out there waiting to be known. On the contrary, there is an irreducible distinction between knowledge of things, in which the noetic consciousness is absorbed in the object, and the axiological consciousness which transcends what is given and creates the unreal. In other words, we must not confuse truth and value. Truth is not a value, and we ought not to speak of the truth of values. But there is a truth of action. That is to say, while theoretical truth is attained through the conformity of thought with reality, truth in action is attained through the conformity produced in the reality (work) created by action with the axiological project and intention. We know a fact when our thought is conformed to an objective state of affairs. In the sphere of action however truth consists in the conformity between what we achieve or bring about and our value-laden intention. But this is not all there is to be said. For through his action a man creates not simply his work but also himself. This is why the truth of action embraces the totality of the work and its creator.”

Values, as an expression of a creative will, tend to become norms; and norms, as universalizable, are essentially social. “Moreover, whereas values (valuations) are personal and cannot be imposed, norms can be imposed by others. A society or group, for example, can accept certain norms and try to enforce or impose acceptance on its individual members or on another group. Norms then become values rendered static; and they can be accepted servilely or because people are looking for a secure foothold or a refuge from personal decision which is always a venture, as it means going beyond or transcending the given. At the same time values can also present themselves not as constraining norms or rules or commandments but as attracting or exercising an appeal. To their creator values can appear as attracting ideals and ends; and they can appear in the same way to others. The commandment is replaced by an appeal. The creator then owes his domination over others simply to the influence of values which is creates.”
Rene Le Senne (1882-1954) – Senne was a French philosopher. “He was a student at the École Normale Supérieure in 1903 and agréé at the University of Paris in 1906; he defended his dissertation for a doctorate of letters in 1930. He then taught at the Lycée Louisle-Grand, was named professor at the Sorbonne in 1942, and was admitted to the Académie des Sciences morales et politiques in 1948. With Louis lavelle he established the collection Philosophie de l'Esprit in 1934; he also directed the Logos and Caractères collections of the Presses Universitaires de France and presided at the International Institute of Philosophy in 1952 and 1953. His thought is dialectical, like that of O. Hamelin (1856–1907), whose method he reformed and enlarged. It begins with relation and not with being, as does Lavelle’s, and seeks not so much an explanation of the world as salvation of the person. The privileged relation for Le Senne is duty, to which he devoted his doctoral dissertation (Le Devoir, Paris 1930); dialectic itself is a duty, as duty is a dialectic. Duty encroaches upon intelligence, but man must allow himself to be stimulated by contradiction everywhere and surmount it. At the provocation of the irrational, he writes, the self-answers with courage. This courage must be inventive, for the work of awareness never ends; it cannot establish itself alongside Infinity, which unceasingly moves reflection and makes it pass alternately from an obstacle to a value (Obstacle el Valeur, Paris 1934). This is why the moral treatise he published presents both exemplary lives, such as those of Socrates and Jesus, and analyses of concepts (Traité de morale générale, Paris 1942).”

Le Senne opposed reasoning to lived experience; yet the opposition he referred to as the ideo-existential relation is a call to live thought and to think life. Value thus reaches man from two directions, each of which preserves the image of the other. A sort of refraction, or diffraction, of value into life follows this; it is manifested by a double cogito - reflection, surpassing its given determinations, centers itself in the self and in God. There is no self without God and no God without self, except asymptotically. Le Senne's vision of the world is harsher than that of Lavelle; he insists on the inter-human bond, but on condition of seeing in it a work in common rather than a mystical intimacy. The opacity and the conflicts of nature contaminate value itself, as one sees in the example of war, where hostility rests on the devotion of each belligerent to one same value, that of country. There is no solution to this aporia except an increasing fidelity to the solidarity itself of values. Thence the condemnation of all fanaticisms, not because they are intense but because they are exclusive; thence also the refusal to give privilege to any particular value, not even charity. God alone is the perfectly determining and indeterminable value for all determined values. Even in future life Le Senne seemed to await a sort of perpetual purgatory.”

Le Senne admits that there is a plurality of values. “Moral value, which he links with the idea of acting in accordance with duty or moral obligation, is not the only value. Truth, beauty and love are also values. Consider, for example, a mother who performed those actions in regard to her child which love would prompt but who did so simply and solely out of a sense of moral obligation.” In one place Le Senne asserts that value is the knowledge of the Absolute. Elsewhere he speaks of the Absolute as being itself pure and infinite value. “Le Senne’s theory of value calls Platonism to mind, at any rate if we are prepared to identify the absolute Good of the Republic with the Beauty in itself of the Symposium and the One of the Parmenides, the difference being that Le Senne’s absolute value is identified with the personal God of the Christian religion. And unless we are inclined to write off all metaphysics as so much nonsense, we can presumably form some idea of what he means. For example, he claims that there is a transcendent divine reality which reveals itself not simply in the physical world as experienced by man but also in the axiological world or world of values, which constitutes a constituent element in experience. Though however Le Senne’s theory of values is doubtless religiously edifying, and though we can have a general impression of its meaning, there are a good many questions.”
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Raymond Ruyer (1902-87) was a French philosopher in the late 20th century. Author of many important works, he covered several topics such as the philosophy of biology, the philosophy of informatics, the philosophy of value and others. His most popular book is *The Gnosis of Princeton* in which he presents his own philosophic views under the pretense that he was representing the views of an imaginary group of American scientists. He developed a theory of consciousness of all living matter, named panpsychism, which was a major influence on philosophers such as Simondon, Deleuze and Guattari. Born born in the village of Plainfaing department of Vosges, France. Ruyer studied at the École Normale Supérieure, passing the aggregation in philosophy with a thesis on the phenomenology of knowledge. In 1937 he published his first book, *The body and the conscience*. During World War II Raymond Ruyer was a prisoner of war in Germany from 1940 to 1944. Upon his return he was appointed professor of philosophy at the Université de Nancy, where he developed his theories of the philosophical implications of various branches of science, mainly embryology, biology and informatics. At the same time, he continued his research on the theory of value which he had started before the war. In the 1970s he was named corresponding member of the Institut de France. He was also offered a position at the Sorbonne which he declined, preferring to continue working in Nancy.

“Being opposed to the existentialism and the leftist trends of the French post-war intelligentsia, Ruyer's work was better accepted in scientific circles abroad than in France. Publicist Raymond Aron advised him to try his luck at writing more popular works. His first such attempts did not raise public interest. Therefore, based on the assumption that the French public was more fascinated by scientific developments in America, Ruyer published the book *The Gnosis of Princeton*. He claimed to be in contact with a group of unidentified American gnostic philosophers who were trying to create a new religion identified as the Gnosis of Princeton, where most of these imaginary scientists were active. Thereafter Raymond Ruyer presented his own gnostic ideas. The book was a success as many of its readers were not aware of the hoax for a long time. However, his next publications did not raise interest in France, and were better known in Canada and the United States. His last work *Embryogenesis of the World and the Silent God* was never published and is deposited as a manuscript at the University of Nancy. Ruyer has devoted special studies to the theory of values: *The World of Values* (1948), and *Philosophy of Value* (1952). “The philosophy of Ruyer is to some extent a revival of lines of thought expounded by Leibniz.”

Louis Lavelle (1883-1951): “Louis Lavelle, the French philosopher, was born in Saint-Martin-de-Villéréal, in southwestern France. Lavelle received a doctorate from the Lycée Fustel de Coulanges, Strasbourg (1921), before becoming professor of philosophy at the Sorbonne (1932–34) and the Collège de France (1941–51). He was appointed inspector general of national education (1941) and elected to the Académie des Sciences Morales et Politiques in 1947. His major works include *La Dialectique du monde sensible* (1921; The Dialectic of the World of the Senses), *La Conscience de soi* (1933; Self-Awareness), *La Présence totale* (1934; The Total Presence), *Le Mal et la souffrance* (1940; Evil and Suffering), and *Introduction à l'ontologie* (1947; Introduction to Ontology). In a time of reaction against speculative system-building, Lavelle boldly elaborated an extensive system combining elements of the French *philosophie de l'esprit and existentialism*. Convinced that the modern world needs basic security, Lavelle, like other existentialist thinkers, sought philosophical and moral certitude in the experience of the self, pure inwardness, and absolute existence. Unlike such philosophers as Jean-Paul Sartre, who disintegrated the human universe inherited from tradition, Lavelle, like Karl Jaspers and Karl Barth, attempted to reintegrate the basic experiences of humanity in a novel form.”
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**Metaphysics of Participation**: “Metaphysics was for Lavelle "the science of spiritual inwardness." According to him, Immanuel Kant had shown that we cannot find true reality on the side of the object, or thing, because objects and the world they compose cannot have independent existence. The essence of things resides in their relation to a being for whom they are "objects." Consequently, in the search for true or absolute reality we must turn toward the act of consciousness, the inwardness of the human being. Thus, Lavelle's central preoccupation was to discover and describe the fundamental relation between our innermost being and the Absolute. Lavelle pointed out that there is a primitive act upon which our very being depends, as well as the being of the entire world. It is our primordial experience of being part of the world, in which act we find ourselves also participating in something that infinitely transcends us - the Act. From a subtle dialectic description of this spiritual act of participation flow the broad lines of Lavelle's doctrine.”

**Ontology of Spiritualistic Existentialism**: “The originality of Lavelle's conception of the nature of beings in their relation to Being consists in his introducing a dynamic and actualistic content into the traditional themes of Aristotelian ontology. His approach yields a finalistic and optimistic view of the universe and human destiny. All experiences of humankind emerge against the background of the limited individual being, participating in the Absolute Being. By their relation to participation, which is constant and eternal, individual beings establish their relation to the world, and through the notions of essence and existence they establish their spiritual identity. The Absolute Being is pure actuality, the infinite source of existential dynamism, and an endless reservoir of all possible forms or essences, from which individual beings receive their own limited existence. In spite of this direct and continuous dependence of the individual on his source, actualism is reconciled in Lavelle's thought with temporal progression, dynamism with formal immobility, and human freedom is safeguarded by the self-creativity of the individual. Indeed, from the human point of view, participation is a pursuit of an ideal that constantly moves ahead of our efforts. In this pursuit we create our spiritual self, and our experiences, moving onward, progressively acquire a unique form. Our effort in life is meant to discover this form, which has its prototype in the reservoir of Being and is our spiritual essence. The accomplishment of our essence at our death means the radical passage from limited existence into transfinite Being. Thus, participation appears as the means of humanity’s ultimate redemption, toward which everything occurring in the universe converges.”

**Ethics of Consent**: “In Lavelle's moral philosophy an unusual meaning is given to existential themes, such as freedom, human destiny, and solitude. Lavelle had a constructive conception of man's vocation and of the ideal of life. Freedom is the essence of man. But whereas the Absolute Act is synonymous with absolute freedom, man, the participating act, is limited by the "natural spontaneity" of the instinct. Consequently, the life of the spirit, which he proposed as the ideal of human life, is a fighting toward gradual liberation from the passivity peculiar to instinct. We become fully human by subordinating natural spontaneity to reflection and rational discipline. Human freedom originates in this process; and this conversion of spontaneity into freedom is the real vehicle of participation. The spiritual being, like the Leibnizian monad, is endowed with potentialities for the accomplishment of its preestablished essence. Our vocation is to seek to make our actual selves coincide with the "better part of ourselves," which represents these potentialities. This self-searching and self-controlling effort presupposes an "act of consent" to our vocation of the spirit. In opposition to other existentialist thinkers who glorify the "exceptional instant," Lavelle rehabilitated everyday existence, seeing even in the least significant instant an opportunity for consent to the self-creative effort and, thereby, an opportunity for participation in the Absolute. Finally, the theme of solitude was reconciled with that of human communion insofar as the ideal of wisdom was seen to lie in the union between a certain asceticism and everyday life and love.”
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Emmanuel Mounier (1905-50): Mounier was a French philosopher, theologian, teacher and essayist. “Mounier was the guiding spirit in the French personalist movement, and founder and director of Esprit, the magazine which was the organ of the movement. Mounier, who was the child of peasants, was a brilliant scholar at the Sorbonne. In 1929, when he was only twenty-four, he came under the influence of the French writer Charles Péguy, to whom he ascribed the inspiration of the personalist movement. Mounier’s personalism became a main influence of the non-conformists of the 1930s. Peter Maurin used to say wherever he went, There is a man in France called Emmanuel Mounier. He wrote a book called The Personalist Manifesto. You should read that book. He taught at the Lycée du Parc at Lyon and at the Lycee Français Jean Monnet at Brussels. Although Mounier was critical of the Moscow Trials of the 1930s, he has been taken to task by the historian Tony Judt, among others, for his failure to respond critically to the excesses of Stalinism in the postwar period. Mounier once commented, in a restrained manner, on the Pope's silence concerning the persecution of the Jews by the Nazi regime; thus, he is cited in the bibliography on Pope Pius XII as indirectly originating the “black legend” of Pius XII.”

“Personalism is a philosophical school of thought searching to describe the uniqueness of 1) God as Supreme Person or 2) a human person in the world of nature, specifically in relation to animals. One of the main points of interest of Personalism is human subjectivity or self-consciousness, experienced in a person's own acts and inner happenings—in everything in the human being that is internal, whereby each human being is an eyewitness of its own self. Other principles: (i) Persons have unique value, (ii) Only persons have free will. According to idealism there is one more principle: (iii) Only persons are real (in the ontological sense). Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz (1646–1716) defined “more precisely the nature of individuality and ascribed to the individual a large degree of metaphysical independence. He conceived of substance as realized both in the Infinite and in finite monads as psychical and active.”

According to Thomas D. Williams, “Personalism exists in many different versions, and this makes it somewhat difficult to define as a philosophical and theological movement. Many philosophical schools have at their core one particular thinker or even one central work which serves as a canonical touchstone. Personalism is a more diffused and eclectic movement and has no such universal reference point. It is, in point of fact, more proper to speak of many personalisms than one personalism. In 1947 Jacques Maritain could write that there are at least ‘a dozen personalist doctrines, which at times have nothing more in common than the word ‘person.’ Moreover, because of their emphasis on the subjectivity of the person and their ties to phenomenology and existentialism, some dominant forms of personalism have not lent themselves to systematic treatises. It is perhaps more proper to speak of personalism as a ‘current’ or a broader ‘worldview, since it represents more than one school or one doctrine while at the same time the most important forms of personalism do display some central and essential commonalities. Most important of the latter is the general affirmation of the centrality of the person for philosophical thought. Personalism posits ultimate reality and value in personhood — human as well as (at least for most personalists) divine. It emphasizes the significance, uniqueness and inviolability of the person, as well as the person’s essentially relational or communitarian dimension. The title ‘personalism’ can therefore legitimately be applied to any school of thought that focuses on the reality of persons and their unique status among beings in general, and personalists normally acknowledge the indirect contributions of a wide range of thinkers throughout the history of philosophy who did not regard themselves as personalists. Personalists believe that the human person should be the ontological and epistemological starting point of philosophical reflection. They are concerned to investigate the experience, the status, and the dignity of the human being as person, and regard this as the starting-point for all subsequent philosophical analysis.”
Emmanuel Mounier’s Personalism: “In France, philosopher Emmanuel Mounier (1905–1950) was the leading proponent of personalism, around which he founded the review Esprit, which exists to this day. Under Jean-Marie Domenach’s direction, it criticized the use of torture during the Algerian War. Personalism was seen as an alternative to both Liberalism and Marxism, which respected human rights and the human personality without indulging in excessive collectivism. Mounier’s personalism had an important influence in France, including in political movements, such as Marc Sangnier’s Ligue de la jeune République (Young Republic League) founded in 1912. A Jewish anti-fascist, Zeev Sternhell, has identified personalism with fascism in a very controversial manner, claiming that Mounier’s personalism movement shared ideas and political reflexes with fascism. He argued that Mounier’s revolt against individualism and materialism would have led him to share the ideology of fascism.”

Catholic Personalism: “Following on the writings of Dorothy Day, a distinctively Christian Personalism developed in the 20th century. Its main theorist was the Polish philosopher Karol Wojtyła (later Pope John Paul II). In his work, Love and Responsibility, first published in 1960, Wojtyła proposed what he termed ‘the personalistic norm’: This norm, in its negative aspect, states that the person is the kind of good which does not admit of use and cannot be treated as an object of use and as such the means to an end. In its positive form the personalistic norm confirms this: the person is a good towards which the only proper and adequate attitude is love. This brand of personalism has come to be known as Thomistic because of its efforts to square modern notions regarding the person with the teachings of Thomas Aquinas. This is a first principle of Christian personalism: persons are not to be used, but to be respected and loved… the Second Vatican Council formulated what has come to be considered the key expression of this personalism: man is the only creature on earth that God willed for its own sake and he cannot fully find himself except through a sincere gift of himself. This formula for self-fulfillment offers a key for overcoming the dichotomy between personal realization and the needs or demands of social life.”

Boston Personalism: “Personalism flourished in the early 20th century at Boston University in a movement known as Boston Personalism led by theologian Borden Parker Bowne. Bowne emphasized the person as the fundamental category for explaining reality and asserted that only persons are real. He stood in opposition to certain forms of materialism which would describe persons as mere particles of matter. For example, against the argument that persons are insignificant specks of dust in the vast universe, Bowne would say that it is impossible for the entire universe to exist apart from a person to experience it. Ontologically speaking, the person is “larger” than the universe because the universe is but one small aspect of the person who experiences it. Personalism affirms the existence of the soul. Most personalists assert that God is real, and that God is a person.”

California Personalism: “George Holmes Howison taught a metaphysical theory called Personal Idealism which was also called California Personalism by others to distinguish it from the Boston Personalism taught by Borden Parker Bowne. Howison maintained that both impersonal, monistic idealism and materialism run contrary to the moral freedom experienced by persons. To deny the freedom to pursue the ideals of truth, beauty, and benignant love is to undermine every profound human venture, including science, morality, and philosophy… The Personal Idealism of Howison was explained in his book The Limits of Evolution and Other Essays Illustrating the Metaphysical Theory of Personal Idealism. Howison created a radically democratic notion of personal idealism that extended all the way to God, who was no more the ultimate monarch, no longer the only ruler and creator of the universe, but the ultimate democrat in eternal relation to other eternal persons. Howison found few disciples among the religious, for whom his thought was heretical; the non-religious considered his proposals too religious.”
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Pierre Teilhard de Chardin (1881-1955) [Religious Thinker] A French idealist philosopher and Jesuit priest who trained as a paleontologist and geologist and took part in the discovery of Peking Man. “He conceived the vitalist idea of the Omega Point (a maximum level of complexity and consciousness towards which he believed the universe was evolving) and developed Vladimir Vernadsky's concept of noosphere. Although many of Teilhard's writings were censored by the Catholic Church during his lifetime because of his views on original sin, Teilhard has been posthumously praised by Pope Benedict XVI and other eminent Catholic figures, and his theological teachings were cited by Pope Francis in the 2015 encyclical, Laudato si’. The response to his writings by evolutionary biologists has been, with some exceptions, decidedly negative.”

He was born in the Château of Sarcenat at Orcines, close to Clermont-Ferrand, France. “On the Teilhard side he is descended from an ancient family of magistrates from Auvergne originating in Murat, Cantal, and on the de Chardin side he is descended from a family that was ennobled under Louis XVIII. He was the fourth of eleven children. His father, Emmanuel Teilhard (1844–1932), an amateur naturalist, collected stones, insects and plants and promoted the observation of nature in the household. Pierre Teilhard's spirituality was awakened by his mother, Berthe de Dompiere. When he was 12, he went to the Jesuit college of Mongré, in Villefranche-sur-Saône, where he completed baccalaureates of philosophy and mathematics. Then, in 1899, he entered the Jesuit novitiate at Aix-en-Provence, where he began a philosophical, theological and spiritual career. As of the summer 1901, the Waldeck-Rousseau laws, which submitted congregational associations' properties to state control, prompted some of the Jesuits to exile themselves in the United Kingdom. Young Jesuit students continued their studies in Jersey. In the meantime, Teilhard earned a licentiate in literature in Caen in 1902. From 1905 to 1908, he taught physics and chemistry in Cairo, Egypt, at the Jesuit College of the Holy Family. He wrote...it is the dazzling of the East foreseen and drunk greedily...in its lights, its vegetation, its fauna and its deserts. Teilhard studied theology in Hastings, in Sussex (United Kingdom), from 1908 to 1912. There he synthesized his scientific, philosophical and theological knowledge in the light of evolution. His reading of L'Évolution Créatrice (The Creative Evolution) by Henri Bergson was, he said, the catalyst of a fire which devoured already its heart and its spirit. Teilhard was ordained a priest on August 24, 1911, at age 30.”

Paleontology: “From 1912 to 1914, Teilhard worked in the paleontology laboratory of the Museum National d'Histoire Naturelle, in Paris, studying the mammals of the middle Tertiary period. Later he studied elsewhere in Europe. In June 1912 he formed part of the original digging team, with Arthur Smith Woodward and Charles Dawson at the Piltdown site, after the discovery of the first fragments of the (fraudulent) Piltdown Man, with some even suggesting he participated in the hoax. Professor Marcellin Boule (specialist in Neanderthal studies), who so early as 1915 astutely recognized the non-hominid origins of the Piltdown finds, gradually guided Teilhard towards human paleontology. At the museum's Institute of Human Paleontology, he became a friend of Henri Breuil and took part with him, in 1913, in excavations at the prehistoric painted Caves of Castillo in the northwest of Spain.”

Service in World War I: “Mobilised in December 1914, Teilhard served in World War I as a stretcher-bearer in the 8th Moroccan Rifles. For his valor, he received several citations including the Médaille militaire and the Legion of Honour. Throughout these years of war, he developed his reflections in his diaries and in letters to his cousin, Marguerite Teillard-Chambon, who later edited them into a book: Genèse d'une pensée (Genesis of a thought). He confessed later: ...the war was a meeting ... with the Absolute. In 1916, he wrote his first essay: La Vie Cosmique (Cosmic life), where his scientific and philosophical thought was revealed just as his mystical life. He pronounced his solemn vows as a Jesuit in Sainte-Foy-lès-Lyon, on May 26, 1918, during a

**Research in China.** “In 1923 he travelled to China with Father Emile Licent, who was in charge in Tianjin of a significant laboratory collaboration between the Natural History Museum in Paris and Marcellin Boule's laboratory. Licent carried out considerable basic work in connection with missionaries who accumulated observations of a scientific nature in their spare time. He was known as 德日進 (pinyin: Dérìjìn) in China. Teilhard wrote several essays, including *La Messe sur le Monde* (the Mass on the World), in the Ordos Desert. In the following year he continued lecturing at the Catholic Institute and participated in a cycle of conferences for the students of the Engineers' Schools. Two theological essays on Original Sin sent to a theologian at his request on a purely personal basis were wrongly understood…The Church required him to give up his lecturing at the Catholic Institute and to continue his geological research in China. Teilhard traveled again to China in April 1926. He would remain there for about twenty years, with many voyages throughout the world. He settled until 1932 in Tientsin with Emile Licent, then in Beijing. Teilhard made five geological research expeditions in China between 1926 and 1935. They enabled him to establish a general geological map of China. He joined the ongoing excavations of the Peking Man Site at Zhoukoudian as an advisor in 1926 and continued in the role for the Cenozoic Research Laboratory of the Geological Survey of China…in 1928.”

“He resided in Manchuria with Emile Licent, then stayed in Western Shansi (Shanxi) and northern Shensi (Shaanxi) with the Chinese paleontologist C. C. Young and with Davidson Black, Chairman of the Geological Survey of China. After a tour in Manchuria in the area of Great Khingan with Chinese geologists, Teilhard joined the team of American Expedition Center-Asia in the Gobi Desert organised in June and July, by the American Museum of Natural History with Roy Chapman Andrews. Henri Breuil and Teilhard discovered that the Peking Man, the nearest relative of Pithecanthropus from Java, was a faber (worker of stones and controller of fire). Teilhard wrote *L'Esprit de la Terre* (the Spirit of the Earth). Teilhard took part as a scientist in the Croisière Jaune (Yellow Cruise) financed by André Citroën in Central Asia. Northwest of Beijing in Kalgan, he joined the Chinese group who joined the second part of the team, the Pamir group, in Aksu. He remained with his colleagues for several months in Ürümqi, capital of Sinkiang. The following year the Sino-Japanese War (1937–1945) began. In 1933, Rome ordered him to give up his post in Paris. Teilhard undertook several explorations in the south of China. He traveled in the valleys of Yangtze River and Sichuan in 1934, then, the following year, in Kwang-If and Guangdong. The relationship with Marcellin Boule was disrupted; the museum cut its financing on the grounds that Teilhard worked more for the Chinese Geological Service than for the museum. During all these years, Teilhard strongly contributed to the constitution of an international network of research in human paleontology related to the whole of eastern and southeastern Asia.”

**World Travels.** “Teilhard participated in the 1935 Yale–Cambridge expedition in northern and central India with the geologist Helmut de Terra and Patterson, who verified their assumptions on Indian Paleolithic civilisations in Kashmir and the Salt Range Valley. He then made a short stay in Java, on the invitation of Dutch paleontologist Ralph von Koenigswald to the site of Java man. A second cranium, more complete, was discovered. Professor von Koenigswald had also found a tooth in a Chinese apothecary shop in 1934 that he believed belonged to a three-meter-tall ape, Gigantopithecus which lived between one hundred thousand and around a million years ago.” His travels and related writings continued until later years of his life.”
Chapter III. History of Philosophy

6-5. The Existentialism of Sartre

“Existentialism can be thought of as the twentieth-century analogue of nineteenth-century romanticism. The two movements have in common the demand that the whole fabric of life be recognized and taken into account in our thinking and acting. As such they express a form of resistance to reductionist analyses of life and its meaning for human beings. But there are also significant differences. Existentialism is typically focused on individual human lives and the poignant inevitability of suffering and choice for each individual whereas romanticism tended to be more oriented to the whole of nature and saw human beings as a part of that wider picture. Furthermore, romanticism flourished before the wars and genocides of the twentieth century whereas existentialism is born amid those horrors. From one point of view, the existentialists divide roughly between writers (most famously, perhaps, Albert Camus) and philosophers. The philosophical existentialists divide roughly between the atheistic and the religious. Søren Kierkegaard (1813-1855) [the ultimate anti-Christianity Christian] is often considered to be the father of them all, but Friedrich Nietzsche (1884-1900) [the ultimate anti-Christ philosopher] is a crucial figure at the origins of the developing line of atheistic existentialism. Religious existentialists included both Jews such as Martin Buber (1878-1965) [the Protestant Jew] and Christians such as Paul Tillich (1886-1965) [the Christian crypto-atheist infatuated with Being and God]. Other religious existentialists include Karl Jaspers, Gabriel Marcel, and Karl Rahner. The atheistic existentialists include Martin Heidegger (1889-1976) [the non-Christian atheist infatuated with Being and time], though he denied that he was an existentialist, and Jean-Paul Sartre (1905-1980) [the ultimate atheist infatuated with Being and nothingness]. It is quite a cast of characters. And the classifications make less sense the better you know them, not least because it is hard to disentangle theism and atheism in the context of existential reflection on human life.”

Concepts: (a) **Existence precedes essence.** “Sartre claimed that a central proposition of Existentialism is that existence precedes essence, which means that the most important consideration for individuals is that they are individuals - independently acting and responsible, conscious beings (existence) - rather than what labels, roles, stereotypes, definitions, or other preconceived categories the individuals fit (essence). The actual life of the individuals is what constitutes what could be called their true essence instead of there being an arbitrarily attributed essence others use to define them. Thus, human beings, through their own consciousness, create their own values and determine a meaning to their life. Although it was Sartre who explicitly coined the phrase, similar notions can be found in the thought of existentialist philosophers such as Heidegger, and Kierkegaard: ‘The subjective thinker’s form, the form of his communication, is his style. His form must be just as manifold as the opposites that he holds together. The systematic eins, zwei, drei is an abstract form that also must inevitably run into trouble whenever it is to be applied to the concrete. To the same degree as the subjective thinker is concrete, to the same degree his form must also be concretely dialectical. But just as he himself is not a poet, not an ethicist, not a dialectician, so also his form is none of these directly. His form must first and last be related to existence, and in this regard he must have at his disposal the poetic, the ethical, the dialectical, the religious. Subordinate character, setting, etc., which belong to the well-balanced character of the esthetic production, are in themselves breadth; the subjective thinker has only one setting – existence - and has nothing to do with localities and such things. The setting is not the fairyland of the imagination, where poetry produces consummation, nor is the setting laid in England, and historical accuracy is not a concern. The setting is inwardness in existing as a human being; the concretion is the relation of the existence-categories to one another. Historical accuracy and historical actuality are breadth.’ [Søren Kierkegaard]"
“Some interpret the imperative to define oneself as meaning that anyone can wish to be anything. However, an existentialist philosopher would say such a wish constitutes an inauthentic existence - what Sartre would call 'bad faith'. Instead, the phrase should be taken to say that people are (1) defined only insofar as they act and (2) that they are responsible for their actions. For example, someone who acts cruelly towards other people is, by that act, defined as a cruel person. Furthermore, by this action of cruelty, such persons are themselves responsible for their new identity (cruel persons). This is as opposed to their genes, or human nature, bearing the blame. As Sartre writes in his work *Existentialism is a Humanism*: ‘... man first of all exists, encounters himself, surges up in the world - and defines himself afterwards’. Of course, the more positive, therapeutic aspect of this is also implied: A person can choose to act in a different way, and to be a good person instead of a cruel person. Here it is also clear that since humans can choose to be either cruel or good, they are, in fact, neither of these things essentially. Sartre's definition of existentialism was based on Heidegger's magnum opus *Being and Time*. In a set of letters, Heidegger implies that Sartre misunderstood him for his own purposes of subjectivism, and that he did not mean that actions take precedence over being so long as those actions were not reflected upon. This way of living, Heidegger called average everydayness.”

(b) **The Absurd**: “The notion of the Absurd contains the idea that there is no meaning in the world beyond what meaning we give it. This meaninglessness also encompasses the amorality or unfairness of the world. This contrasts with the notion that bad things don't happen to good people; to the world, metaphorically speaking, there is no such thing as a good person or a bad person; what happens happens, and it may just as well happen to a good person as to a bad person. Because of the world's absurdity, at any point in time, anything can happen to anyone, and a tragic event could plummet someone into direct confrontation with the Absurd. The notion of the Absurd has been prominent in literature throughout history. Many of the literary works of Søren Kierkegaard, Samuel Beckett, Franz Kafka, Fyodor Dostoyevsky, Eugène Ionesco, Miguel de Unamuno, Luigi Pirandello, Jean-Paul Sartre, Joseph Heller and Albert Camus contain descriptions of people who encounter the absurdity of the world. It is in relation to the concept of the devastating awareness of meaninglessness that Albert Camus claimed that there is only one truly serious philosophical problem, and that is suicide in his *The Myth of Sisyphus*. Although prescriptions against the possibly deleterious consequences of these kinds of encounters vary, from Kierkegaard's religious stage to Camus' insistence on persevering in spite of absurdity, the concern with helping people avoid living their lives in ways that put them in the perpetual danger of having everything meaningful break down is common to most existentialist philosophers. The possibility of having everything meaningful break down poses a threat of quietism, which is inherently against the existentialist philosophy...the possibility of suicide makes all humans existentialists.”

(c) **Facticity**: “Facticity is a concept defined by Sartre in *Being and Nothingness* as the in-itself, which delineates for humans the modalities of being and not being. This can be more easily understood when considering facticity in relation to the temporal dimension of our past: one's past is what one is, in the sense that it co-constitutes oneself. However, to say that one is only one's past would be to ignore a significant part of reality (the present and the future), while saying that one's past is only what one was, would entirely detach it from oneself now. A denial of one's own concrete past constitutes an inauthentic lifestyle, and the same goes for all other kinds of facticity (having a human body - e.g., one that doesn't allow a person to run faster than the speed of sound - identity, values, etc.). Facticity is both a limitation and a condition of freedom. It is a limitation in that a large part of one's facticity consists of things one couldn't have chosen (birthplace, etc.), but a condition of freedom in the sense that one's values most likely depend on it. However, even though one's facticity is set in stone (as being past, for instance), it cannot determine a person: The
value ascribed to one's facticity is still ascribed to it freely by that person. As an example, consider two men, one of whom has no memory of his past and the other who remembers everything. They both have committed many crimes, but the first man, knowing nothing about this, leads a rather normal life while the second man, feeling trapped by his own past, continues a life of crime, blaming his own past for trapping him in this life. There is nothing essential about his committing crimes, but he ascribes this meaning to his past.”

“However, to disregard one's facticity when, in the continual process of self-making, one projects oneself into the future, that would be to put oneself in denial of oneself, and thus would be inauthentic. In other words, the origin of one's projection must still be one's facticity, though in the mode of not being it (essentially). Another aspect of facticity is that it entails angst, both in the sense that freedom produces angst when limited by facticity, and in the sense that the lack of the possibility of having facticity to step in for one to take responsibility for something one has done, also produces angst. Another aspect of existential freedom is that one can change one's values. Thus, one is responsible for one's values, regardless of society's values. The focus on freedom in existentialism is related to the limits of the responsibility one bears, as a result of one's freedom: the relationship between freedom and responsibility is one of interdependency, and a clarification of freedom also clarifies that for which one is responsible.”

(d) **Authenticity:** “Many noted existentialist writers consider the theme of authentic existence important. Authentic existence involves the idea that one has to create oneself and then live in accordance with this self. What is meant by authenticity is that in acting, one should act as oneself, not as one's acts or as one's genes or any other essence requires. The authentic act is one that is in accordance with one's freedom. Of course, as a condition of freedom is facticity, this includes one's facticity, but not to the degree that this facticity can in any way determine one's choices (in the sense that one could then blame one's background for making the choice one made). The role of facticity in relation to authenticity involves letting one's actual values come into play when one makes a choice (instead of, like Kierkegaard's Aesthete, choosing randomly), so that one also takes responsibility for the act instead of choosing either-or without allowing the options to have different values. In contrast to this, the inauthentic is the denial to live in accordance with one's freedom. This can take many forms, from pretending choices are meaningless or random, through convincing oneself that some form of determinism is true, to a sort of mimicry where one acts as one should. How one should act is often determined by an image one has of how one such as oneself (say, a bank manager, lion tamer, prostitute, etc.) acts. This image usually corresponds to some sort of social norm, but this does not mean that all acting in accordance with social norms is inauthentic: The main point is the attitude one takes to one's own freedom and responsibility, and the extent to which one acts in accordance with this freedom.”

(e) **The Other and the Look:** “The Other (when written with a capital O) is a concept more properly belonging to phenomenology and its account of inter-subjectivity. However, the concept has seen widespread use in existentialist writings, and the conclusions drawn from it differ slightly from the phenomenological accounts. The experience of the Other is the experience of another free subject who inhabits the same world as a person does. In its most basic form, it is this experience of the Other that constitutes inter-subjectivity and objectivity. To clarify, when one experiences someone else, and this Other person experiences the world (the same world that a person experiences) - only from over there - the world itself is constituted as objective in that it is something that is there as identical for both of the subjects; a person experiences the other person as experiencing the same things. This experience of the Other's look is what is termed the Look. While this experience, in its basic phenomenological sense, constitutes the world as objective, and oneself as objectively existing subjectivity (one experiences oneself as seen in the Other's Look in
precisely the same way that one experiences the Other as seen by him, as subjectivity), in existentialism, it also acts as a kind of limitation of freedom. This is because the Look tends to objectify what it sees. As such, when one experiences oneself in the Look, one doesn't experience oneself as nothing (no thing), but as something. Sartre's own example of a man peeping at someone through a keyhole can help clarify this: at first, this man is entirely caught up in the situation he is in; he is in a pre-reflexive state where his entire consciousness is directed at what goes on in the room. Suddenly, he hears a creaking floorboard behind him, and he becomes aware of himself as seen by the Other. He is thus filled with shame for he perceives himself as he would perceive someone else doing what he was doing, as a Peeping Tom. The Look is then co-constitutive of one's facticity. Another characteristic feature of the Look is that no Other really needs to have been there: It is quite possible that the creaking floorboard was nothing but the movement of an old house; the Look isn't some kind of mystical telepathic experience of the actual way the other sees one (there may also have been someone there, but he could have not noticed that the person was there). It is only one's perception of the way another might perceive him.”

(f) **Angst and Dread:** “Existential angst, sometimes called existential dread, anxiety, or anguish, is a term that is common to many existentialist thinkers. It is generally held to be a negative feeling arising from the experience of human freedom and responsibility. The archetypical example is the experience one has when standing on a cliff where one not only fears falling off it, but also dreads the possibility of throwing oneself off. In this experience that nothing is holding me back, one senses the lack of anything that predetermines one to either throw oneself off or to stand still, and one experiences one's own freedom. It can also be seen in relation to the previous point how angst is before nothing, and this is what sets it apart from fear that has an object. While in the case of fear, one can take definitive measures to remove the object of fear, in the case of angst, no such constructive measures are possible. The use of the word nothing in this context relates both to the inherent insecurity about the consequences of one's actions, and to the fact that, in experiencing freedom as angst, one also realizes that one is fully responsible for these consequences. There is nothing in people that acts in their stead - that they can blame if something goes wrong. Therefore, not every choice is perceived as having dreadful possible consequences (and, it can be claimed, human lives would be unbearable if every choice facilitated dread). However, this doesn't change the fact that freedom remains a condition of every action.”

(g) **Despair:** “Despair, in existentialism, is generally defined as a loss of hope. More specifically, it is a loss of hope in reaction to a breakdown in one or more of the defining qualities of one's self or identity. If a person is invested in being a particular thing, such as a bus driver or an upstanding citizen, and then finds their being-thing compromised, they would normally be found in a state of despair - a hopeless state. For example, a singer who loses the ability to sing may despair if they have nothing else to fall back on - nothing to rely on for their identity. They find themselves unable to be what defined their being. What sets the existentialist notion of despair apart from the conventional definition is that existentialist despair is a state one is in even when they aren't overtly in despair. So long as a person's identity depends on qualities that can crumble, they are in perpetual despair - and as there is, in Sartrean terms, no human essence found in conventional reality on which to constitute the individual's sense of identity, despair is a universal human condition. As Kierkegaard defines it in Either/Or: Let each one learns what he can; both of us can learn that a person’s unhappiness never lies in his lack of control over external conditions, since this would only make him completely unhappy. In *Works of Love*…Love hopes all things - yet is never put to shame. To relate oneself expectantly to the possibility of the good is to hope. To relate oneself expectantly to the possibility of evil is to fear. By the decision to choose hope one decides infinitely more than it seems, because it is an eternal decision.”
Relations with Others: (a) **Opposition to positivism and rationalism:** “Existentialists oppose definitions of human beings as rational, and, therefore, oppose positivism and rationalism. Existentialism asserts that people actually make decisions based on subjective meaning rather than pure rationality. The rejection of reason as the source of meaning is a common theme of existentialist thought, as is the focus on the feelings of anxiety and dread that we feel in the face of our own radical freedom and our awareness of death. Kierkegaard advocated rationality as a means to interact with the objective world (e.g., in the natural sciences), but when it comes to existential problems, reason is insufficient: Human reason has boundaries. Like Kierkegaard, Sartre saw problems with rationality, calling it a form of bad faith, an attempt by the self to impose structure on a world of phenomena - the Other - that is fundamentally irrational and random. According to Sartre, rationality and other forms of bad faith hinder people from finding meaning in freedom. To try to suppress their feelings of anxiety and dread, people confine themselves within everyday experience, Sartre asserts, thereby relinquishing their freedom and acquiescing to being possessed in one form or another by the Look of the Other (i.e., possessed by another person—or at least one’s idea of that other person).”

(b) **Religion:** “An existentialist reading of the Bible would demand that the reader recognize that he is an existing subject studying the words more as a recollection of events. This is in contrast to looking at a collection of truths that are outside and unrelated to the reader but may develop a sense of reality/God. Such a reader is not obligated to follow the commandments as if an external agent is forcing them upon him, but as though they are inside him and guiding him from inside. This is the task Kierkegaard takes up when he asks: Who has the more difficult task: the teacher who lectures on earnest things…from everyday life - or the learner who should put it to use?”

(c) **Nihilism:** “Although nihilism and existentialism are distinct philosophies, they are often confused with one another. A primary cause of confusion is that Friedrich Nietzsche is an important philosopher in both fields, but also the existentialist insistence on the inherent meaninglessness of the world. Existentialist philosophers often stress the importance of Angst as signifying the absolute lack of any objective ground for action, a move that is often reduced to a moral or an existential nihilism. A pervasive theme in the works of existentialist philosophy, however, is to persist through encounters with the absurd, as seen in Camus’ *The Myth of Sisyphus* (One must imagine Sisyphus happy), and it is only very rarely that existentialist philosophers dismiss morality or one’s self-created meaning: Kierkegaard regained a sort of morality in the religious (although he wouldn’t himself agree that it was ethical; the religious suspends the ethical), and Sartre’s final words in Being and Nothingness are ‘All these questions, which refer us to a pure and not an accessory (or impure) reflection, can find their reply only on the ethical plane. We shall devote to them a future work.’”

(d) **Etymology:** “The term "existentialism" was coined by the French Catholic philosopher Gabriel Marcel in the mid-1940s. At first, when Marcel applied the term to him at a colloquium in 1945, Jean-Paul Sartre rejected it. Sartre subsequently changed his mind and, on October 29, 1945, publicly adopted the existentialist label in a lecture to the Club Maintenant in Paris. The lecture was published as *L’existentialisme est un humanisme* (Existentialism is a Humanism), a short book that did much to popularize existentialist thought. Marcel later came to reject the label himself in favor of the term Neo-Socratic, in honor of Kierkegaard’s essay *On The Concept of Irony*. Some scholars argue that the term should be used only to refer to the cultural movement in Europe in the 1940s and 1950s associated with the works of the philosophers Jean-Paul Sartre, Simone de Beauvoir, Maurice Merleau-Ponty, and Albert Camus. Other scholars extend the term to Kierkegaard, and yet others extend it as far back as Socrates. However, the term is often identified with the philosophical views of Jean-Paul Sartre.”
History of Existentialism: (a) Precursors of Existentialism: “The problem of what humans are in themselves can be discerned in the Socratic imperative know thyself, as well as in the work of the 16th-century French essayist Michel de Montaigne and Blaise Pascal, a 17th-century French religious philosopher and mathematician. Montaigne had said: ‘If my mind could gain a foothold, I would not write essays, I would make decisions; but it is always in apprenticeship and on trial’. And Pascal had insisted on the precarious position of humans situated between Being and Nothingness: ‘We burn with the desire to find solid ground and an ultimate sure foundation whereon to build a tower reaching to the Infinite. But our whole groundwork cracks, and the earth opens to abysses. The stance of the internal tribunal - of one’s withdrawal into one’s own spiritual interior - which reappeared in some existentialists (in Marcel and Sartre, for example) already belonged, as earlier noted, to St. Augustine. In early 19th-century French philosophy, it was defended by a reformed ideologue of the French Revolution, Marie Maine de Biran, who wrote: ‘Even from infancy I remember that I marvelled at the sense of my existence. I was already led by instinct to look within myself in order to know how it was possible that I could be alive and be myself.’ From then on, that posture inspired a considerable part of French philosophy.”

“The theme of the irreducibility of existence to reason, common to many existentialists, was also defended by the German idealist F. W. J. von Schelling as he argued against G. W. F. Hegel in the last phase of his philosophy; Schelling’s polemic, in turn, inspired the thinker usually cited as the father of existentialism, the religious Dane Søren Kierkegaard. The requirement to know humanity in its particularity and, therefore, in terms of a procedure different from those used by science to obtain knowledge of natural objects was confronted by Wilhelm Dilthey, an expounder of historical reason, who viewed understanding (Verstehen) as the procedure and thus as the proper method of the human sciences. Understanding, according to Dilthey, consists in the reliving and reproducing of the experience of others. Hence, it is also a feeling together with others and a sympathetic participation in their emotions. Understanding, therefore, accomplishes a unity between the knowing object and the object known.”

(b) Immediate Background of Founders: “The theses of existentialism found a particular relevance during World War II, when Europe found itself threatened alternately by material and spiritual destruction. Under those circumstances of uncertainty, the optimism of Romantic inspiration, by which the destiny of humankind is infallibly guaranteed by an infinite force (such as Reason, the Absolute, or Mind) and propelled by it toward an ineluctable progress, appeared to be untenable. Existentialism was moved to insist on the instability and the risk of all human reality, to acknowledge that the individual is thrown into the world - i.e., abandoned to a determinism that could render his initiatives impossible - and to hold that his very freedom is conditioned and hampered by limitations that could at any moment render it empty. The negative aspects of existence, such as pain, frustration, sickness, and death - which 19th-century optimism refused to take seriously because they do not touch the infinite principle that those optimists believed to be manifest in humans - became for existentialism the essential features of human reality. The thinkers who, by virtue of the negative character of their philosophy, constituted the exception to 19th-century Romanticism thus became the acknowledged masters of the existentialists. Against Hegelian necessitarianism, Kierkegaard interpreted existence in terms of possibility: dread - which dominates existence through and through - is the sentiment of the possible. It is the feeling of what can happen to a person even when he has made all of his calculations and taken every precaution. Despair, on the other hand, discovers in possibility its only remedy, for ‘If man remains without possibilities, it is as if he lacked air.’ The German philosopher and economist Karl Marx, in holding that the individual is constituted essentially by the relationships of work and production that tie him to things and other humans, had insisted on the alienating character that those
relationships assume in capitalist society, where private property transforms the individual from an end to a means, from a person to the instrument of an impersonal process that subjugates him without regard for his needs and his desires. Nietzsche had viewed the amor fati (love of fate) as the “formula for man’s greatness. Freedom consists in desiring what is and what has been and in choosing it and loving it as if nothing better could be desired.”405

(c) Emergence as a movement: “Modern existentialism reproduced such ideas and combined them in more or less coherent ways. Human existence is, for all the forms of existentialism, the projection of the future on the basis of the possibilities that constitute it. For some existentialists (Heidegger and Jaspers, for example), the existential possibilities, inasmuch as they are rooted in the past, merely lead every project for the future back to the past, so that only what has already been chosen can be chosen (Nietzsche’s amor fati). For others (such as Sartre), the possibilities that are offered to existential choice are infinite and equivalent, such that the choice between them is indifferent; and for still others (Abbagnano and Merleau-Ponty), the existential possibilities are limited by the situation, but they neither determine the choice nor render it indifferent. The issue is one of individuating, in every concrete situation and by means of a specific inquiry, the real possibilities offered to humans. For all the existentialists, however, the choice among possibilities - i.e., the projection of existence - implies risks, renunciation, and limitation. Among the risks, the most serious is the descent into inauthenticity or alienation, the degradation from being a person into being a thing. Against that risk, for the theological forms of existentialism (e.g., Marcel, the Swiss theologian Karl Barth, and the German biblical scholar Rudolf Bultmann), there is the guarantee of transcendent help from God, which in its turn is guaranteed by faith.”

“Existentialism, consequently, by insisting on the individuality and non-repeatability of existence (following Kierkegaard and Nietzsche), is sometimes led to regard one’s coexistence with other humans (held to be, however, an ineluctable fact of the human situation) as a condemnation or alienation of humanity. Marcel said that all that exists in society beyond the individual is expressible by a minus sign, and Sartre affirmed, in his major work L’Être et le néant (1943; Being and Nothingness), that the Other is the hidden death of my possibilities. For other forms of existentialism, however, a coexistence that is not anonymous (as that of a mob) but grounded on personal communication is the condition of authentic existence. Existentialism has had ramifications in various areas of contemporary culture. In literature, Franz Kafka, author of haunting novels, walking in Kierkegaard’s footsteps, described human existence as the quest for a stable, secure, and radiant reality that continually eludes it or as threatened by a guilty verdict about which it knows neither the reason nor the circumstances but against which it can do nothing - a verdict that ends with death. The theses of contemporary existentialism were then diffused and popularized by the novels and plays of Sartre and by the writings of the French novelists and dramatists Simone de Beauvoir - an important philosopher of existentialism in her own right - and Albert Camus. In L’Homme révolté, Camus described the metaphysical rebellion as the movement by which a man protests against his condition and against the whole of creation. In art, the analogues of existentialism may be considered to be Surrealism, Expressionism, and in general those schools that view the work of art not as the reflection of a reality external to humans but as the free immediate expression of human reality. Existentialism made its entrance into psychopathology through Jaspers’s Allgemeine Psychopathologie (1913; General Psychopathology), which was inspired by the need to understand the world in which the mental patient lives by means of a sympathetic participation in his experience. Later, the Swiss psychiatrist Ludwig Binswanger, in one of his celebrated works, Über Ideenflucht (1933; “On the Flight of Ideas”), inspired by Heidegger’s thought, viewed the origin of mental illness as a failure in the existential possibilities that constitute human existence. From Jaspers and Binswanger, the existentialist current…”
(d) **Methodological Issues In Existentialism:** “The methods that existentialists employ in their interpretations have a presupposition in common: the immediacy of the relationship between the interpreter and the interpreted, between the interrogator and the interrogated, between the problem of being and Being itself. The two terms coincide in existence: the person who poses the question ‘What is Being?’ cannot but pose it to himself and cannot respond without starting from his own being.” 406 “That common ground notwithstanding, each existentialist thinker has defended and worked out his own method for the interpretation of existence. Heidegger, an existentialist with ontological concerns, availed himself of the philosophy of Edmund Husserl, the founder of phenomenology, which employs speech that manifests or discloses what it is that one is speaking about and that is true - in the etymological use of the Greek word αλήθεια. The phenomenon is, from Heidegger’s point of view, not mere appearance, but the manifestation or disclosure of Being in itself. Phenomenology is thus capable of disclosing the structure of Being and hence is an ontology of which the point of departure is the being of the one who poses the question about Being, namely, the human being.”

“On the other hand, Jaspers, an authority in psychopathology as well as in the philosophy of human existence, employed the method of the rational clarification of existence; he maintained that existence, as the quest for Being, is humanity’s effort of rational self-understanding, or universalizing, and of communicating - a method that presupposes that existence and reason are the two poles of the being of humans. Reason is possible existence - i.e., existence that, as Jaspers wrote in his *Vernunft und Existenz* (1935; Reason and Existence), becomes manifest to itself and as such real, if, with, through and by another existence, it arrives at itself. Such activity, however, is never consummated. Thus, when the impossibility of its achievement is recognized, it is changed into faith, into the recognition of transcendence as providing the only possibility of its final achievement.” “Jaspers, a professor at the University of Heidelberg, was acquainted with Martin Heidegger, who held a professorship at Marburg before acceding to Husserl’s chair at Freiburg in 1928. They held many philosophical discussions, but later became estranged over Heidegger’s support of National Socialism (Nazism). They shared an admiration for Kierkegaard, and in the 1930s, Heidegger lectured extensively on Nietzsche. Nevertheless, the extent to which Heidegger should be considered an existentialist is debatable. In Being and Time, he presented a method of rooting philosophical explanations in human existence (Dasein) to be analyzed in terms of existential categories (existentiale); and this has led many commentators to treat him as an important figure in the existentialist movement.”

“According to Sartre, the foremost philosopher of mid-20th-century France, the method of philosophy is existential psychoanalysis - i.e., the analysis of the fundamental project in which human existence consists. In contrast to the precepts of Freudian psychoanalysis, which stop short at the irreducibility of the libido, or primitive psychic drive, existential psychoanalysis tries to determine the original choice through which humans construct their world and decide in a preliminary way upon particular choices. According to Marcel, the method of philosophy depends upon a recognition of the mystery of Being (Le Mystère de l’être [1951]; The Mystery of Being) - i.e., of the impossibility of discovering Being through objective or rational analyses or demonstrations. Philosophy should lead humanity up, however, to the point of making possible the productive illumination of Revelation. Finally, according to humanistic existentialism, as represented by Abbagnano and Merleau-Ponty, the method of philosophy consists of the analysis and the determination - by employing all available techniques, including those of science - of the structures that constitute existence - i.e., of the relations that connect the individual with other beings and that figure, therefore, not only in the constitution of the individual but in the constitution of other beings as well.”
Jean-Paul Sartre (1905-80)

Jean-Paul Charles Aymard Sartre was a French philosopher, playwright, novelist, political activist, biographer, and literary critic. “He was one of the key figures in the philosophy of existentialism and phenomenology, and one of the leading figures in 20th-century French philosophy and Marxism. [He looks for a fusion of the two, a rejuvenation of ossified Marxism through an injection of existentialism.] His work has also influenced sociology, critical theory, post-colonial theory, and literary studies; and continues to influence these disciplines. Sartre was also noted for his open relationship with prominent feminist and fellow existentialist philosopher and writer Simone de Beauvoir. Together, Sartre and de Beauvoir challenged the cultural and social assumptions and expectations of their upbringings, which they considered bourgeois, in both lifestyle and thought. The conflict between oppressive, spiritually destructive conformity (bad faith) and an authentic way of being became the dominant theme of Sartre’s early work, a theme embodied in his principal philosophical work *Being and Nothingness* (*L’Être et le Néant*, 1943). Sartre’s introduction to his philosophy is his work *Existentialism and Humanism* (*L’existentialisme est un humanisme*, 1946), originally presented as a lecture. He was awarded the 1964 Nobel Prize in Literature but refused it, saying that he always declined official honors and that ‘a writer should not allow himself to be turned into an institution’.”

**Early Life and Writings:** “Sartre lost his father at an early age and grew up in the home of his maternal grandfather, Carl Schweitzer, uncle of the medical missionary Albert Schweitzer and himself professor of German at the Sorbonne. The boy, who wandered in the Luxembourg Gardens of Paris in search of playmates, was small in stature and cross-eyed. His brilliant autobiography, *Les Mots* (1963; Words), narrates the adventures of the mother and child in the park as they went from group to group—in the vain hope of being accepted—then finally retreated to the sixth floor of their apartment “on the heights where (the) dreams dwell.” “The words” saved the child, and his interminable pages of writing were the escape from a world that had rejected him but that he would proceed to rebuild in his own fancy. Sartre went to the Lycée Henri IV in Paris and, later on, after the remarriage of his mother, to the lycée in La Rochelle. From there he went to the prestigious École Normale Supérieure, from which he was graduated in 1929. Sartre resisted what he called “bourgeois marriage,” but while still a student he formed with Simone de Beauvoir a union that remained a settled partnership in life. Simone de Beauvoir’s memoirs, *Mémoires d’une jeune fille rangée* (1958; Memoirs of a Dutiful Daughter) and *La Force de l’âge* (1960; The Prime of Life), provide an intimate account of Sartre’s life from student years until his middle 50s. It was also at the École Normale Supérieure and at the Sorbonne that he met several persons who were destined to be writers of great fame; among these were Raymond Aron, Maurice Merleau-Ponty, Simone Weil, Emmanual Mounier, Jean Hippolyte, and Claude Lévi-Strauss. From 1931 until 1945 Sartre taught in the lycées of Le Havre, Laon, and, finally, Paris. Twice this career was interrupted, once by a year of study in Berlin and the second time when Sartre was drafted in 1939 to serve in World War II. He was made prisoner in 1940 and released a year later.”

“During his years of teaching in Le Havre, Sartre published *La Nausée* (1938; Nausea), his first claim to fame. This novel, written in the form of a diary, narrates the feeling of revulsion that a certain Roquentin undergoes when confronted with the world of matter—not merely the world of other people but the very awareness of his own body. According to some critics, *La Nausée* must be viewed as a pathological case, a form of neurotic escape. Most probably it must be appreciated also as a most original, fiercely individualistic, antisocial piece of work, containing in its pages many of the philosophical themes that Sartre later developed. Sartre took over the phenomenological method, which proposes careful, unprejudiced description rather than..."
deduction, from the German philosopher Edmund Husserl and used it with great skill in three successive publications: *L’Imagination* (1936; Imagination: A Psychological Critique), *Esquisse d’une théorie des émotions* (1939; Sketch for a Theory of the Emotions), and *L’Imaginaire: Psychologie phénoménologique de l’imagination* (1940; The Psychology of Imagination). But it was above all in *L’Être et le néant* (1943; Being and Nothingness) that Sartre revealed himself as a master of outstanding talent. Sartre places human consciousness, or no-thingness (néant), in opposition to being, or thingness (être). Consciousness is not-matter and by the same token escapes all determinism. The message, with all the implications it contains, is a hopeful one; yet the incessant reminder that human endeavor is and remains useless makes the book tragic as well.”

**Post-World War II Work:** “Having written his defense of individual freedom and human dignity, Sartre turned his attention to the concept of social responsibility. For many years he had shown great concern for the poor and the disinherited of all kinds. While a teacher, he had refused to wear a tie, as if he could shed his social class with his tie and thus come closer to the worker. Freedom itself, which at times in his previous writings appeared to be a gratuitous activity that needed no particular aim or purpose to be of value, became a tool for human struggle in his brochure *L’Existentialisme est un humanisme* (1946; *Existentialism and Humanism*). Freedom now implied social responsibility. In his novels and plays Sartre began to bring his ethical message to the world at large. He started a four-volume novel in 1945 under the title *Les Chemins de la liberté*, of which three were eventually written: *L’Âge de raison* (1945; The Age of Reason), *Le Sursis* (1945; The Reprieve), and *La Mort dans l’âme* (1949; Iron in the Soul, or Troubled Sleep). After the publication of the third volume, Sartre changed his mind concerning the usefulness of the novel as a medium of communication and turned back to plays.”

“What a writer must attempt, said Sartre, is to show man as he is. Nowhere is man more man than when he is in action, and this is exactly what drama portrays. He had already written in this medium during the war, and now one play followed another: *Les Mouches* (produced 1943; The Flies), *Huis-clos* (produced 1944, published 1945; In Camera, or No Exit), *Les Mains sales* (1948; Crime passionel, 1949; U.S. title, Dirty Hands; acting version, Red Gloves), *Le Diable et le bon dieu* (1951; Lucifer and the Lord), *Nekrassov* (1955), and *Les Séquestrés d’Altona* (1959; Loser Wins, or The Condemned of Altona). All the plays, in their emphasis upon the raw hostility of man toward man, seem to be predominantly pessimistic; yet, according to Sartre’s own confession, their content does not exclude the possibility of a morality of salvation. Other publications of the same period include a book, *Baudelaire* (1947), a vaguely ethical study on the French writer and poet Jean Genet titled *Saint Genet, comédien et martyr* (1952; Saint Genet, Actor and Martyr), and innumerable articles that were published in *Les Temps Modernes*, the monthly review that Sartre and Simone de Beauvoir founded and edited. These articles were later collected in several volumes under the title *Situations.*”

**Political Activities:** “After World War II, Sartre took an active interest in French political movements, and his leanings to the left became more pronounced. He became an outspoken admirer of the Soviet Union, although he did not become a member of the Communist Party. In 1954 he visited the Soviet Union, Scandinavia, Africa, the United States, and Cuba. Upon the entry of Soviet tanks into Budapest in 1956, however, Sartre’s hopes for communism were sadly crushed. He wrote in *Les Temps Modernes* a long article, “Le Fantôme de Staline,” that condemned both the Soviet intervention and the submission of the French Communist Party to the dictates of Moscow. Over the years this critical attitude opened the way to a form of “Sartrian Socialism” that would find its expression in a new major work, *Critique de la raison dialectique* (1960; Eng. trans., of the introduction only, under the title The Problem of Method; U.S. title, Search for a Method). Sartre set out to examine critically the Marxist dialectic and discovered that
it was not livable in the Soviet form. Although he still believed that Marxism was the only philosophy for the current times, he conceded that it had become ossified and that, instead of adapting itself to particular situations, it compelled the particular to fit a predetermined universal. Whatever its fundamental, general principles, Marxism must learn to recognize the existential concrete circumstances that differ from one collectivity to another and to respect the individual freedom of man. The Critique, somewhat marred by poor construction, is in fact an impressive and beautiful book, deserving of more attention than it has gained so far. A projected second volume was abandoned. Instead, Sartre prepared for publication Les Mots, for which he was awarded the 1964 Nobel Prize for Literature, an offer that was refused."

**Last Years:** “From 1960 until 1971 most of Sartre’s attention went into the writing of a four-volume study called Flaubert. Two volumes with a total of some 2,130 pages appeared in the spring of 1971. This huge enterprise aimed at presenting the reader with a total biography of Gustave Flaubert, the famous French novelist, through the use of a double tool: on the one hand, Karl Marx’s concept of history and class and, on the other, Sigmund Freud’s illuminations of the dark recesses of the human soul through explorations into his childhood and family relations. Although at times Sartre’s genius comes through and his fecundity is truly unbelievable, the sheer volume of the work and the minutely detailed analysis of even the slightest Flaubertian dictum hamper full enjoyment. As if he himself were saturated by the prodigal abundance of his writings, Sartre moved away from his desk during 1971 and did very little writing. Under the motto that commitment is an act, not a word, Sartre often went into the streets to participate in rioting, in the sale of left-wing literature, and in other activities that in his opinion were the way to promote the revolution. Paradoxically enough, this same radical Socialist published in 1972 the third volume of the work on Flaubert, L’Idiot de la famille, another book of such density that only the bourgeois intellectual can read it. The enormous productivity of Sartre came herewith to a close. His mind, still alert and active, came through in interviews and in the writing of scripts for motion pictures. He also worked on a book of ethics. However, his was no longer the power of a genius in full productivity. Sartre became blind and his health deteriorated.” He died of a lung tumor in 1980.

**As Public Intellectual:** “Sartre’s philosophy lent itself to his being a public intellectual. He envisaged culture as a very fluid concept; neither pre-determined, nor definitely finished; instead, in true existential fashion, culture was always conceived as a process of continual invention and re-invention. This marks Sartre, the intellectual, as a pragmatist, willing to move and shift stance along with events. He did not dogmatically follow a cause other than the belief in human freedom, preferring to retain a pacifist’s objectivity. It is this overarching theme of freedom that means his work subverts the bases for distinctions among the disciplines. Therefore, he was able to hold knowledge across a vast array of subjects: the international world order, the political and economic organization of contemporary society, especially France, the institutional and legal frameworks that regulate the lives of ordinary citizens, the educational system, the media networks that control and disseminate information. Sartre systematically refused to keep quiet about what he saw as inequalities and injustices in the world. Sartre always sympathized with the Left and supported the French Communist Party (PCF) until the 1956 Soviet invasion of Hungary. Following the Liberation the PCF were infuriated by Sartre’s philosophy, which appeared to lure young French men and women away from the ideology of communism and into Sartre’s own existentialism. From 1956 onwards Sartre rejected the claims of the PCF to represent the French working classes, objecting to its authoritarian tendencies. In the late 1960s Sartre supported the Maoists, a movement that rejected the authority of established communist parties. However, despite aligning with the Maoists, Sartre said after the May events: If one rereads all my books, one will realize that I have not changed profoundly, and that I have always remained an anarchist.”
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Philosophical Development: Thus, “Sartre was born in Paris where he spent most of his life. After a traditional philosophical education in prestigious Parisian schools that introduced him to the history of Western philosophy with a bias toward Cartesianism and neo-Kantianism, not to mention a strong strain of Bergsonism, Sartre succeeded his former school friend, Raymond Aron, at the French Institute in Berlin (1933–1934) where he read the leading phenomenologists of the day, Husserl, Heidegger and Scheler. He prized Husserl’s restatement of the principle of intentionality that seemed to free the thinker from the inside/outside epistemology inherited from Descartes while retaining the immediacy and certainty that Cartesians prized so highly. What he read of Heidegger at that time is unclear, but he deals with the influential German ontologist explicitly after his return and especially in his masterwork, Being and Nothingness (1943). He exploits the latter’s version of Husserlian intentionality by insisting that human reality (Heidegger’s Dasein or human way of being) is in the world primarily via its practical concerns and not its epistemic relationships. This lends both Heidegger’s and Sartre’s early philosophies a kind of “pragmatist” character that Sartre, at least, will never abandon. It has been remarked that many of the Heideggerian concepts in Sartre’s existentialist writings also occur in those of Bergson, whose *Les Données immédiates de la conscience* (Time and Free Will) Sartre once credited with drawing him toward philosophy. But it is clear that Sartre devoted much of his early philosophical attention to combating the then influential Bergsonism and that mention of Bergson’s name decreases as that of Heidegger grows in Sartre’s writings during the vintage existentialist years. Sartre seems to have read the phenomenological ethicist Max Scheler, whose concept of the intuitive grasp of paradigm cases is echoed in Sartre’s reference to the image of the kind of person one should be that both guides and is fashioned by our moral choices. But where Scheler in the best Husserlian fashion argues for the discovery of such value images, Sartre insists on their creation. The properly existentialist version of phenomenology is already in play.”

“Though Sartre was not a serious reader of Hegel or Marx until during and after the war, like so many of his generation, he came under the influence of Kojève’s Marxist and protoexistentialist interpretation of Hegel, though he never attended his famous lectures in the 1930s as did Lacan and Merleau-Ponty. It was Jean Hyppolite’s translation of and commentary on Hegel’s *Phenomenology of Spirit* that marked Sartre’s closer study of the seminal German philosopher. This is especially evident in his posthumously published *Notebooks for an Ethics* written in 1947–48 to fulfill the promise of an ethics of authenticity made in *Being and Nothingness*. That project was subsequently abandoned but the Hegelian and Marxist presence became dominant in Sartre’s next major philosophical text, *The Critique of Dialectical Reason* (1960) and in an essay that came to serve as its Introduction, *Search for a Method* (1957). Dilthey had dreamt of completing Kant’s famous triad with a fourth Kritik, namely, a critique of historical reason. Sartre pursued this project by combining a Hegelian-Marxist dialectic with an Existentialist psychoanalysis that incorporates individual responsibility into class relationships, thereby adding a properly Existentialist dimension of moral responsibility to a Marxist emphasis on collective and structural causality—what Raymond Aron would later criticize as an impossible union of Kierkegaard and Marx. In the final analysis, Kierkegaard wins out; Sartre’s Marxism remains adjectival to his existentialism and not the reverse. This becomes apparent in the last phase of his work.”

“Sartre had long been fascinated with the French novelist Gustave Flaubert. In what some would consider the culmination of his thought, he weds Existentialist biography with Marxian social critique in a Hegelian totalization of an individual and his era, to produce the last of his many in-progress projects, a multi-volume study of Flaubert’s life and times, *The Family Idiot* (1971–1972). In this work, Sartre joins his Existentialist vocabulary of the 1940s and early 1950s with his Marxian lexicon of the late 1950s and 1960s to ask what we can know about a man in the
present state of our knowledge. This study, which he describes as a novel that is true, incarnates that mixture of phenomenological description, psychological insight, and social critique that has become the hallmark of Sartrean philosophy. These features doubtless contributed to his being awarded the Nobel Prize for literature, which he characteristically refused along with its substantial cash grant lest his acceptance be read as approval of the bourgeois values that the honor seemed to emblemize. In his last years, Sartre, who had lost the use of one eye in childhood, became almost totally blind. Yet he continued to work with the help of a tape recorder, producing with Benny Lévy portions of a co-authored ethics, the published parts of which indicate, in the eyes of many, that its value may be more biographical than philosophical. After his death, thousands spontaneously joined his funeral cortège in a memorable tribute to his respect and esteem among the public at large...Parisian newspaper lamented: France has lost its conscience.”

Ontology: “Like Husserl and Heidegger, Sartre distinguished ontology from metaphysics and favored the former. In his case, ontology is primarily descriptive and classificatory, whereas metaphysics purports to be causally explanatory, offering accounts about the ultimate origins and ends of individuals and of the universe as a whole. Unlike Heidegger, however, Sartre does not try to combat metaphysics as a deleterious undertaking. He simply notes in a Kantian manner that it raises questions we cannot answer. On the other hand, he subtitled Being and Nothingness a Phenomenological Ontology. Its descriptive method moves from the most abstract to the highly concrete. It begins by analyzing two distinct and irreducible categories or kinds of being: the in-itself (en-soi) and the for-itself (pour-soi), roughly the nonconscious and consciousness respectively, adding a third, the for-others (pour-autrui), later in the book. He concludes with a sketch of the practice of existential psychoanalysis that interprets our actions to uncover the fundamental project that unifies our lives.”

“One can see why Sartre is often described as a Cartesian dualist, but this is imprecise. Whatever dualism pervades his thought is one of spontaneity/inertia. His is not a two-substance ontology like the thinking thing and the extended thing (mind and matter) of Descartes. Only the in-itself is conceivable as substance or thing. The for-itself is a no-thing, the internal negation of the in-itself, on which it depends. Viewed more concretely, this duality is cast as facticity and transcendence. The givens of our situation such as our language, our environment, our previous choices and our very selves in their function as in-itself constitute our facticity. As conscious individuals, we transcend (surpass) this facticity in what constitutes our situation. In other words, we are always beings in situation, but the precise mixture of transcendence and facticity that forms any situation remains indeterminable, at least while we are engaged in it. Hence Sartre concludes that we are always more than our situation and that this is the ontological foundation of our freedom. We are condemned to be free, in his hyperbolic phrase.”
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“The category or ontological principle of the for-others comes into play as soon as the other subject or Other appears on the scene. The Other cannot be deduced from the two previous principles but must be encountered. Sartre's famous analysis of the shame one experiences at being discovered in an embarrassing situation is a phenomenological argument (what Husserl called an eidetic reduction) of our awareness of another as subject. It carries the immediacy and the certainty that philosophers demand of our perception of other minds without suffering the weakness of arguments from analogy commonly used by empiricists to defend such knowledge.”

“The roles of consciousness and the in-itself in his earlier work are assumed by praxis (human activity in its material context) and the practico-inert respectively in the Critique of Dialectical Reason. Praxis is dialectical in the Hegelian sense that it surpasses and subsumes its other, the practico-inert. The latter, like the in-itself, is inert but as practico- is the sedimentation of previous praxes. Thus, speech acts would be examples of praxis, but language would be practico-inert; social institutions are practico-inert but the actions they both foster and limit are praxes.”

“The Other in Being and Nothingness alienates or objectifies us (in this work Sartre seems to use these terms equivalently) and the third party is simply this Other writ large. The us is objectified by another and hence has the ontological status of being-in-itself but the collective subject or we, he insists, is simply a psychological experience. In the Critique another ontological form appears, the mediating third, that denotes the group member as such and yields a collective subject without reducing the respective agents to mere ciphers of some collective consciousness. In other words, Sartre accords an ontological primacy to individual praxis while recognizing its enrichment as group member of a praxis that sustains predicates such as command/obedience and right/duty that are properly its own. The concepts of praxis, practico-inert and mediating third form the basis of a social ontology that merits closer attention than the prolix Critique encourages.”

Psychology: “Sartre's gifts of psychological description and analysis are widely recognized. What made him so successful a novelist and playwright contributed to the vivacity and force of his phenomenological arguments as well. His early studies of emotive and imaging consciousness in the late 1930s press the Husserlian principle of intentionality farther than their author seemed willing to go. For example, in The Psychology of Imagination (1940), Sartre argues that Husserl remains captive to the idealist principle of immanence (the object of consciousness lies within consciousness), despite his stated goal of combating idealism, when he seems to consider images as miniatures of the perceptual object reproduced or retained in the mind. On the contrary, Sartre argues, if one insists that all consciousness is intentional in nature, one must conclude that even so-called images are not objects in the mind but are ways of relating to items in the world in a properly imaginative manner, namely, by what he calls derealizing them or rendering them present-absent. It should be admitted that Sartre never read Husserl's posthumously published lectures on the image that might have corrected his criticism. Though Husserl struggled with the notion of mental image for the first thirty years of his career and distinguished imaging consciousness Bildbewusstsein from the imagination Phantasie, he resisted any account that would employ what Sartre calls the principle of immanence and so invite an infinite regress in the vain attempt to reach the transcendent. Still Husserl continued to appeal to mental images in his account of imaging consciousness while eventually avoiding them in analyzing the imagination.”

Similarly, our emotions are not inner states but are ways of relating to the world; they too are intentional. In this case, emotive behavior involves physical changes and what he calls a quasi-magical attempt to transform the world by changing ourselves. The person who gets worked up when failing to hit the golf ball or to open the jar lid, is, on Sartre’s reading, intending a world where physiological changes conjure up solutions in the problematic world. The person who
literally jumps for joy, to cite another of his examples, is trying by a kind of incantation to possess a good all at once that can be realized only across a temporal spread. If emotion is a joke, he warns, it is a joke we believe in. These are all spontaneous, prereflective relations. They are not the products of reflective decision. Yet insofar as they are even prereflectively conscious, we are responsible for them. And this raises the question of freedom, a necessary condition for ascribing responsibility and the heart of his philosophy.”

“The basis of Sartrean freedom is ontological: we are free because we are not a self (an in-itself) but a presence-to-self (the transcendence or nihilation of our self). This implies that we are other to ourselves, that whatever we are or whatever others may ascribe to us, we are in the manner of not being it, that is, in the manner of being able to assume a perspective in its regard. This inner distance reflects not only the nonself-identity of the for-itself and the ekstatic temporality that it generates but forms the site of what Sartre calls freedom as the definition of man. To that freedom corresponds a coextensive responsibility. We are responsible for our world as the horizon of meaning in which we operate and thus for everything in it insofar as their meaning and value are assigned by virtue of our life-orienting fundamental choice. At this point the ontological and the psychological overlap while remaining distinct as occurs so often in phenomenology.”

“Such fundamental choice has been criticized as being criterionless and hence arbitrary. But it would be better to speak of it as criterion-constituting in the sense that it grounds the set of criteria on the basis of which our subsequent choices are made. It resembles what ethicist R. M. Hare calls “decisions of principle (that establish the principles for subsequent decisions but are themselves unprincipled) and what Kierkegaard would describe as conversion. In fact, Sartre sometimes employed this term himself to denote a radical change in one’s basic project. It is this original sustaining choice that Existential psychoanalysis seeks to uncover.”

“Sartre’s use of intentionality is the backbone of his psychology. And his psychology is the key to his ontology that is being fashioned at this time. In fact, the concept of imaging consciousness as the locus of possibility, negativity and lack emerges as the model for consciousness in general (being-for-itself) in Being and Nothingness. That said, it would not be an exaggeration to describe Sartre as a philosopher of the imaginary, so important a role does imaging consciousness or its equivalent play in his work.”

Ethics: “Sartre was a moralist but scarcely a moralizer. His earliest studies, though phenomenological, underscored the freedom and by implication the responsibility of the practitioner of the phenomenological method. Thus, his first major work, Transcendence of the Ego, in addition to constituting an argument against the transcendental ego (the epistemological subject that cannot be an object) central to German idealism and Husserlian phenomenology, introduces an ethical dimension into what was traditionally an epistemological project by asserting that this appeal to a transcendental ego conceals a conscious flight from freedom. The phenomenological reduction that constitutes the objects of consciousness as pure meanings or significations devoid of the existential claims that render them liable to skeptical doubt—such a reduction or “bracketing of the being question” carries a moral significance as well. The authentic subject, as Sartre will later explain in his Notebooks for an Ethics, will learn to live without an ego, whether transcendental or empirical, in the sense that the transcendental ego is superfluous and the empirical ego (of scientific psychology) is an object for consciousness when it reflects on itself in an objectifying act that he calls “accessory reflection.” His works take pains either to ascribe moral responsibility to agents individually or collectively or to set the ontological foundations for such ascriptions.”

“Authenticity is achieved, Sartre claims, by a conversion that entails abandonment of our original choice to coincide with ourselves consciously (the futile desire to be in-itself-for-itself or
Chapter III. History of Philosophy

God) and thereby free ourselves from identification with our egos as being-in-itself. In our present alienated condition, we are responsible for our egos as we are for any object of consciousness. Earlier he said that it was bad faith (self-deception) to try to coincide with our egos since the fact is that whatever we are we are in the manner of not being it due to the othering nature of consciousness. Now his mention of conversion to authenticity via a purifying (non-objectifying) reflection elaborates that authentic project. He insists that we must allow our spontaneous selfness (what he terms ipseity here and in Being and Nothingness) to replace the Me or Ego, which he criticizes as an abusive intermediary whose future prefigures my future. The shift is from relations of appropriation or being where I focus on identifying with my ego in a bad-faith flight from freedom, to relations of existence and autonomy where I attend entirely to my project and its goal. The former is egoistic, Sartre now implies, where the latter is outgoing and generous. This resonates with what he will say about the creative artist's work as a gift, an appeal to another freedom and an act of generosity.”

“It is now common to distinguish three distinct ethical positions in Sartre's writings. The first and best known, existentialist ethics is one of disalienation and authenticity. It assumes that we live in a society of oppression and exploitation. The former is primary and personal, the latter structural and impersonal. While he enters into extended polemics in various essays and journal articles of the late 1940s and '50s concerning the systematic exploitation of people in capitalist and colonialist institutions, Sartre always sought a way to bring the responsibility home to individuals who could in principle be named. As Merleau-Ponty observed, Sartre stressed oppression over exploitation, individual moral responsibility over structural causation but without denying the importance of the latter. In fact, as his concept of freedom thickened from the ontological to the social and historical in the mid '40s, his appreciation of the influence of factual conditions in the exercise of freedom grew apace. Sartre's concept of authenticity, occasionally cited as the only existential virtue, is often criticized as denoting more a style than a content. Admittedly, it does seem compatible with a wide variety of life choices. Its foundation, again, is ontological-the basic ambiguity of human reality that is what it is not (that is, its future as possibility) and is not what it is (its past as facticity, including its ego or self, to which we have seen it is related via an internal negation). We could say that authenticity is fundamentally living this ontological truth of one's situation, namely, that one is never identical with one's current state but remains responsible for sustaining it. Thus, the claim that's just the way I am would constitute a form of self-deception or bad faith as would all forms of determinism, since both instances involve lying to oneself about the ontological fact of one's nonself-coincidence and the flight from concomitant responsibility for choosing to remain that way.”

“Given the fundamental division of the human situation into facticity and transcendence, bad faith or inauthenticity can assume two principal forms: one that denies the freedom or transcendence component (I can't do anything about it) and the other that ignores the factical dimension of every situation (I can do anything by just wishing it). The former is the more prevalent form of self-deception, but the latter is common to people who lack a sense of the real in their lives. Sartre sometimes talks as if any choice could be authentic so long as it is lived with a clear awareness of its contingency and responsibility. But his considered opinion excludes choices that oppress or consciously exploit others. In other words, authenticity is not entirely style; there is a general content and that content is freedom. Thus, the authentic Nazi is explicitly disqualified as being oxymoronic. Sartre's thesis is that freedom is the implicit object of any choice, a claim he makes but does not adequately defend in his Humanism lecture. He seems to assume that freedom is the aspect under which any choice is made, its formal object, to revive an ancient term. But a stronger argument than that would be required to disqualify an authentic Nazi.”
“Though critical of its bourgeois variety, Sartre does support an existentialist humanism, the motto of which could well be his remark that you can always make something out of what you've been made into (Situations 9:101). In fact, his entire career could be summarized in these words that carry an ethical as well as a critical message. The first part of his professional life focused on the freedom of the existential individual (you can always make something out of...); the second concentrated on the socioeconomic and historical conditions which limited and modified that freedom (what you've been made into), once freedom ceased to be merely the definition of man and included the possibility of genuine options in concrete situations. That phase corresponded to Sartre's political commitment and active involvement in public debates, always in search of the exploitative systems such as capitalism, colonialism and racism at work in society and the oppressive practices of individuals who sustained them. As he grew more cognizant of the social dimension of individual life, the political and the ethical tended to coalesce. In fact, he explicitly rejected Machiavellianism.”

“If Sartre's first and best-known ethics corresponds to the ontology of Being and Nothingness, his second, dialectical ethics builds on the philosophy of history developed in the Critique of Dialectical Reason. In a series of posthumously published notes for lectures in the 1960s, some of which were never delivered, Sartre sketched a theory of ethics based on the concepts of human need and the ideal of integral man in contrast with its counter-concept, the subhuman. What this adds to his published ethics is a more specific content and a keener sense of the social conditions for living a properly human life. Sartre's third attempt at an ethics, which he called an ethics of the we, was undertaken in interview format with his secretary, Benny Lévy, toward the end of his life. It purports to question many of the main propositions of his ethics of authenticity, yet what has appeared in print chiefly elaborates claims already stated in his earlier works. But since the tapes on which these remarks were recorded are unavailable to the public and Sartre's illness at the time they were made was serious, their authority as revisionary of his general philosophy remains doubtful. If ever released in its entirety, this text will constitute a serious hermeneutical challenge.”

Politics: “Sartre was not politically involved in the 1930s though his heart, as he said, was on the left, like everyone's. The War years, occupation and resistance made the difference. He emerged committed to social reform and convinced that the writer had the obligation to address the social issues of the day. He founded the influential journal of opinion, Les Temps modernes, with his partner Simone de Beauvoir, as well as Merleau-Ponty, Raymond Aron and others. In the Présentation to the initial issue (October 1945), he elaborated his idea of committed literature and insisted that failure to address political issues amounted to supporting the status quo. After a brief unsuccessful attempt to help organize a non-Communist leftist political organization, he began his long love-hate relationship with the French Communist Party, which he never joined but which for years he considered the legitimate voice of the working class in France. This continued till the Soviet invasions of Hungary in 1956. Still, Sartre continued to sympathize with the movement, if not the Party, for some time afterwards. He summarized his disillusionment in an essay 'The Communists are afraid of Revolution,' following the events of May 1968. By then he had moved toward the radical Left and what the French labeled ‘les Maos,’ whom he likewise never joined but whose mixture of the ethical and the political attracted him.”

“Politically, Sartre tended toward what the French call libertarian socialism, which is a kind of anarchism. Ever distrustful of authority, which he considered the Other in us, his ideal was a society of voluntary eye-level relations that he called the city of ends. One caught a glimpse of this in his description of the forming group (le groupe en fusion) in the Critique. There each was the same as the others in terms of practical concern. Each suspended his or her personal interests
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for the sake of the common goal. No doubt these practices hardened into institutions and freedom was compromised once more in bureaucratic machinery. But that brief taste of genuine positive reciprocity was revelatory of what an authentic social existence could be. Sartre came to recognize how the economic conditions the political in the sense that material scarcity, as both Ricardo and Marx insisted, determines our social relations. In Sartre's reading, scarcity emerges as the source of structural and personal violence in human history as we know it. It follows, he believes, that liberation from such violence will come only through the counter violence of revolution and the advent of a “socialism of abundance.”

“What Sartre termed the progressive/regressive method for historical investigation is a hybrid of historical materialism and existentialist psycho-analysis. It respects the often-decisive role of economic considerations in historical explanation (historical materialism) while insisting that ‘the men that History makes are not the men that make history; in other words, he resists complete economic determinism by implicit appeal to his humanist motto: You can always make something out of…’ Never one to avoid a battle, Sartre became embroiled in the Algerian War, generating deep hostility from the Right to the point that a bomb was detonated at the entrance to his apartment building on two occasions by supporters of a French Algeria. Sartre's political critique conveyed in a series of essays, interviews and plays, especially The Condemned of Altona, once more combined a sense of structural exploitation (in this case, the institution of colonialism and its attendant racism) with an expression of moral outrage at the oppression of the Muslim population and the torture of captives by the French military. Mention of the play reminds us of the role of imaginative art in Sartre's philosophical work. This piece, whose chief protagonist is Frantz the butcher of Smolensk, though ostensibly about the effect of Nazi atrocities at the Eastern front on a postwar industrialist family in Hamburg, is really addressing the question of collective guilt and the French suppression of the Algerian war for independence raging at that time. Sartre often turned to literary art to convey or even to work through philosophical thoughts that he had already or would later conceptualize in his essays and theoretical studies. Which brings us to the relation between imaginative literature and philosophy in his work.”

Art and Philosophy: “The strategy of indirect communication has been an instrument of Existentialists since Kierkegaard adopted the use of pseudonyms in his philosophical writings in the early nineteenth century. The point is to communicate a feeling and an attitude that the reader/spectator adopts in which certain existentialist themes such as anguish, responsibility or bad faith are suggested but not dictated as in a lecture. Asked why his plays were performed only in the bourgeois sections of the city, Sartre replied that no bourgeois could leave a performance of one of them without “thinking thoughts traitorous to his class. The so-called aesthetic suspension of disbelief coupled with the tendency to identify with certain characters and to experience their plight vicariously conveys conviction rather than information. And this is what existentialism is chiefly about: challenging the individual to examine their life for intimations of bad faith and to heighten their sensitivity to oppression and exploitation in their world.”

“The artwork, for Sartre, has always carried a special power: that of communicating among freedoms without alienation or objectification. In this sense, it has stood as an exception to the objectifying gaze of his vintage existentialist texts. That relation between artist and public via the work of art Sartre calls gift-appeal. In his The Imaginary, he speaks of the portrait inviting the viewer to realize its possibilities by regarding it aesthetically. By the time he gathers these thoughts in What is Literature? and Notebooks for an Ethics, the concept of writing as an act of generosity to which the reader responds by an act of re-creation that respects the mutuality of these freedoms - this gift/response model assumes political significance.”
Sartre in the 21st Century: “Foucault once dismissed Sartre testily as a man of the nineteenth century trying to think the twentieth… With his emphasis on consciousness, subjectivity, freedom, responsibility and the self, his commitment to Marxist categories and dialectical thinking, especially in the second part of his career, and his quasi Enlightenment humanism, Sartre seemed to personify everything that structuralists and poststructuralists like Foucault opposed. In effect, the enfant terrible of mid-century France had become the traditionalist of the following generation. A classic example of philosophical parricide. In fact, some of this criticism was misdirected while other portions exhibit a genuine philosophical choice about goals and methods. Though Sartre resolutely insisted on the primacy of free organic praxis methodologically, ontologically, and ethically, on which he based the freedom and responsibility that define his humanism, he respected what his critic Louis Althusser called structural causality and made allowance for it with his concept of the practico-inert. But it is the primacy awarded consciousness/praxis in this regard that strikes structuralist and poststructuralist critics as naive and simply wrong. Added to this is Sartre's passion for totalizing thought, whether individually in terms of a life project or collectively in terms of dialectical rationality, that counters the fragmenting and anti-teleological claims of poststructuralist authors. And then there is his famous denial of the Freudian unconscious and his relative neglect of semiotics and the philosophy of language in general.”

“One should note that Sartre's suspicion of Freudian psychoanalysis became quite nuanced in his later years. His appeal to the lived (le vécu) and to pre-theoretical comprehension, especially in his Flaubert study, for example, incorporated many features of the “unconscious” drives and relations proper to psychoanalytic discourse. And while he was familiar with Saussure and structural linguistics, to which he occasionally referred, he admitted that he had never formulated an explicit philosophy of language but insisted that one could be reconstructed from elements employed throughout his work. But at least five features of Sartre's thought seem particularly relevant to current discussions among philosophers both Anglo-American and Continental. The first is his concept of the human agent as not a self but a presence to self. This opening up of the Cartesian thinking thing supports a wide variety of alternative theories of the self while retaining the features of freedom and responsibility that, one can argue, have been central tenets of Western philosophy and law since the Greeks. Emphasis on an ethics of responsibility in contrast to one of rules, principles or values in recent years has led to a wide-spread interest in the work of Levinas as a necessary complement to so-called postmodern ethics. But Sartrean authenticity is equally relevant in this regard, as Charles Taylor and others have pointed out. And its location within a mundane ontology may resonate better with philosophers of a more secular bent.”

“Next, the recent revival of the understanding of philosophy as a way of life as distinct from an academic discipline focused on epistemology or more recently on the philosophy of language, while renewing an interest in Hellenistic ethics as well as in various forms of spirituality, can find in Sartrean existentialism forms of care of the self that invite fruitful conversation with contemporary ethics, aesthetics and politics without devolving into moralism, aestheticism or fanaticism. From a philosopher suspicious of moral recipes and focused on concrete, lived experience, this is perhaps as much as one could expect or desire.”

“Sartre dealt implicitly with issue of race in many of his works, beginning with Being and Nothingness. Race relations, especially segregation in the South, figured centrally in his reports from the United States during two visits after the War (1945 and 1946) and were a major topic of his many writings on colonialism and neocolonialism thereafter. It formed the theme of his play, “The Respectful Prostitute” (1946). He claimed that even as a boy, whenever he heard of the French “colonies,” he thought of racial exploitation. He wrote in Black Orpheus about the Africa poets using the colonizers' language against them in their poems of liberation: “Black poetry in
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French is the only great revolutionary poetry of our time.” He fulminated against the violence of colonialism and its implicit “justification” by appeal to the subhumanity of the native population. On several occasions in diverse works Sartre referred to the cry of the oppressed and exploited: “We too are humans!” as the guiding ideal of their fight for liberty. His existential humanism grounds his critique of the capitalist and colonialist “systems.” He wrote that “the meanness is in the system”—a claim that resonated with liberation movements then and now. But his properly existentialist understanding of that phrase, respecting the ethical primacy of free organic praxis, requires that he qualify the remark with “not entirely”; for whatever system he speaks of rides on the backs of responsible individuals, alone or more likely in social wholes, for whom moral responsibility can and should be ascribed. This may serve as his lesson to the ontology and the ethics of race relations in the twenty-first century. His appeal for violence to counter the inherent violence of the colonial system in Algeria reached hyperbolic proportions in his prefatory essay to Franz Fanon’s The Wretched of the Earth (1961).

“Of the other topics in current philosophical discussions to which Sartre offers relevant remarks, I would conclude by mentioning feminism. This suggestion will certainly raise some eyebrows because even his fans admit that some of the images and language of his earlier work were clearly sexist in character. And yet, Sartre always favored the exploited and oppressed in any relationship and he encouraged his life-long partner, Simone de Beauvoir, to write The Second Sex, commonly recognized as the seminal work for the second-wave of the feminist movement. In addition to the plausible extrapolations of many remarks made apropos the exploitation of blacks and Arabs, just mentioned, I shall cite two concepts in Sartre’s work that I believe carry particular promise for feminist arguments. The first occurs in the short work Anti-Semite and Jew (1946). Many authors have mined this text for arguments critical of “masculinist” biases, but I wish to underscore the “spirit of synthesis” that Sartre champions there in contrast with the “analytical spirit” that he criticizes. The issue is whether the Jew should be respected legally in his concrete Jewishness—his culture, his practices, including dietary and religious observances—or whether he should be satisfied with the “Rights of Man and of the Citizen” as his analytic, liberal democratic “friend” proposes. The abstract, analytic thinker counsels, in effect, “You enjoy all the rights of a French Citizen, just don't be so Jewish.” Sartre, on the other hand, argues “synthetically” (concretely) for the rights of the Jew or the Arab or the woman (his examples) to vote as such in any election. In other words, their “rights” are concrete and not mere abstractions. One should not sacrifice the Jew (or the Arab or the woman) to the “man.” In Michael Walzer’s words: Sartre is promoting “multiculturalism...avant la lettre.”

“The second concept that issues from Sartre’s later writing which is of immediate relevance to feminist thought is that of positive reciprocity and its attendant notion of generosity. We are familiar with the conflictual nature of interpersonal relations in Sartre’s vintage existentialist writings: “Hell is other people” and the like. But in his aesthetic writings and in the Notebooks for an Ethics, he describes the artist’s work as a generous act, an invitation from one freedom to another. He even suggests that this might serve as a model for interpersonal relations in general. And in his major work in social ontology, the Critique of Dialectical Reason, Sartre charts the move from objectifying and alienating relationships (series) to the positive reciprocity of the group members. Some feminist authors have employed these Sartrean concepts in their arguments. There remains much still to extract from Sartre’s later works in this area. As Sartrean existentialism frees itself from the limitations of its post-war adolescence and shows its mature psychological, ontological and ethical face to the new century, it enters with adult standing into the ongoing conversation that we call Western philosophy. Its relevance remains as actual today as does the human condition that it describes and analyzes.”

422
6-6. The Phenomenology

“Phenomenology is commonly understood in either of two ways: as a disciplinary field in philosophy, or as a movement in the history of philosophy. The discipline of phenomenology may be defined initially as the study of structures of experience, or consciousness. Literally, phenomenology is the study of phenomena: appearances of things, or things as they appear in our experience, or the ways we experience things, thus the meanings things have in our experience. Phenomenology studies conscious experience as experienced from the subjective or first-person point of view. This field of philosophy is then to be distinguished from, and related to, the other main fields of philosophy: ontology (the study of being or what is), epistemology (the study of knowledge), logic (the study of valid reasoning), ethics (the study of right and wrong action), etc. The historical movement of phenomenology is the philosophical tradition launched in the first half of the 20th century by Edmund Husserl, Martin Heidegger, Maurice Merleau-Ponty, Jean-Paul Sartre, et al. In that movement, the discipline of phenomenology was prized as the proper foundation of all philosophy - as opposed, say, to ethics or metaphysics or epistemology. The methods and characterization of the discipline were widely debated by Husserl and his successors, and these debates continue to the present day.”

“Basically, phenomenology studies the structure of various types of experience ranging from perception, thought, memory, imagination, emotion, desire, and volition to bodily awareness, embodied action, and social activity, including linguistic activity. The structure of these forms of experience typically involves what Husserl called intentionality, that is, the directedness of experience toward things in the world, the property of consciousness that it is a consciousness of or about something. According to classical Husserlian phenomenology, our experience is directed toward - represents or intends - things only through particular concepts, thoughts, ideas, images, etc. These make up the meaning or content of a given experience and are distinct from the things they present or mean. The basic intentional structure of consciousness, we find in reflection or analysis, involves further forms of experience. Thus, phenomenology develops a complex account of temporal awareness (within the stream of consciousness), spatial awareness (notably in perception), attention (distinguishing focal and marginal or horizontal awareness), awareness of one’s own experience (self-consciousness, in one sense), self-awareness (awareness-of-oneself), the self in different roles (as thinking, acting, etc.), embodied action (including kinesthetic awareness of one’s movement), purpose or intention in action (more or less explicit), awareness of other persons (in empathy, intersubjectivity, collectivity), linguistic activity (involving meaning, communication, understanding others), social interaction (including collective action), and everyday activity in our surrounding life-world (in a particular culture).”

“Furthermore, in a different dimension, we find various grounds or enabling conditions - conditions of the possibility - of intentionality, including embodiment, bodily skills, cultural context, language and other social practices, social background, and contextual aspects of intentional activities. Thus, phenomenology leads from conscious experience into conditions that help to give experience its intentionality. Traditional phenomenology has focused on subjective, practical, and social conditions of experience. Recent philosophy of mind, however, has focused especially on the neural substrate of experience, on how conscious experience and mental representation or intentionality are grounded in brain activity. It remains a difficult question how much of these grounds of experience fall within the province of phenomenology as a discipline. Cultural conditions thus seem closer to our experience and to our familiar self-understanding than do the electrochemical workings of our brain, much less our dependence on quantum-mechanical states of physical systems to which we may belong.”
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History of Phenomenology: “Phenomenology came into its own with Husserl, much as epistemology came into its own with Descartes, and ontology or metaphysics came into its own with Aristotle on the heels of Plato. Yet phenomenology has been practiced, with or without the name, for many centuries. When Hindu and Buddhist philosophers reflected on states of consciousness achieved in a variety of meditative states, they were practicing phenomenology. When Descartes, Hume, and Kant characterized states of perception, thought, and imagination, they were practicing phenomenology. When Brentano classified varieties of mental phenomena (defined by the directedness of consciousness), he was practicing phenomenology. When William James appraised kinds of mental activity in the stream of consciousness (including their embodiment and their dependence on habit), he too was practicing phenomenology. And when recent analytic philosophers of mind have addressed issues of consciousness and intentionality, they have often been practicing phenomenology. Still, the discipline of phenomenology, its roots tracing back through the centuries, came to full flower in Husserl.”

Husserl’s work was followed by a flurry of phenomenological writing in the first half of the 20th century. The diversity of traditional phenomenology is apparent in the Encyclopedia of Phenomenology, which features separate articles on some seven types of phenomenology. (1) Transcendental constitutive phenomenology studies how objects are constituted in pure or transcendental consciousness, setting aside questions of any relation to the natural world around us. (2) Naturalistic constitutive phenomenology studies how consciousness constitutes or takes things in the world of nature, assuming with the natural attitude that consciousness is part of nature. (3) Existential phenomenology studies concrete human existence, including our experience of free choice or action in concrete situations. (4) Generative historicist phenomenology studies how meaning, as found in our experience, is generated in historical processes of collective experience over time. (5) Genetic phenomenology studies the genesis of meanings of things within one’s own stream of experience. (6) Hermeneutical phenomenology studies interpretive structures of experience, how we understand and engage things around us in our human world, including ourselves and others. (7) Realistic phenomenology studies the structure of consciousness and intentionality, assuming it occurs in a real world that is largely external to consciousness and not somehow brought into being by consciousness. The most famous philosophers of the classical phenomenologists were Husserl, Heidegger, Sartre, and Merleau-Ponty. In these four thinkers we find different conceptions of phenomenology, different methods, and different results. A brief sketch of their differences will capture both a crucial period in the history of phenomenology and a sense of the diversity of the field of phenomenology.”

Edmund Husserl published Logical Investigation (1900-01), outlining a complex system of philosophy, moving from logic to philosophy of language, to ontology, to a phenomenological theory of intentionality, and finally to a phenomenological theory of knowledge. His Ideas (1913) focused squarely on phenomenology itself. Martin Heidegger published Being and Time and The Basic Problems of Phenomenology (both in 1927) which resolved into what he called fundamental ontology. He approached phenomenology, “in a quasi-poetic idiom, through the root meanings of logos and phenomena, so that phenomenology is defined as the art or practice of letting things show themselves.” In Being and Nothingness (1943), Jean-Paul Sartre developed his conception of phenomenological ontology; becoming the philosophical foundation for his popular philosophy of existentialism. “In Sartre’s model of intentionality, the central player in consciousness is a phenomenon, and the occurrence of a phenomenon just is a consciousness-of-an-object. The chestnut tree I see is, for Sartre, such a phenomenon in my consciousness.” Joining with Sartre and Beauvoir, in his Phenomenology of Perception (1945), Maurice Merleau-Ponty developed a rich variety of phenomenology emphasizing the role of the body in human experience.
Phenomenology with Ontology, Epistemology, Logic, and Ethics: “The discipline of phenomenology forms one basic field in philosophy among others. How is phenomenology distinguished from, and related to, other fields in philosophy? Traditionally, philosophy includes at least four core fields or disciplines: ontology, epistemology, ethics, and logic. Suppose phenomenology joins that list. Consider then these elementary definitions of field: Ontology is the study of beings or their being - what is; Epistemology is the study of knowledge - how we know; Logic is the study of valid reasoning - how to reason; Ethics is the study of right and wrong - how we should act; Phenomenology is the study of our experience - how we experience; The domains of study in these five fields are clearly different, and they seem to call for different methods of study. Philosophers have sometimes argued that one of these fields is first philosophy, the most fundamental discipline, on which all philosophy or all knowledge or wisdom rests. Historically (it may be argued), Socrates and Plato put ethics first, then Aristotle put metaphysics or ontology first, then Descartes put epistemology first, then Russell put logic first, and then Husserl (in his later transcendental phase) put phenomenology first.”

“Consider epistemology. As we saw, phenomenology helps to define the phenomena on which knowledge claims rest, according to modern epistemology. On the other hand, phenomenology itself claims to achieve knowledge about the nature of consciousness, a distinctive kind of first-person knowledge, through a form of intuition.”

“Consider logic. As we saw, logical theory of meaning led Husserl into the theory of intentionality, the heart of phenomenology. On one account, phenomenology explicates the intentional or semantic force of ideal meanings, and propositional meanings are central to logical theory. But logical structure is expressed in language, either ordinary language or symbolic languages like those of predicate logic or mathematics or computer systems. It remains an important issue of debate where and whether language shapes specific forms of experience (thought, perception, emotion) and their content or meaning. So, there is an important (if disputed) relation between phenomenology and logico-linguistic theory, especially philosophical logic and philosophy of language (as opposed to mathematical logic per se).”

“Consider ontology. Phenomenology studies (among other things) the nature of consciousness, which is a central issue in metaphysics or ontology, and one that leads into the traditional mind-body problem. Husserlian methodology would bracket the question of the existence of the surrounding world, thereby separating phenomenology from the ontology of the world. Yet Husserl’s phenomenology presupposes theory about species and individuals (universals and particulars), relations of part and whole, and ideal meanings - all parts of ontology.”

“Now consider ethics. Phenomenology might play a role in ethics by offering analyses of the structure of will, valuing, happiness, and care for others (in empathy and sympathy). Historically, though, ethics has been on the horizon of phenomenology. Husserl largely avoided ethics in his major works, though he featured the role of practical concerns in the structure of the life-world or of Geist (spirit, or culture, as in Zeitgeist), and he once delivered a course of lectures giving ethics (like logic) a basic place in philosophy, indicating the importance of the phenomenology of sympathy in grounding ethics. In Being and Time Heidegger claimed not to pursue ethics while discussing phenomena ranging from care, conscience, and guilt to falleness and authenticity.”

“Allied with ethics are political and social philosophy. Sartre and Merleau-Ponty were politically engaged in 1940s Paris, and their existential philosophies suggest a political theory based in individual freedom. Sartre later sought an explicit blend of existentialism with Marxism. Still, political theory has remained on the borders of phenomenology. Social theory, however, has been closer to phenomenology as such.” “Classical phenomenology, then, ties into certain areas of epistemology, logic, and ontology, and leads into parts of ethical, social, and political theory.”
Edmund Gustav Albrecht Husserl (1859-1938) was a German philosopher who established the school of phenomenology. “Husserl was born in Prossnitz (Moravia) on April 8th, 1859. His parents were non-orthodox Jews; Husserl himself and his wife would later convert to Protestantism. They had three children, one of whom died in World War I. In the years 1876–78 Husserl studied astronomy in Leipzig, where he also attended courses of lectures in mathematics, physics and philosophy. Among other things, he heard Wilhelm Wundt's lectures on philosophy. In 1878–81 Husserl continued his studies in mathematics, physics and philosophy in Berlin. His mathematics teachers there included Leopold Kronecker and Karl Weierstrass, whose scientific ethos Husserl was particularly impressed with. However, he took his PhD in mathematics in Vienna (January 1883), with a thesis on the theory of variations. After that he returned to Berlin, to become Weierstrass' assistant. When Weierstrass got seriously ill, Masaryk suggested that Husserl go back to Vienna, to study philosophy with Franz Brentano, the author of Psychology from an Empirical Standpoint (1874). After a brief military service in Vienna, Husserl followed Masaryk's advice and studied with Brentano from 1884–86. Brentano's lectures on psychology and logic had a lasting impact on Husserl, as had his general vision of a strictly scientific philosophy. Brentano then recommended Husserl to his pupil Carl Stumpf in Halle, who is perhaps best known for his Psychology of Tone (two volumes, 1883/90). This recommendation enabled Husserl to prepare and submit his habilitation dissertation On the Concept of Number (1887) with Stumpf. That thesis was later integrated into Husserl's first published monograph, Philosophy of Arithmetic, which appeared in 1891. In this work, Husserl combined his mathematical, psychological and philosophical competencies to attempt a psychological foundation of arithmetic.”

“In 1900/01 his first phenomenological work was published in two volumes, titled Logical Investigations. The first volume contains a forceful attack against psychologism, whereas the (much larger) second volume consists of six descriptive-psychological and epistemological investigations.” “In the first decade of the 20th century, Husserl considerably refined and modified his method into what he called transcendental phenomenology. This method has us focus on the essential structures that allow the objects naively taken for granted in the natural attitude to constitute themselves in consciousness. As Husserl explains in detail in his second major work, Ideas (1913), the resulting perspective on the realm of intentional consciousness is supposed to enable the phenomenologist to develop a radically unprejudiced justification of his (or her) basic views on the world and himself and explore their rational interconnections.”

“In 1916 Husserl became Heinrich Rickert's successor as full professor in Freiburg/Breisgau, where (among many other things) he worked on passive synthesis. He gave four lectures on Phenomenological Method and Phenomenological Philosophy at University College, London, in 1922. In 1923 he received a call to Berlin, which he rejected. Husserl retired in 1928, his successor being his former assistant Martin Heidegger (whose major work Being, and Time had been published in Husserl's Yearbook in 1927). In 1929 he accepted an invitation to Paris. His lectures there were published as Cartesian Meditations in 1931. In the same year, Husserl gave a number of talks on Phenomenology and Anthropology, in which he criticized his two antipodes, Heidegger and Max Scheler. In 1933 Hitler took over in Germany. Husserl received a call to Los Angeles but rejected. Because of his Jewish ancestors, he became more and more humiliated and isolated. In 1935 he gave a series of invited lectures in Prague, resulting in his last major work, The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology.”
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**Pure logic, meaning, intuitive fulfillment and intentionality:** “As a philosopher with a mathematical background, Husserl was interested in developing a general theory of inferential systems, which he conceived of as a theory of science, on the ground that every science (including mathematics) can be looked upon as a system of propositions that are interconnected by a set of inferential relations. Following John S. Mill, he argues in Logical Investigations that the best way to study the nature of such propositional systems is to start with their linguistic manifestations, i.e., (sets of) sentences and (assertive) utterances thereof. How are we to analyze these sentences and the propositions they express? Husserl's approach is to study the units of consciousness that the respective speaker presents himself as having—that he gives voice to—in expressing the proposition in question (for instance, while writing a mathematical textbook or giving a lecture). These units of consciousness he labels intentional acts or intentional experiences, since they always represent something as something—thus exhibiting what Brentano called intentionality. According to Husserl, there are non-intentional units of consciousness as well. (He quotes pain as an example.) What distinguishes intentional from non-intentional experiences is the former's having intentional content. Even objectless (i.e., empty) intentional experiences like your thought of the winged horse Pegasus have content. On Husserl's view, that thought simply lacks a corresponding object; the intentional act is merely as of, but not really of, an object. Husserl rejects representationalist accounts of intentionality, such as the mental image theory, according to which intentional experiences represent intra-mental pictorial representations of objects, where like other pictures such images may exist without there being a depicted object in the actual world. For Husserl, this view leads to a false duplication of objects represented in the veridical case; and it already presupposes what an adequate conception of pictorial representation is yet to accomplish: an explanation of what it is that makes the underlying phantasy content, or phantasm, the representing image of something or other. It is precisely an intentional content that does the trick here (as in all cases of intentional consciousness), according to Husserl, in a way to be explained in more detail by his phenomenology of consciousness.”

“In the case of propositional acts, i.e., units of consciousness that can be given voice to by a complete sentence (paradigmatically, a declarative sentence), Husserl identifies their content with the propositional meaning expressed by that sentence. In the case of their non-propositional but still intentional parts, he identifies the corresponding intentional content with a sub-propositional meaning. For example, the judgement Napoleon is a Frenchman contains an act of thinking of Napoleon whose intentional content is the sub-propositional meaning expressed by the name Napoleon. (Accordingly, the judgement can be looked upon as an act of ascribing the property of being French to the referent of that name.) Experiences like this, which can be given voice to by either a singular or a general term, are called nominal acts (as opposed to the propositional acts containing them). Their contents are called nominal meanings. Husserl regards both propositional and nominal meanings as the subject-matter of pure logic or logic in the wide sense—the study of (i) what distinguishes sense (alias meaning) from nonsense (this part of pure logic being called pure grammar) and (ii) which of the senses delivered by pure grammar are logically consistent and which of them are not (this part of pure logic being labelled logic in the narrow sense).

“An important and still largely unexplored claim of Husserl's is that any logically consistent meaning can in principle be subjectively fulfilled, more or less adequately, by a unified intuition, such as an act of continuous perception or intuitive imagination, where the structure and other essential features of the meaning in question can be read off from the respective mode of intuitive fulfillment. Inconsistent meanings can be singled out and studied by means of (reflection upon) corresponding experiences of intuitive conflict, like for instance the discrete switching back and forth between a duck-head- imagination and a rabbit-head-imagination in the case of an attempted
intuitive imagination of a duck-head that is at the same time a rabbit-head. Some meanings are inconsistent for formal-logical reasons. According to Husserl, all analytically false propositions belong to this category. Other meanings are inconsistent because they conflict with some general material a priori truth, also called essential law. The proposition expressed by the sentence There are perceptual objects whose surface is both (visibly) completely green and completely red at the same time is a case in point.”

“Meanings generally and propositions in particular exist independently of their actually functioning as intentional content. Thus, true propositions such as the Pythagorean theorem can be discovered. Propositions and their components are abstract, i.e., atemporal, objects. However, what does it mean to grasp a proposition or, more generally, a sense? How can an abstract object become the content of an intentional act? Combining ideas of Bolzano and Lotze, Husserl answers this question by taking recourse to the notion of an ideal (i.e., abstract) species or type, as follows. Propositions and other meanings are ideal species that can be (but do not have to be) instantiated by certain particular features, i.e., dependent parts, of intentional acts. Those species are also called ideal matters. The particular features instantiating an ideal matter—Husserl refers to them as “moments of matter”—are laid bare by phenomenological description, a reflection-based (or introspective) analysis taking into account both the linguistic expression(s) (if any) and the modes of (possible) intuitive fulfillment or conflict associated with the respective experience. Since phenomenological description yields ideal species, it involves what Husserl was later (notably in Ideas) to call eidetic reduction, i.e., an unfolding of abstract features shared by appropriate sets of fictitious or real-life examples, by way, e.g., of free imaginative variation on an arbitrarily chosen initial example (for the method of “free variation”, see Experience and Judgement, sec. 87).”

“Phenomenological description also yields the “moment of quality” of the intentional experience under investigation, i.e., the particular feature instantiating its psychological mode (judgement, conscious deliberation, conscious desire, conscious hope, etc.), which roughly corresponds to the speech act mode of an utterance giving voice to that experience. Furthermore, the description yields relations of “foundation”, i.e., one-sided or mutual relative existential dependencies between (1) the experience in question and other experiences and (2) the particular descriptive features of the experience. Thus, an experience of pleasure about a given event is one-sidedly founded, relative to the stream of consciousness it belongs to, in a particular belief-state to the effect that this event has occurred. Like all foundation relations, this one holds in virtue of an essential law, to the effect that conscious pleasure about some state of affairs requires a corresponding (and simultaneous) belief. Quite generally, a given object a of type F is founded in a particular object b of type G (where a is different from b and F is different from G) relative to a particular whole c of type H if and only if (i) there is an essential law in virtue of which it holds that for any object x of type F there is an object y of type G and a whole z of type H, such that both x and y are (proper) parts of z, and (ii) both a and b are (proper) parts of c. Of course, the notion of an essential law needs further clarification.”

\textbf{Indexicality and propositional content:} “However, as Husserl was well aware, the species-theory of content faces at least one serious objection. This objection concerns utterances that are essentially occasional, i.e., systematically context-sensitive, expressions like I am here now and the ‘indexical’ experiences they give voice to. If the intentional content of an indexical experience is to serve as a (sub-) propositional content, it must uniquely determine the object (if any) that the respective experience refers to. That is to say: if two indexical experiences display the same intentional content, they must refer to the same object (if any). It seems, though, that the moments of matter of two such experiences can instantiate the same ideal matter—the same type of
(particular) content—whilst representing different objects. If you and I both think I am here, our respective thoughts share the same type of content, or so it would seem, but they represent different states of affairs. In order to accommodate this observation, Husserl draws a distinction between, on the one hand, the general meaning function of an utterance and, on the other hand, the respective meaning (i.e., the propositional or sub-propositional content expressed in the relevant context of utterance). However, it is doubtful whether this distinction really helps Husserl overcome the difficulty the phenomenon of context-sensitivity poses for his species-theory of content. If intentional contents are ideal matters in the sense of types of particular matters, and if this kind of type may remain constant while the intentional object and hence the (sub-)propositional content differs, then surely intentional contents thus conceived cannot always function as (sub-)propositional contents, as Husserl's theory would have it. Rather, there must be another intentional content involved, namely the respective meaning, which serves as the (sub-)propositional content of the indexical experience. And this content does not appear to be an ideal species. (It may be argued, however, that even (sub-)propositional contents of indexical utterances can be instantiated multiply in thought and speech, thus qualifying as ideal species after all. But the crucial question is whether this holds true in complete generality: consider the above example I am here now.)”

“However, that may be, Husserl construes (sub-)propositional contents (respective meanings) as two-factored, with the general meaning function plus the relevant context of utterance (if any) determining the content in question. And at least in the case of indexical experiences he seems to identify their intentional contents with these two-factored contents, for he holds that intentional content, which is referred to as noematic sense or noematic nucleus in Ideas, uniquely determines reference, i.e., intentional object. Some scholars even go as far as to claim that Husserl defines the noematic sense as a certain person, object, event, state of affairs which presents itself, taken exactly as it present itself or as it is intended.”

Singularity, consciousness and horizon-intentionality: “Husserl sees quite clearly that indexical experiences (just as experiences given voice to by means of genuine proper names) are characterized, among other things, by their singularity: they represent a particular object, or set of objects, x, such that x is to be regarded as the intentional object of the respective experience in all relevant possible worlds (i.e., in all actual or counterfactual circumstances relative to which we are determining the object represented by that experience). Thus, for instance, in sec. 47 of Ideas, he describes what an experiencing subject, at a given time, in the light of his (or her) current indexical experiences, considers to be “the actual world” as a “special case” of a whole manifold of “possible worlds” each of which corresponds to a possible future course of experience (possible, that is, relative to the indexical experience in question). These (actual or potential) future experiences can be said to be (more or less) anticipated by the experiencing subject at the respective time, and they constitute what Husserl calls the “intentional horizon” of the indexical experience in the light of whose intentional content they are anticipated (cf. Smith and McIntyre 1982). For example, if you see something as a table, you will expect it to appear to you in certain ways if you go around and observe it.”

The phenomenological epoché: “An externalist reading (or rational reconstruction) of Husserl's theory of content might, however, be taken to conflict with the methodological constraints posed by the phenomenological epoché, which—together with the dynamic method and eidetic reduction—builds the essential core of the transcendental-phenomenological method introduced in Ideas. Husserl developed the method of epoché or “bracketing” around 1906. It may be regarded as a radicalization of the methodological constraint, already to be found.”
Martin Heidegger (1889-1976) was a German philosopher “whose work is perhaps most readily associated with phenomenology and existentialism, although his thinking should be identified as part of such philosophical movements only with extreme care and qualification. His ideas have exerted a seminal influence on the development of contemporary European philosophy. They have also had an impact far beyond philosophy, for example in architectural theory, literary criticism, theology, psychotherapy, and cognitive science.” He was born in Messkirch, Germany, on September 26, 1889. “In 1909 he spent two weeks in the Jesuit order before leaving to study theology at the University of Freiburg. In 1911 he switched subjects, to philosophy. He began teaching at Freiburg in 1915. In 1917 he married Elfride Petri, with whom he had two sons and from whom he never parted. Heidegger’s philosophical development began when he read Brentano and Aristotle, plus the latter’s medieval scholastic interpreters. Indeed, Aristotle’s demand in the Metaphysics to know what it is that unites all possible modes of Being (or ‘is-ness’) is, in many ways, the question that ignites and drives Heidegger’s philosophy. From this platform he proceeded to engage deeply with Kant, Kierkegaard, Nietzsche, and, perhaps most importantly of all for his subsequent thinking in the 1920s, two further figures: Dilthey (whose stress on the role of interpretation and history in the study of human activity profoundly influenced Heidegger) and Husserl (whose understanding of phenomenology as a science of essences he was destined to reject). In 1915 Husserl took up a post at Freiburg and in 1919 Heidegger became his assistant. Heidegger spent a period teaching at the University of Marburg (1923–1928), but then returned to Freiburg to take up the chair vacated by Husserl on his retirement. Out of such influences, explorations, and critical engagements, Heidegger’s magnum opus, Being and Time was born. Although Heidegger’s academic and intellectual relationship with his Freiburg predecessor was complicated and occasionally strained, Being and Time was dedicated to Husserl.”

“Published in 1927, Being and Time is standardly hailed as one of the most significant texts in the canon of contemporary European (or Continental) Philosophy. It catapulted Heidegger to a position of international intellectual visibility and provided the philosophical impetus for a number of later programmes and ideas in the contemporary European tradition, including Sartre’s existentialism, Gadamer’s philosophical hermeneutics, and Derrida’s notion of deconstruction. Moreover, Being and Time, and indeed Heidegger’s philosophy in general, has been presented and engaged with by thinkers such as Dreyfus and Rorty who work somewhere near the interface between the contemporary European and the analytic traditions. A cross-section of broadly analytic reactions to Heidegger (positive and negative) may be found alongside other responses in. Being and Time is discussed in section 2 of this article.”

“In 1933 Heidegger joined the Nazi Party and was elected Rector of Freiburg University, where, depending on whose account one believes, he either enthusiastically implemented the Nazi policy of bringing university education into line with Hitler’s nauseating political programme or he allowed that policy to be officially implemented while conducting a partially underground campaign of resistance to some of its details, especially its anti-Semitism. During the short period of his rectorship - he resigned in 1934 - Heidegger gave a number of public speeches in which Nazi images plus occasional declarations of support for Hitler are integrated with the philosophical language of Being and Time. After 1934 Heidegger became increasingly distanced from Nazi politics. Although he didn’t leave the Nazi party, he did attract some unwelcome attention from its enthusiasts. After the war, however, a university denazification committee at Freiburg investigated Heidegger and banned him from teaching, a right which he did not get back until 1949. One year later he was made professor Emeritus. Against this background of contrary information, one will search in vain through Heidegger’s later writings for the sort of total and unambiguous repudiation of National Socialism that one might hope to find.”
“After *Being and Time* there is a reorienting shift in Heidegger's philosophy known as ‘the turn’. Exactly when this occurs is a matter of debate, although it is probably safe to say that it is in progress by 1930 and largely established by the early 1940s. If dating the turn has its problems, saying exactly what it involves is altogether more challenging. Indeed, Heidegger himself characterized it not as a turn in his own thinking (or at least in his thinking alone) but as a turn in Being. As he later put it in a preface he wrote to Richardson's ground-breaking text on his work (Richardson 1963), the “Kehre is at work within the issue [that is named by the titles ‘Being and Time’/‘Time and Being.’]… It is not something that I did, nor does it pertain to my thinking only”.

The core elements of the turn are indicated in what is now considered by many commentators to be Heidegger's second greatest work, *Contributions to Philosophy (From Enowning)*. This uncompromising text was written in 1936–7 but was not published in German until 1989 and not in English translation until 1999. Section 3 of this article will attempt to navigate the main currents of the turn, and thus of Heidegger's later philosophy, in the light of this increasingly discussed text.

**Being and Time**: “The publication of Heidegger’s masterpiece, *Sein und Zeit (Being and Time)*, in 1927 generated a level of excitement that few other works of philosophy have matched. Despite its nearly impenetrable obscurity, the work earned Heidegger promotion to full professorship at Marburg and recognition as one the world’s leading philosophers. The extreme density of the text was due in part to Heidegger’s avoidance of traditional philosophical terminology in favor of neologisms derived from colloquial German, most notably Dasein (literally, being-there). Heidegger used that technique to further his goal of dismantling traditional philosophical theories and perspectives. *Being and Time* began with a traditional ontological question, which Heidegger formulated as the Seinsfrage, or the question of Being. In an essay first published in 1963, ‘My Way to Phenomenology,’ Heidegger put the Seinsfrage as follows: ‘If Being is predicated in manifold meanings, then what is its leading fundamental meaning? What does Being mean?’ If, in other words, there are many kinds of Being, or many senses in which existence may be predicated of a thing, what is the most-fundamental kind of Being, the kind that may be predicated of all things? In order to address that question properly, Heidegger found it necessary to undertake a preliminary phenomenological investigation of the Being of the human individual, which he called Dasein. In that endeavor he ventured onto philosophical ground entirely untrodden.”

“Since at least the time of René Descartes (1596-1650), one of the basic problems of Western philosophy had been to establish a secure foundation for the individual human’s presumed knowledge of the world around him on the basis of phenomena or experiences about which he could be certain (see epistemology). That approach presupposed a conception of the individual as a mere thinking subject (or thinking substance) who is radically distinct from the world and therefore cognitively isolated from it. Heidegger stood that approach on its head. For Heidegger, the very Being of the individual involves engagement with the world. The fundamental character of Dasein is a condition of already ‘Being-in-the-world’ - of already being caught up in, involved with, or committed to other individuals and things. Dasein’s practical involvements and commitments, therefore, are ontologically more basic than the thinking subject and all other Cartesian abstractions. Accordingly, *Being and Time* gives pride of place to ontological concepts such as world, everydayness, and Being-with-others.”

“Yet the framework of Being and Time is suffused by a sensibility - derived from secularized Protestantism - that stresses the paramountcy of original sin. Emotionally laden concepts such as angst, guilt, and falling suggest that worldliness and the human condition in general are essentially a curse. Heidegger, it seems, had implicitly adopted the critique of mass society set forth by 19th-
century thinkers such as Kierkegaard and Friedrich Nietzsche, a perspective that was well established within Germany’s largely illiberal professoriate in the early 20th century. That theme is illustrated in Being and Time’s treatment of authenticity, one of the central concepts of the work. Heidegger’s view seemed to be that the majority of human beings lead an existence that is inauthentic. Rather than facing up to their own finitude - represented above all by the inevitability of death - they seek distraction and escape in inauthentic modalities such as curiosity, ambiguity, and idle talk. Heidegger characterized such conformity in terms of the notion of the anonymous das Man - ‘the They.’ Conversely, the possibility of authentic Being-in-the-world seemed to portend the emergence of a new spiritual aristocracy. Such individuals would be capable of heeding the call of conscience to fulfill their potential for Being-a-self.”

“Another distinguishing feature of Being and Time is its treatment of temporality (Zeitlichkeit). Heidegger believed that traditional Western ontology from Plato to Immanuel Kant had adopted a static and inadequate understanding of what it means to be human. For the most part, previous thinkers had conceived of the Being of humans in terms of the properties and modalities of thinghood, of that which is present-at-hand. In Being and Time, Heidegger conversely stressed Being-in-the-world as Existentz - a form of beingthat is ecstatically, rather than passively, oriented toward its own possibilities. From that standpoint one of the distinctive features of inauthentic Dasein is that it fails to actualize its Being. Its existential passivity becomes indistinguishable from the nonecstatic, inert being of things.”

“The problem of historicity, as discussed in Division II of Being and Time, is one of the most poorly understood sections of the work. Being and Time is usually interpreted as favoring the standpoint of an individual Dasein: social and historical concerns are intrinsically foreign to the basic approach of the work. Nevertheless, with the concept of historicity Heidegger indicated that historical questions and themes are legitimate topics of ontological inquiry. The concept of historicity suggests that Dasein always temporalizes, or acts in time, as part of a larger social and historical collectivity - as part of a people or Volk. As such, Dasein possesses a heritage on which it must act. Historicity thus means making a decision about how to actualize (or act upon) salient elements of a collective past. Heidegger stresses that Dasein is future-oriented: it responds to the past, in the context of the present, for the sake of the future. His treatment of historicity thus constitutes a polemical response to the traditional historicism of Leopold von Ranke, Johann Gustav Droysen, and Wilhelm Dilthey, which viewed human life as historical in a sense that was passive and devoid of intentionality (the quality of being about or directed toward something else). That kind of historicism failed to understand history as a project that humans consciously undertake in order to respond to their collective past for the sake of their future.”

Later Philosophy: “Shortly after finishing Being and Time, Heidegger became dissatisfied with its basic approach. Indeed, the projected second part of the book, to be called Zeit und Sein (Time and Being), was never written. His doubts centred on the notion of Dasein, one of the chief innovations of Being and Time. In retrospect, Heidegger found it too redolent of the subjective and anthropological preconceptions he had been trying to surmount. Ironically, although Heidegger’s treatise had begun by posing the Seinsfrage, the question of Being, the ensuing train of argumentation never managed to return to this theme. In Heidegger’s subsequent writings, the Seinsfrage gradually returned to the fore. Simultaneously, however, Heidegger grew increasingly doubtful of the capacity of philosophy to articulate the truth of Being. More and more, he tended to regard Western metaphysics as hopelessly riddled with errors and missteps rather than as a useful point of departure. Instead, he became enamored of the power of poetry, especially that of Friedrich Hölderlin and Rainer Maria Rilke, to unveil the mysteries of Being.”
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“In 1928 Heidegger accepted the chair of philosophy at Freiburg formerly occupied by Husserl, who had retired. He served as rector of the university from 1933 to 1934. From 1936 to 1941 he delivered a series of important lectures on Nietzsche, though they remained unpublished until the early 1960s. His Beiträge zur Philosophie (Contributions to Philosophy), composed in 1936–38 but not published until 1989, was viewed by some interpreters as the long-awaited sequel to Being and Time. That work, however, lacked the clarity and force of other writings of the 1930s, such as the powerful essay The Origin of the Work of Art” (1936). Perhaps the consummate statement of Heidegger’s later philosophy is the “Letter on Humanism” (1946). In that text the worldly and practical involvements of Dasein seem like a dim and distant memory. The last anthropological residues have been permanently effaced. Instead, Heidegger resolutely philosophizes from the standpoint of Being itself, to which he claims a kind of privileged and direct access. He makes portentous and mysterious proclamations, some of which are barely intelligible (e.g., “Being is the trembling of the Godding”), and he vilifies reason as “the most stiff-necked adversary of thought.” That work and other late writings frequently seem to border on mysticism, as when, in Was heisst Denken? (1954; What Is Called Thinking?), Heidegger speaks laconically of “the fourfold”: gods, men, the earth, and the heavens.”

“The later Heidegger claimed that the “forgetting of Being” (Seinsvergessenheit) was the distinguishing feature of modern life. In a rare 1966 interview with the German news magazine Der Spiegel, he was pressed to offer a bit of practical wisdom that philosophy might bestow on a troubled age. Heidegger shrugged in despair: “Only a God can save us!” Such proclamations led his colleague Karl-Otto Apel to suggest sardonically that Heidegger suffered from a ‘forgetting of reason’ (Logosvergessenheit). The other major theme of Heidegger’s postwar writings was technology. In his view, technology had come to dominate all aspects of modern life. In one of his most-sustained meditations on that theme, ‘The Question Concerning Technology’ (1949), he explained how in the modern age technology had turned the totality of Being into mere stuff, a standing reserve to be dominated and manipulated by human beings. Modern man, he lamented, takes the entirety of Being as raw material for production and subjects the entirety of the object-world to the sweep and order of production. From that standpoint, he argued, the outcome of World War II really did not matter, insofar as all the world’s major political actors at the time - the Allied Powers as well as Germany and Japan - stood equally under the pernicious sway of what he referred to as technological enframing (das Gestell). There could be no doubt that, by addressing the problem of technology’s nearly unchallenged predominance, Heidegger was responding to one of the central concerns of modern life. At the same time, however, many interpreters felt that, by refusing to distinguish between constructive and destructive uses of technology, Heidegger’s analysis risked collapsing into a simplistic Ludditism.”

Heidegger and Nazism: “In the months after the appointment of Adolf Hitler as chancellor of Germany in January 1933, German universities came under increasing pressure to support the “national revolution” and to eliminate Jewish scholars and the teaching of “Jewish” doctrines, such as the theory of relativity. In April 1933 Heidegger was elected rector of Freiburg by the university’s teaching staff. One month later he became a member of the Nazi Party; until he resigned as rector in April 1934, he helped to institute Nazi educational and cultural programs at Freiburg and vigorously promoted the domestic and foreign policies of the Nazi regime. Already during the late 1920s he had criticized the dissolute nature of the German university system, where specialization and the ideology of academic freedom precluded the attainment of a higher unity. In a letter of 1929 he bemoaned the progressive Jewification (Verjudung) of the German spirit.” He called for recognizing the university along the lines of the Nazi leadership principle.”

Karl Theodor Jaspers (1883-1969): “German philosopher, one of the most important Existentialists in Germany, who approached the subject from man’s direct concern with his own existence. In his later work, as a reaction to the disruptions of Nazi rule in Germany and World War II, he searched for a new unity of thinking that he called world philosophy. Jaspers was the oldest of the three children of Karl Wilhelm Jaspers and Henriette Tantzen. His ancestors on both sides were peasants, merchants, and pastors who had lived in northern Germany for generations. His father, a lawyer, was a high constable of the district and eventually a director of a bank. Jaspers was delicate and sickly in his childhood. As a consequence of his numerous childhood diseases, he developed bronchiectasis during his adolescent years, and this condition led to cardiac decompensation (the inability of the heart to maintain adequate circulation). These ailments were a severe handicap throughout his adult life. Jaspers entered the University of Heidelberg in 1901, enrolling in the faculty of law; in the following year he moved to Munich, where he continued his studies of law, but without much enthusiasm. He spent the next six years studying medicine at the Universities of Berlin, Göttingen, and Heidelberg. After he completed his state examination to practice medicine in 1908, he wrote his dissertation *Heimweh und Verbrechen* (Nostalgia and Crime). In February 1909 he was registered as a doctor. He had already become acquainted with his future wife, Gertrud Mayer, during his student years, and he married her in 1910.”

Research in Clinical Psychiatry: “In 1909 Jaspers became a volunteer research assistant at the University of Heidelberg psychiatric clinic, a position he held until 1915. The clinic was headed by the renowned neuropathologist Franz Nissl, who had assembled under him an excellent team of assistants. Because of his desire to learn psychiatry in his own way without being regimented into any particular pattern of thought by his teachers, Jaspers elected to work in his own time, at his own pace, and with patients in whom he was particularly interested. This was granted to him only because he agreed to work without a salary.”

“When Jaspers started his research work, clinical psychiatry was considered to be empirically based but lacking any underlying systematic framework of knowledge. It dealt with different aspects of the human organism as they might affect the behaviour of human beings suffering from mental illness. These aspects ranged from anatomical, physiological, and genetic to neurological, psychological, and sociological influences. A study of these aspects opened the way to an understanding and explanation of human behaviour. Diagnosis was of paramount importance; therapy was largely neglected. Aware of this situation, Jaspers realized the conditions that were required in order to establish psychopathology as a science: a language had to be found that, on the basis of previously conducted research, was capable of describing the symptoms of disease well enough to facilitate positive recognition in other cases; and various methods appropriate to the different spheres of psychiatry had to be worked out.”

“Jaspers tried to bring the methods of Phenomenology—the direct investigation and description of phenomena as consciously experienced, without theories about their causal explanation—into the field of clinical psychiatry. These efforts soon bore fruit, and his reputation as a researcher in the forefront of new developments in psychiatry was established. In 1911, when he was only 28 years old, he was requested by Ferdinand Springer, a well-known publisher, to write a textbook on psychopathology; he completed the *Allgemeine Psychopathologie* (General Psychopathology, 1965) two years later. The work was distinguished by its critical approach to the various methods available for the study of psychiatry and by its attempt to synthesize these methods into a cohesive whole.”
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**Transition to Philosophy:** “In 1913 Jaspers, by virtue of his status in the field of psychology, entered the philosophical faculty—which included a department of psychology - of the University of Heidelberg. His academic advance in the university was rapid. In 1916 he was appointed assistant professor in psychology; in 1920 assistant professor in philosophy; in 1921 professor in philosophy; and in 1922 he took over the second chair in that field. The transition from medicine to philosophy was due in part to the fact that, while the medical faculty was fully staffed, the philosophical faculty needed an empirical psychologist. But the transition also corresponded to Jaspers’ intellectual development.”

“In 1919 Jaspers published some of his lectures, entitled *Psychologie der Weltanschauungen* (*Psychology of World Views*). He did not intend to present a philosophical work but rather one aimed at demarcating the limits of a psychological understanding of man. Nevertheless, this work touched on the border of philosophy. In it were foreshadowed all of the basic themes that were fully developed later in Jaspers’ major philosophical works. By investigating the legitimate boundaries of philosophical knowledge, Jaspers tried to clarify the relationship of philosophy to science. Science appeared to him as knowledge of facts that are obtained by means of scholarly methodological principles and that are apodictically certain and universally valid. Following Max Weber, a sociologist and historian, he asserted that scientific principles also applied to both the social and humanistic sciences. In contrast to science, Jaspers considered philosophy to be a subjective interpretation of Being, which - although prophetically inspired - attempted to postulate norms of value and principles of life as universally valid. As Jaspers’ understanding of philosophy deepened, he gradually discarded his belief in the role of a prophetic vision in philosophy. He bent all his energies toward the development of a philosophy that would be independent of science but that would not become a substitute for religious beliefs. Though the system presupposed science, it passed beyond the boundaries of science in an effort to illuminate the totality of man’s existence. For Jaspers man’s existence meant not mere being-in-the-world but rather man’s freedom of being. The idea of being oneself signified for Jaspers the potentiality to realize one’s freedom of being in the world. Thus, the task of philosophy was to appeal to the freedom of the individual as the subject who thinks and exists and to focus on man’s existence as the centre of all reality.”

“The elaboration of these germinal ideas occupied Jasper’s thought from 1920 to 1930. During this decade his brother-in-law, Ernst Mayer, himself a philosopher of repute, worked with him. During these years he also enjoyed the friendship of Martin Heidegger. Somewhat later, this friendship broke up because of Heidegger’s entry into the National Socialist Party. In the early years of the 1930s the fruits of his intellectual labour became evident: in 1931 *Die geistige Situation der Zeit* (*Man in the Modern Age*, 1933) was published; in 1932 the three volumes of *Philosophie* (*Philosophy*, 1969) appeared—perhaps the most systematic presentation of Existential philosophy in the German language. A book on Max Weber also appeared in 1932.”

**Conflict with the Nazi Authorities:** “When Hitler came into power in 1933, Jaspers was taken by surprise, as he had not taken National Socialism seriously. He thought that this movement would destroy itself from within, thus leading to a reorganization and liberation by the other political forces active at the time. These expectations, however, did not materialize. Because his wife was Jewish, Jaspers qualified as an enemy of the state. From 1933 he was excluded from the higher councils of the university but was allowed to teach and publish. In 1935 the first part of his future work on logic, entitled *Vernunft und Existenz* (*Reason and Existence*, 1955), appeared; in 1936 a book on Nietzsche; in 1937 an essay on Descartes; in 1938 a further work preliminary to his logic, entitled *Existenzphilosophie* (*Philosophy of Existence*, 1971). Unlike many other famous intellectuals of that time, he was not prepared to make any concessions to the doctrines of National
Socialism. Consequently, a series of decrees were promulgated against him, including removal from his professorship and a total ban on any further publication. These measures effectively barred him from carrying on his work in Germany.”

“Friends tried to assist him to emigrate to another country. Permission was finally granted to him in 1942 to go to Switzerland, but a condition was imposed by the Nazis that required his wife to remain behind in Germany. He refused to accept this condition and decided to stay with his wife, notwithstanding the dangers. It became necessary for his friends to hide his wife. Both of them had decided, in case of an arrest, to commit suicide. In 1945 he was told by a reliable source that his deportation was scheduled to take place on April 14. On March 30, however, Heidelberg was occupied by the Americans. Disillusioned by the events of these years, Jaspers withdrew more and more into himself. He revised the General Psychopathology in an effort to make it represent the high point of a free but responsible search for knowledge of man, as distinct from science, which had betrayed man. He also completed his work on logic, Von der Wahrheit (Of Truth), the first part of which was intended to throw the light of reason on the irrational teachings of the times. These works appeared in print in 1946 and 1947.

Postwar Development of Thought: “After the capitulation of Germany, Jaspers saw himself confronted with the tasks of rebuilding the university and helping to bring about a moral and political rebirth of the people. He dedicated all of his energies in the postwar years toward the accomplishment of these two tasks. He also represented the interests of the university to the military powers. He gathered his thoughts on how the universities could best be rebuilt in his work Die Idee der Universität (1946; The Idea of the University, 1959). He called for a complete de-Nazification of the teaching staff, but this proved to be impossible because the number of professors who had never compromised with the Nazis was too small. It was only gradually that the autonomous university of the pre-Nazi years could once again assert itself in Germany. Jaspers felt that an acknowledgment of national guilt was a necessary condition for the moral and political rebirth of Germany. In one of his best political works, Die Schuldfrage (1946; The Question of German Guilt, 1947), he stated that whoever had participated actively in the preparation or execution of war crimes and crimes against humanity was morally guilty. Those, however, who passively tolerated these happenings because they did not want to become victims of Nazism were only politically responsible. In this respect, all survivors of this era bore the same responsibility and shared a collective guilt. He felt that the fact that no one could escape this collective guilt and responsibility might enable the German people to transform their society from its state of collapse into a more highly developed and morally responsible democracy. The fact that these ideas attracted hardly any attention was a further disappointment to Jaspers. In the spring of 1948 he accepted a professorship in philosophy in Basel, Switz. In spite of the apparent neglect of Jaspers’ ideas of a moral regeneration of the German people, his departure for Basel was regarded as a betrayal by many of the German people. Jaspers himself hoped to find there a peace of mind that might enable him to work through and revise his whole approach to the entire field of philosophy.”

“This revision was guided mainly by the conviction that modern technology in the sphere of communication and warfare had made it imperative for mankind to strive for world unity. This new development in his thinking was defined by him as world philosophy, and its primary task was the creation of a mode of thinking that could contribute to the possibility of a free world order. The transition from existence philosophy to world philosophy was based on his belief that a different kind of logic would make it possible for free communication to exist among all mankind. His thought was expressed in Der philosophische Glaube (1948; The Perennial Scope of Philosophy, 1949) and Der philosophische Glaube angesichts der Offenbarung (1962; Philoso-
phical Faith and Revelation, 1967). Since all thought in its essence rests on beliefs, he reasoned, the task confronting man is to free philosophical thinking from all attachments to the transient objects of this world. To replace previous objectifications of all metaphysical and religious systems, Jaspers introduced the concept of the cipher. This was a philosophical abstraction that could represent all systems, provided that they entered into communication with one another by means of the cipher. In other words, the concept of the cipher enabled a common ground to be shared by all of the various systems of thought, thus leading to a far greater tolerance than had ever before been possible. A world history of philosophy, entitled Die grossen Philosophen (1957; The Great Philosophers, 2 vol., 1962, 1966), had as its aim to investigate to what extent all past thought could become communicable.”

“Jaspers also undertook to write a universal history of the world, called Vom Ursprung und Ziel der Geschichte (1949; The Origin and Goal of History, 1953). At the centre of history is the axial period (from 800 to 200 bc), during which time all the fundamental creations that underlie man’s current civilization came into being. Following from the insights that came to him in preparing this work, he was led to realize the possibility of a political unity of the world in a 1958 work called Die Atombombe und die Zukunft des Menschen (The Future of Mankind, 1961). The aim of this political world union would not be absolute sovereignty but rather world confederation, in which the various entities could live and communicate in freedom and peace.”

“Under the influence of these ideas, Jaspers closely observed, during the latter years of his life, both world politics and the politics of Germany. When the efforts toward democracy in Germany appeared to him to turn more and more into a national oligarchy of parties, he wrote a bitter attack on these tendencies in Wohin treibt die Bundesrepublik? (1966; The Future of Germany, 1967). This book caused much annoyance among West German politicians of all shades. Jaspers, in turn, reacted to their unfair reception by returning his German passport in 1967 and taking out Swiss citizenship. At the time of his death in 1969, Jaspers had published 30 books. In addition, he had left 30,000 handwritten pages, as well as a large and important correspondence.”
Maurice Merleau-Ponty (1908-1961): was a French phenomenological philosopher, strongly influenced by Edmund Husserl and Martin Heidegger. “The constitution of meaning in human experience was his main interest and he wrote on perception, art, and politics. He was on the editorial board of Les Temps modernes, the leftist magazine established by Jean-Paul Sartre in 1945. At the core of Merleau-Ponty's philosophy is a sustained argument for the foundational role perception plays in understanding the world as well as engaging with the world. Like the other major phenomenologists, Merleau-Ponty expressed his philosophical insights in writings on art, literature, linguistics, and politics. He was the only major phenomenologist of the first half of the twentieth century to engage extensively with the sciences and especially with descriptive psychology. It is through this engagement that his writings have become influential in the recent project of naturalizing phenomenology, in which phenomenologists use the results of psychology and cognitive science. Merleau-Ponty emphasized the body as the primary site of knowing the world, a corrective to the long philosophical tradition of placing consciousness as the source of knowledge and maintained that the body and that which it perceived could not be disentangled from each other. The articulation of the primacy of embodiment led him away from phenomenology towards what he was to call indirect ontology or the ontology of the flesh of the world (la chair du monde), seen in his final and incomplete work, The Visible and Invisible, and his last published essay, Eye and Mind.”

Life: “Maurice Merleau-Ponty was born in 1908 in Rochefort-sur-Mer, Charente-Maritime, France. His father died in 1913 when Merleau-Ponty was five years old. After secondary schooling at the lycée Louis-le-Grand in Paris, Merleau-Ponty became a student at the École Normale Supérieure, where he studied alongside Jean-Paul Sartre, Simone de Beauvoir, Simone Weil, and Jean Hyppolite. He attended Edmund Husserl's Paris Lectures in February 1929. In 1929, Merleau-Ponty received his DES degree (diplôme d'études supérieures (fr), roughly equivalent to an MA thesis) from the University of Paris, on the basis of the (now-lost) thesis La Notion de multiple intelligible chez Plotin (Plotinus’s Notion of the Intelligible Many), directed by Émile Bréhier. He passed the agrégation in philosophy in 1930. An article published in French newspaper Le Monde in October 2014 makes the case of recent discoveries about Merleau-Ponty’s likely authorship of the novel Nord. Récit de l’arctique (Grasset, 1928). Convergent sources from close friends (Beauvoir, Elisabeth Zaza Lacoin) seem to leave little doubt that Jacques Heller was a pseudonym of the 20-year-old Merleau-Ponty.”

“Merleau-Ponty taught first at the Lycée de Beauvais (1931–33) and then got a fellowship to do research from the Caisse nationale de la recherche scientifique (fr). From 1934–1935 he taught at the Lycée de Chartres. He then in 1935 became a tutor at the École Normale Supérieure, where he was awarded his doctorate on the basis of two important books: La structure du comportement (1942) and Phénoménologie de la Perception (1945). After teaching at the University of Lyon from 1945 to 1948, Merleau-Ponty lectured on child psychology and education at the Sorbonne from 1949 to 1952. He was awarded the Chair of Philosophy at the Collège de France from 1952 until his death in 1961, making him the youngest person to have been elected to a Chair. Besides his teaching, Merleau-Ponty was also political editor for Les Temps modernes from the founding of the journal in October 1945 until December 1952. In his youth he had read Karl Marx's writings and Sartre even claimed that Merleau-Ponty converted him to Marxism. Their friendship ended over a quarrel as he became disillusioned about communism, while Sartre still endorsed it. Merleau-Ponty died suddenly of a stroke in 1961 at age 53, apparently while preparing for a class on René Descartes. He is buried in Père Lachaise Cemetery in Paris.”
**Consciousness:** “In his *Phenomenology of Perception* (1945), Merleau-Ponty developed the concept of the body-subject (le corps propre) as an alternative to the Cartesian ego cogito. This distinction is especially important in that Merleau-Ponty perceives the essences of the world existentially. Consciousness, the world, and the human body as a perceiving thing are intricately intertwined and mutually engaged. The phenomenal thing is not the unchanging object of the natural sciences, but a correlate of our body and its sensory-motor functions. Taking up and communing with (Merleau-Ponty’s phrase) the sensible qualities it encounters, the body as incarnated subjectivity intentionally elaborates things within an ever-present world frame, through use of its pre-conscious, pre-predicative understanding of the world’s makeup. The elaboration, however, is inexhaustible (the hallmark of any perception according to Merleau-Ponty). Things are that upon which our body has a grip (prise), while the grip itself is a function of our connaturality with the world’s things. The world and the sense of self are emergent phenomena in an ongoing becoming.”

“The essential partiality of our view of things, their being given only in a certain perspective and at a certain moment in time does not diminish their reality, but on the contrary establishes it, as there is no other way for things to be copresent with us and with other things than through such Abschattungen (sketches, faint outlines, adumbrations). The thing transcends our view but is manifest precisely by presenting itself to a range of possible views. The object of perception is immanently tied to its background - to the nexus of meaningful relations among objects within the world. Because the object is inextricably within the world of meaningful relations, each object reflects the other (much in the style of Leibniz's monads). Through involvement in the world - being-in-the-world - the perceiver tacitly experiences all the perspectives upon that object coming from all the surrounding things of its environment, as well as the potential perspectives that that object has upon the beings around it.”

“Each object is a mirror of all others. Our perception of the object through all perspectives is not that of a propositional, or clearly delineated, perception; rather, it is an ambiguous perception founded upon the body’s primordial involvement and understanding of the world and of the meanings that constitute the landscape’s perceptual gestalt. Only after we have been integrated within the environment so as to perceive objects as such can we turn our attention toward particular objects within the landscape so as to define them more clearly. This attention, however, does not operate by clarifying what is already seen, but by constructing a new Gestalt oriented toward a particular object. Because our bodily involvement with things is always provisional and indeterminate, we encounter meaningful things in a unified though ever-open-ended world.”

**The Primacy of Perception:** “From the time of writing *Structure of Behavior and Phenomenology of Perception*, Merleau-Ponty wanted to show, in opposition to the idea that drove the tradition beginning with John Locke, that perception was not the causal product of atomic sensations. This atomist-causal conception was being perpetuated in certain psychological currents of the time, particularly in behaviorism. According to Merleau-Ponty, perception has an active dimension, in that it is a primordial openness to the lifeworld (the Lebenswelt).”

“This primordial openness is at the heart of his thesis of the primacy of perception. The slogan of Husserl's phenomenology is all consciousness is consciousness of something, which implies a distinction between acts of thought (the noesis) and intentional objects of thought (the noema). Thus, the correlation between noesis and noema becomes the first step in the constitution of analyses of consciousness. However, in studying the posthumous manuscripts of Husserl, who remained one of his major influences, Merleau-Ponty remarked that, in their evolution, Husserl's work brings to light phenomena which are not assimilable to noesis–noema correlation. This is
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particularly the case when one attends to the phenomena of the body (which is at once body-subject and body-object), subjective time (the consciousness of time is neither an act of consciousness nor an object of thought) and the other (the first considerations of the other in Husserl led to solipsism).”

“The distinction between acts of thought (noesis) and intentional objects of thought (noema) does not seem, therefore, to constitute an irreducible ground. It appears rather at a higher level of analysis. Thus, Merleau-Ponty does not postulate that all consciousness is consciousness of something, which supposes at the outset a noetic-noematic ground. Instead, he develops the thesis according to which all consciousness is perceptual consciousness. In doing so, he establishes a significant turn in the development of phenomenology, indicating that its conceptualizations should be re-examined in the light of the primacy of perception, in weighing up the philosophical consequences of this thesis.”

**Corporeity**: “Taking the study of perception as his point of departure, Merleau-Ponty was led to recognize that one's own body (le corps propre) is not only a thing, a potential object of study for science, but is also a permanent condition of experience, a constituent of the perceptual openness to the world. He therefore underlines the fact that there is an inherence of consciousness and of the body of which the analysis of perception should take account. The primacy of perception signifies a primacy of experience, so to speak, insofar as perception becomes an active and constitutive dimension. Merleau-Ponty demonstrates a corporeity of consciousness as much as an intentionality of the body, and so stands in contrast with the dualist ontology of mind and body in Descartes, a philosopher to whom Merleau-Ponty continually returned, despite the important differences that separate them. In the *Phenomenology of Perception* Merleau-Ponty wrote: Insofar as I have hands, feet; a body, I sustain around me intentions which are not dependent on my decisions and which affect my surroundings in a way that I do not choose. The question concerning corporeity connects also with Merleau-Ponty's reflections on space (l'espace) and the primacy of the dimension of depth (la profondeur) as implied in the notion of being in the world (être au monde; to echo Heidegger's In-der-Welt-sein) and of one's own body (le corps propre).”

**Language**: “The highlighting of the fact that corporeity intrinsically has a dimension of expressivity which proves to be fundamental to the constitution of the ego is one of the conclusions of *The Structure of Behavior* that is constantly reiterated in Merleau-Ponty's later works. Following this theme of expressivity, he goes on to examine how an incarnate subject is in a position to undertake actions that transcend the organic level of the body, such as in intellectual operations and the products of one's cultural life. He carefully considers language, then, as the core of culture, by examining in particular the connections between the unfolding of thought and sense - enriching his perspective not only by an analysis of the acquisition of language and the expressivity of the body, but also by taking into account pathologies of language, painting, cinema, literature, poetry and song. This work deals mainly with language, beginning with the reflection on artistic expression in *The Structure of Behavior* - which contains a passage on El Greco that prefigures the remarks that he develops in ‘Cézanne's Doubt’ (1945) and follows the discussion in Phenomenology of Perception. The work, undertaken while serving as the Chair of Child Psychology and Pedagogy at the University of the Sorbonne, is not a departure from his philosophical and phenomenological works, but rather an important continuation in the development of his thought. As the course outlines of his Sorbonne lectures indicate, during this period he continues a dialogue between phenomenology and the diverse work carried out in psychology, all in order to return to the study of the acquisition of language in children, as well as to broadly take...
advantage of the contribution of Ferdinand de Saussure to linguistics, and to work on the notion of structure through a discussion of work in psychology, linguistics and social anthropology."

**Art:** “Merleau-Ponty distinguishes between primary and secondary modes of expression. This distinction appears in Phenomenology of Perception and is sometimes repeated in terms of spoken and speaking language. Spoken language (le langage parlé), or secondary expression, returns to our linguistic baggage, to the cultural heritage that we have acquired, as well as the brute mass of relationships between signs and significations. Speaking language (le langage parlant), or primary expression, such as it is, is language in the production of a sense, language at the advent of a thought, at the moment where it makes itself an advent of sense. It is speaking language, that is to say, primary expression, that interests Merleau-Ponty and which keeps his attention through his treatment of the nature of production and the reception of expressions, a subject which also overlaps with an analysis of action, of intentionality, of perception, as well as the links between freedom and external conditions. The notion of style occupies an important place in ‘Indirect Language and the Voices of Silence’. In spite of certain similarities with André Malraux, Merleau-Ponty distinguishes himself from Malraux in respect to three conceptions of style, the last of which is employed in Malraux’s The Voices of Silence. Merleau-Ponty remarks that in this work style is sometimes used by Malraux in a highly subjective sense, understood as a projection of the artist’s individuality. Sometimes it is used, on the contrary, in a very metaphysical sense (in Merleau-Ponty’s opinion, a mystical sense), in which style is connected with a conception of an über-artist expressing the Spirit of Painting. Finally, it sometimes is reduced to simply designating a categorization of an artistic school or movement. (However, this account of Malraux’s notion of style—a key element in his thinking—is open to serious question.)”

“For Merleau-Ponty, it is these uses of the notion of style that lead Malraux to postulate a cleavage between the objectivity of Italian Renaissance painting and the subjectivity of painting in his own time, a conclusion that Merleau-Ponty disputes. According to Merleau-Ponty, it is important to consider the heart of this problematic, by recognizing that style is first of all a demand owed to the primacy of perception, which also implies taking into consideration the dimensions of historicity and intersubjectivity. For Merleau-Ponty, style is born of the interaction between two or more fields of being. Rather than being exclusive to individual human consciousness, consciousness is born of the pre-conscious style of the world, of Nature.”

**Science:** “In his essay Cézanne’s Doubt, in which he identifies Paul Cézanne's impressionistic theory of painting as analogous to his own concept of radical reflection, the attempt to return to, and reflect on, prereflective consciousness, Merleau-Ponty identifies science as the opposite of art. In Merleau-Ponty’s account, whereas art is an attempt to capture an individual’s perception, science is anti-individualistic. In the preface to his Phenomenology of Perception, Merleau-Ponty presents a phenomenological objection to positivism: that it can tell us nothing about human subjectivity. All that a scientific text can explain is the particular individual experience of that scientist, which cannot be transcended. For Merleau-Ponty, science neglects the depth and profundity of the phenomena that it endeavors to explain. Merleau-Ponty understood science to be an ex post facto abstraction. Causal and physiological accounts of perception, for example, explain perception in terms that are only arrived at after abstracting from the phenomenon itself. Merleau-Ponty chastised science for taking itself to be the area in which a complete account of nature may be given. The subjective depth of phenomena cannot be given in science as it is. This characterizes Merleau-Ponty’s attempt to ground science in phenomenological objectivity and, in essence, institute a return to the phenomena.”
Chapter III. History of Philosophy

Gabriel Honoré Marcel (1889-1973): Marcel was a French philosopher, playwright, music critic and leading Christian existentialist. "The author of over a dozen books and at least thirty plays, Marcel's work focused on the modern individual's struggle in a techno-logically dehumanizing society. Though often regarded as the first French existentialist, he dissociated himself from figures such as Jean-Paul Sartre, preferring the term 'Philosophy of Existence' or neo-Socrateanism to define his own thought. The Mystery of Being is a well-known two-volume work authored by Marcel." "Marcel's mother died when he was four years old, and he was raised by his father and his maternal aunt, whom his father later married. Marcel had little religious upbringing but received an excellent education, studying philosophy at the Sorbonne and passing an agregation in 1910 that qualified him to teach in secondary schools. Although he produced a stream of philosophical and dramatic works (he wrote more than 30 plays), as well as shorter pieces in reviews and periodicals, Marcel never completed a doctoral dissertation and never held a formal position as a professor, instead working mostly as a lecturer, writer, and critic. He also developed a keen interest in classical music and composed a number of pieces."^451

"Marcel's philosophical style follows the descriptive method of phenomenology. Eschewing a structured, more systematic approach, Marcel developed a method of discursive probing around the edges of central life experiences that was aimed at uncovering truths about the human condition...Marcel always insisted on working with concrete examples from ordinary experience as the initial basis for more abstract philosophical analysis. His work is also significantly autobiographical, a fact that reflected his belief that philosophy is as much a personal quest as a disinterested impersonal search for objective truth. In Marcel's view, philosophical questions involve the questioner in a profound way, an insight that he believed had been lost by much of contemporary philosophy. Marcel's dramatic works were intended to complement his philosophical thinking; many experiences that he brought to life onstage were subject to more detailed analysis in his philosophical writings. The most systematic presentation of his ideas is to be found in his two-volume work Mystère de l'être (1951: The Mystery of Being), based on his Gifford Lectures at the University of Aberdeen (1949–50). Other notable works are: Journal métaphysique (1927; Metaphysical Journal); Être et avoir (1935; Being and Having); Du refus à l'invocation (1940; Creative Fidelity); Homo viator: prélégomènes à une métaphysique de l'espérance (1944; Homo Viator: Introduction to a Metaphysics of Hope); Les Hommes contre l'humain (1951; Man Against Mass Society); Pour une sagesse tragique et son au-delà (1968; Tragic Wisdom and Beyond); several key essays, including On the Ontological Mystery (1933); and several significant plays, including Un Homme de Dieu (1922; A Man of God) and Le Monde cassé (1932: The Broken World), both of which have been performed in English."^452

Basic Philosophical Orientation: “Marcel was influenced by the phenomenology of the German philosopher Edmund Husserl and by his rejection of idealism and Cartesianism, especially early in his career. His basic philosophical orientation was motivated by his dissatisfaction with the approach to philosophy that one finds in René Descartes and in the development of Cartesianism after Descartes. Marcel observed that Cartesianism implies a severance...between intellect and life; its result is a depreciation of the one, and an exaltation of the other, both arbitrary. Descartes is famous for having purposefully doubted all of his ideas and for splitting the interior self-off from the external world; his strategy of methodic doubt was an attempt to restore the link between the mind and reality. According to Marcel, Descartes’s starting point is not an accurate depiction of the self in actual experience, in which there is no division between consciousness and the world. Describing Descartes’s approach as a spectator view, Marcel argued that the self should instead be understood as a participant in reality - a more accurate understanding of the nature of the self and of its immersion in the world of concrete experience."^453
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Being and Having, Mystery and Problem: “Marcel developed his position by introducing a number of important philosophical distinctions for which he became well known. Among them is that between being and having, which was central to his thought. The distinction applies to a number of areas in life, including the experience of human embodiment, the nature of intersubjective relations, and the nature of the human person. Marcel argued that people’s relationships to their own bodies is not one of typical ownership, and so the fact of human embodiment presents a difficulty for any philosophy, such as Cartesianism, that wishes to place the fact of embodiment in doubt. It is thus incorrect to understand embodiment in terms of ownership, or to say that people possess their bodies as instruments; it is more accurate to say instead that I am my body, by which Marcel meant that one cannot look upon one’s body as an object or as a problem to be solved, because the logical detachment that is required to do so cannot be achieved. Indeed, as soon as I consider my body as an object, it ceases to be my body, because the nature of conceptual thought requires detachment from the object under analysis. Nor, however, can I regard my bodily experiences as the sum total of my life. This analysis then opens up the realms of being and having. Having involves taking possession of objects, requires detachment from the self, and is the realm in which one seeks conceptual mastery and universal solutions. Marcel acknowledged that, although it is possible to adopt this attitude toward human beings, it is a distortion of the nature of the self. The realm of being, on the other hand, is one in which experience is unified before conceptual analysis, in which the individual participates in reality and has access to experiences that are later distorted at the level of abstract thinking.”

“Marcel introduced another of his famous distinctions, that between mystery and problem, to further elaborate the notions of being and having. He tended to divide reality into the world of mystery and the world of problems (the world of being and the world of having). These realms further correspond to a distinction between two types of reflection, secondary and primary. In The Mystery of Being, Marcel defined a problem as a task that requires a solution that is available for everybody. What is distinctive about a problem is that it requires an abstraction at the conceptual level from the lived experience of the person who is dealing with the problem. Marcel illustrated this point with an example from his school days, when he was unable to figure out how the wires in an electrical circuit joined together to produce a current. Problems of this sort are objective and universal and can be solved in principle by anyone; they require what Marcel called primary reflection. This is ordinary, everyday reflection; it involves functional, abstract logical analysis and is also the realm of academic disciplines, including theology, science, and philosophy itself. Primary reflection is an essential part of human engagement with reality, a fact Marcel did not wish to deny, but he did wish to challenge the view that it is the only type of reflection or that every human question or concern should be approached by means of primary reflection. He believed that modern philosophy has lost its way because it mistakenly judges that any issue that cannot be analyzed in this abstract, scientific way is not a real area of knowledge.”

“Marcel argued, however, that there is another realm of human experience - the realm of mystery - that cannot be fully understood by means of primary reflection. A deeper type of reflection will be required in order to gain access to that realm (see below Experience and reflection). In On the Ontological Mystery, Marcel characterized a mystery as a problem that encroaches on its own data. The point is best understood by saying that, in the case of a mystery, the questioner is directly involved in the question and so is unable to separate from it in order to study it in an objective manner (and thereby seek an objective solution that would be accessible to everyone). In the realm of mystery, it is not possible to substitute one person for another without altering the question itself. There are several key areas of mystery in human life, according to Marcel: the embodiment of the human subject; the unity of body and mind; and the central human
experiences of faith, fidelity, hope, and love. Marcel illustrated these points with several powerful examples. One concerns what philosophers of religion often refer to as the problem of evil, or the problem of how to reconcile the all-good and all-powerful nature of God with the existence of evil in human experience. Marcel wished to distinguish this problem from what he called the mystery of evil - the way in which an experience of evil affects one in one’s personal life and how one might try to cope with it. In the former case, the problem is considered at an abstract level, and, while the discussion is not without value, it leaves out the issue about evil that most troubles people - the concrete experience of evil itself and how to respond to it. In On the Ontological Mystery, Marcel observed that ‘I can only grasp it as evil in the measure in which it touches me— that is to say, in the measure in which I am involved,…Being ‘involved’ is the fundamental fact’. At the level of primary reflection, the philosopher seeks a universal objective solution, but such a solution is not appropriate at the level of existential contact, according to Marcel, because the experience of the individual is necessarily excluded in the move to abstraction.

Marcel appealed in several places to the example of fidelity to illustrate the key point. Human beings have a fundamental understanding of fidelity not through conceptual analysis but through experience. Indeed, the meaning of fidelity is very difficult to state in conceptual terms, and it is especially difficult to state necessary and sufficient conditions for fidelity. In typical phenomenological fashion, Marcel approached the problem of definition in a concrete way. One might imagine, for example, that fidelity - or faithfulness to a person - requires that the person to whom one is faithful be alive, but Marcel thought it possible to be faithful in certain cases to a person who is deceased. After several failed attempts to capture its nature in conceptual terms, it becomes clear that fidelity is an experience that is hard to define, but it is easy to recognize when one is in the presence of fidelity. Fidelity is an experience that involves the questioner, and, as such, it belongs to the realm of mystery. Marcel, however, did not believe that the realm of mystery is unknowable or that it is a mystical realm. Such a position would invite charges of irrationalism and would subordinate reason and objective truth to personal subjectivity. Mysteries are found at the level of being - the level at which experience is unified, the level at which the distinction between concept and object breaks down. In this realm, reflection on experience and experience
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itself cannot be separated without distorting the experience in question. Thinking about the realm of mystery prompted Marcel to introduce the concept of secondary reflection, which he contrasted with primary reflection, a distinction that also parallels the distinction between problem and mystery. In The Mystery of Being, Marcel noted: Roughly, we can say that where primary reflection tends to dissolve the unity of experience which is first put before it, the function of secondary reflection is essentially recuperative; it reconquers that unity."458

“It is difficult to provide a philosophical account of secondary reflection because it is fundamentally non-conceptual; it is also a movement that helps one to recover those experiences which have been the subject of conceptual analysis but whose meaning has proved elusive because the questioner is removed at the level of primary reflection. Secondary reflection, therefore, can be said to have two aspects. The first is critical reflection on the nature of reflection itself, which reveals that everyday reflective thinking, including in philosophy, theology, and science, does not provide an adequate description of the nature of the self or of key human experiences (faith, fidelity, hope, and love). Such critical reflection also shows the failure of modern epistemology-including the generation of the problem of skepticism - because it begins from the wrong starting point, an artificial split between the self and the world. The second aspect of secondary reflection involves a process of recovery, or what Marcel called, in The Philosophy of Existentialism, an assurance of the realm of mystery. Throughout Marcel’s work there is an attempt to reveal objective structures of human existence by means of the process of secondary reflection, a process that helps individuals to appreciate and recover defining human experiences. He believed that such experiences are expressive of the depth of human nature but that they are often lost in the modern world. Secondary reflection is a way of helping the individual to recover something of those experiences, so its dual aspect as a critique and as a recovery is important. It also allows some rational, objective access to the realm of personal experience. Marcel insisted that such profound experiences are objective - i.e., the same for all human beings - and so there is no possibility of a relativism or subjectivism about experience. Nor is he trying to denigrate primary reflection - the realm of objective knowledge - but wishes to show its proper role in human life and that it is important not to overstate its value."459

The Broken World: “A major theme in Marcel is the notion that human beings live in a broken world (le monde cassé). He meant to convey a number of points by this claim, one that he returned to in different forms in his work. First, the notion of being has been lost in the modern world, replaced by a near-obsession with the power of primary reflection; the modern world is under the sway of what Marcel called the spirit of abstraction (Man against Mass Society). Second, one manifestation of the dominance of primary reflection is the increasing bureaucratization of modern culture, which often identifies human beings with their functional roles in society and which therefore stultifies their inner lives and their creativity to such an extent that people’s self-worth is often directly tied to the social status of their jobs or their potential for owning material possessions. That situation leads to alienation, a key theme in the existentialist movement in general. Marcel elaborated on the broken world by means of yet another distinction that flowed out of earlier themes: that between disponibilité and indisponibilité (usually translated in English as availability and unavailability). Disponibilité describes the degree to which an individual is available for another. Such availability is part of the essence of intersubjective relations but is denigrated in the broken world, dominated as it is by selfishness, emphasis on individual autonomy, instrumentality, and the desire for material success. Indisponibilité is the opposite attitude. It is to approach intersubjective relations in a selfish way - in the language of Immanuel Kant, as a means rather than as an end or, in the language of Martin Buber (a philosopher whose work is very similar to Marcel’s in a number of areas), as an ‘I-It’ rather than as an ‘I-Thou’. In the broken world, the
attitude of ‘I-It’ dominates human relationships at all levels. Marcel illustrated the point with the example of a person who is sitting in the same room but who is not ‘present’ to me, in contrast to a person who is ‘present’ to me but who may be miles away (The Mystery of Being). Third, the broken world is characterized by an obsession with technology and with science as a means of solving all human problems. Marcel did not advocate that technology should be given up, but he argued that it often leads to a smothering of the life of the spirit because it seduces people into equating material comfort with human fulfillment, among other temptations. The experience of the broken world can lead an individual into deep despair, often manifested in lack of self-worth, a feeling of alienation, and a loss of confidence that life has an overall meaning. Finally, however, the human person has as part of its structure what Marcel called an ontological exigency - a need for being, a need to develop the inner life of the spirit in creativity and freedom, including in its ethical dimensions. Ontological exigency is not merely a form of wishful thinking but is an interior urge - an appeal or a call - that offers the human person an ontological hope in the ultimate rationality and meaningfulness of reality. That reassertion of human essence is the beginning of a rejection of the category of having in coming to terms with human existence.”

Religious Belief: “Marcel’s thought has a clear religious dimension, and he recognized early on that it was leading him in a religious direction even though he then had no strong religious beliefs and no formal religious upbringing. His thinking led to his conversion to Roman Catholicism in 1929, and he is now often referred to as a theistic or Christian existentialist. Marcel’s approach to religious belief was notably existentialist, and it is no surprise that he distanced himself from traditional philosophy of religion. Indeed, he remained suspicious of attempts to prove the existence of God or to offer arguments in support of religious belief. Such attempts are an exercise in primary reflection, and, while not without value, they necessarily preclude an experience of God. The essence of religious belief involves an experiential aspect, so the intellectual discussion is necessarily limited. Marcel’s experiential approach to religious belief was rooted in the phenomenological method. He believed that the profound experiences he described in his work - fidelity, hope, disponibilité, and intersubjective relations, all of which involve commitments and relations that elude conceptual description - are best explained if they are understood as being pledged to a transcendent reality, what he often called an ‘Absolute Thou’. Again, drawing upon the example of fidelity, Marcel held that fidelity involves a certain way of being with another person; it is creative because it calls upon the individual to remain open.”

Such experiences have a religious dimension because, as Clyde Pax, another Marcel scholar, put it, the individual often appeals to an ultimate strength, which enables him to make the pledge that he knows he cannot make from himself alone. The pledge to the “Absolute Thou” makes the unconditional commitment that is typical of these types of relationships both possible and intelligible. With regard to the ultimate hope in the meaning of human existence, Marcel observed (in Homo Viator): The only possible source from which this absolute hope springs must once more be stressed. It appears as a response of the creature to the infinite Being to whom it is conscious of owing everything that it has and upon whom it cannot impose any condition whatsoever. It is in that context that Marcel argued that it is no surprise that many human beings experience their lives as a gift. Of course, a gift requires a gift-giver, an example of an indirect argument for the existence of a Supreme Being, one of several to be found in Marcel’s work. Marcel’s thought continues to attract attention in the 21st century because of the enduring relevance of his key themes and the widespread influence of some of the difficulties he identified. These include the phenomenon of the broken world, the hegemony of science and technology, and the stultifying of the life of the spirit in contemporary life and culture, all amid the necessity of responding to the human call for transcendence.”
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Albert Camus (1913-57): “French novelist, essayist, and playwright, best known for such novels as *L’Étranger* (1942; The Stranger), *La Peste* (1947; The Plague), and *La Chute* (1956; The Fall) and for his work in leftist causes. He received the 1957 Nobel Prize for Literature.”

**Early Years:** Less than a year after Camus was born, his father, an impoverished worker, was killed in World War I during the First Battle of the Marne. His mother, of Spanish descent, did housework to support her family. Camus and his elder brother Lucien moved with their mother to a working-class district of Algiers, where all three lived, together with the maternal grandmother and a paralyzed uncle, in a two-room apartment. Camus’s first published collection of essays, *L’Envers et l’endroit* (1937; “The Wrong Side and the Right Side”), describes the physical setting of these early years and includes portraits of his mother, grandmother, and uncle. A second collection of essays, *Noces* (1938; “Nuptials”), contains intensely lyrical meditations on the Algerian countryside and presents natural beauty as a form of wealth that even the very poor can enjoy. Both collections contrast the fragile mortality of human beings with the enduring nature of the physical world. In 1918 Camus entered primary school and was fortunate enough to be taught by an outstanding teacher, Louis Germain, who helped him to win a scholarship to the Algiers lycée (high school) in 1923. A period of intellectual awakening followed, accompanied by great enthusiasm for sport, especially football (soccer), swimming, and boxing. In 1930, however, the first of several severe attacks of tuberculosis put an end to his sporting career and interrupted his studies. Camus had to leave the unhealthy apartment that had been his home for 15 years, and, after a short period spent with an uncle, Camus decided to live on his own, supporting himself by a variety of jobs while registered as a philosophy student at the University of Algiers. At the university, Camus was particularly influenced by one of his teachers, Jean Grenier, who helped him to develop his literary and philosophical ideas and shared his enthusiasm for football. He obtained a diplôme d’études supérieures in 1936 for a thesis on the relationship between Greek and Christian thought in the philosophical writings of Plotinus and St. Augustine. His candidature for the agrégation was cut short by another attack of tuberculosis. To regain his health, he went to a resort in the French Alps - his first visit to Europe - and eventually returned to Algiers via Florence, Pisa, and Genoa. \(^ {461} \)

**Assessment:** “As novelist and playwright, moralist and political theorist, Albert Camus after World War II became the spokesman of his own generation and the mentor of the next, not only in France but also in Europe and eventually the world. His writings, which addressed themselves mainly to the isolation of man in an alien universe, the estrangement of the individual from himself, the problem of evil, and the pressing finality of death, accurately reflected the alienation and disillusionment of the postwar intellectual. He is remembered, with Sartre, as a leading practitioner of the existential novel. Though he understood the nihilism of many of his contemporaries, Camus also argued the necessity of defending such values as truth, moderation, and justice. In his last works he sketched the outlines of a liberal humanism that rejected the dogmatic aspects of both Christianity and Marxism.”\(^ {462} \)

Photo III-6-10. Albert Camus (1913-60), French Novelist
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Today, psychology is defined as the scientific study of behavior and mental processes. Philosophical interest in the mind and behavior dates back to the ancient civilizations of Egypt, Persia, Greece, China, and India. For a condensed overview, see the Timeline of Psychology article The history of psychology as a scholarly study of the mind and behavior dates back to the Ancient Greeks. There is also evidence of psychological thought in ancient Egypt. Psychology was a branch of philosophy until the 1870s, when it developed as an independent scientific discipline in Germany and the United States. Psychology borders on various other fields including physiology, neuroscience, artificial intelligence, sociology, anthropology, as well as philosophy and other components of the humanities. Psychology as a self-conscious field of experimental study began in 1879, when Wilhelm Wundt founded the first laboratory dedicated exclusively to psychological research in Leipzig, Germany. Wundt was also the first person to refer to himself as a psychologist. Other important early contributors to the field include Hermann Ebbinghaus (a pioneer in the study of memory), William James (the American father of pragmatism), and Ivan Pavlov (who developed the procedures associated with classical conditioning).

“Soon after the development of experimental psychology, various kinds of applied psychology appeared. G. Stanley Hall brought scientific pedagogy to the United States from Germany in the early 1880s. John Dewey's educational theory of the 1890s was another example. Also, in the 1890s, Hugo Münsterberg began writing about the application of psychology to industry, law, and other fields. Lightner Witmer established the first psychological clinic in the 1890s. James McKeen Cattell adapted Francis Galton's anthropometric methods to generate the first program of mental testing in the 1890s. In Vienna, meanwhile, Sigmund Freud developed an independent approach to the study of the mind called psychoanalysis, which has been widely influential. The 20th century saw a reaction to Edward Titchener's critique of Wundt's empiricism. This contributed to the formulation of behaviorism by John B. Watson, which was popularized by B. F. Skinner. Behaviorism proposed emphasizing the study of overt behavior, because that could be quantified and easily measured. Early behaviorists considered study of the mind too vague for productive scientific study. However, Skinner and his colleagues did study thinking as a form of covert behavior to which they could apply the same principles as overt (publicly observable) behavior. The final decades of the 20th century saw the rise of cognitive science, an interdisciplinary approach to studying the human mind. Cognitive science again considers the mind as a subject for investigation, using the tools of evolutionary psychology, linguistics, computer science, philosophy, behaviorism, and neurobiology. This form of investigation has proposed that a wide understanding of the human mind is possible, and that such an understanding may be applied to other research domains, such as artificial intelligence.”

“Concurrently, in a curious juxtaposition, the psychoanalytic theories and therapeutic practices developed by the Vienna-trained physician Sigmund Freud and his many disciples - beginning early in the 20th century and enduring for many decades - were upsetting the view of human nature as a rational entity. Freudian theory made reason secondary: for Freud, the unconscious and its often socially unacceptable irrational motives and desires, particularly the sexual and aggressive, were the driving force underlying much of human behavior and mental illness and symptom formation. Making the unconscious conscious became the therapeutic goal of clinicians working within this framework. Freud proposed that much of what humans feel, think, and do is outside awareness, self-defensive in its motivations, and unconsciously determined. Much of it also reflects conflicts grounded in early childhood that play out in complex patterns of seemingly paradoxical behaviors and symptoms.”
Beginning of Western Psychology: "Many of the Ancients' writings would have been lost had it not been for the efforts of the Christian, Jewish and Persian translators in the House of Wisdom, the House of Knowledge, and other such institutions in the Islamic Golden Age, whose glosses and commentaries were later translated into Latin in the 12th century. However, it is not clear how these sources first came to be used during the Renaissance, and their influence on what would later emerge as the discipline of psychology is a topic of scholarly debate."

(a) Etymology and early usage of word: "The first use of the term psychology is often attributed to the German scholastic philosopher Rudolf Göckel (1547–1628), who published the Psychologia hoc est: de hominis perfectione, animo et imprimis ortu hujus… in Marburg in 1590. However, the term seems to have been used more than six decades earlier by the Croatian humanist Marko Marulić (1450–1524) in the title of his Latin treatise, Psychiologia de ratione animae humanae. Although the treatise itself has not been preserved, its title appears in a list of Marulić's works compiled by his younger contemporary, Franjo Bozicevic-Natalis in his 'Vita Marci Maruli Spalatensis' (Krstić, 1964). The term did not come into popular usage until the German Rationalist philosopher, Christian Wolff (1679–1754) used it in his works Psychologia empirica (1732) and Psychologia rationalis (1734). This distinction between empirical and rational psychology was picked up in Denis Diderot's (1713–1780) and Jean le Rond d'Alembert's (1717–1783) Encyclopédie (1751–1784) and was popularized in France by Maine de Biran (1766–1824). In England, the term psychology overtook mental philosophy in the middle of the 19th century, especially in the work of William Hamilton (1788–1856)."

(b) Enlightenment psychological thought: "Early psychology was regarded as the study of the soul (in the Christian sense of the term). The modern philosophical form of psychology was heavily influenced by the works of René Descartes (1596–1650), and the debates that he generated, of which the most relevant were the objections to his Meditations on First Philosophy (1641), published with the text. Also important to the later development of psychology were his Passions of the Soul (1649) and Treatise on Man (completed in 1632 but, along with the rest of The World, withheld from publication after Descartes heard of the Catholic Church's condemnation of Galileo; it was eventually published posthumously, in 1664)."

"Although not educated as a physician, Descartes did extensive anatomical studies of bulls' hearts and was considered important enough that William Harvey responded to him. Descartes was one of the first to endorse Harvey's model of the circulation of the blood but disagreed with his metaphysical framework to explain it. Descartes dissected animals and human cadavers and as a result was familiar with the research on the flow of blood leading to the conclusion that the body is a complex device that is capable of moving without the soul, thus contradicting the "Doctrine of the Soul". The emergence of psychology as a medical discipline was given a major boost by Thomas Willis, not only in his reference to psychology (the Doctrine of the Soul) in terms of brain function, but through his detailed 1672 anatomical work, and his treatise De anima brutorum quaer hominis vitalis ac sentitiva est: exercitationes duae (Two Discourses on the Souls of Brutes - meaning beasts). However, Willis acknowledged the influence of Descartes's rival, Pierre Gassendi, as an inspiration for his work."

"The philosophers of the British Empiricist and Associationist schools had a profound impact on the later course of experimental psychology. John Locke's An Essay Concerning Human Understanding (1689), George Berkeley's Treatise Concerning the Principles of Human Knowledge (1710), and David Hume's A Treatise of Human Nature (1739–1740) were particularly influential, as were David Hartley's Observations on Man (1749) and John Stuart Mill's A System of Logic (1843). Also notable was the work of some Continental Rationalist philosophers, especially Baruch Spinoza's (1632–1677) On the Improvement of the Understanding (1662) and
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Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz's (1646–1716) *New Essays on Human Understanding* (completed 1705, published 1765). Also, was an important contribution Friedrich August Rauch’s (1806–1841) book *Psychology: Or, A View of the Human Soul; Including Anthropology* (1840), the first English exposition of Hegelian philosophy for an American audience. The Danish philosopher Søren Kierkegaard also influenced the humanistic, existential, and modern psychological schools with his works *The Concept of Anxiety* (1844) and *The Sickness Unto Death* (1849).

(c) **Transition to contemporary psychology:** “Also influential on the emerging discipline of psychology were debates surrounding the efficacy of Mesmerism (a precursor to hypnosis) and the value of phrenology. The former was developed in the 1770s by Austrian physician Franz Mesmer (1734–1815) who claimed to use the power of gravity, and later of animal magnetism, to cure various physical and mental ills. As Mesmer and his treatment became increasingly fashionable in both Vienna and Paris, it also began to come under the scrutiny of suspicious officials. In 1784, an investigation was commissioned in Paris by King Louis XVI which included American ambassador Benjamin Franklin, chemist Antoine Lavoisier and physician Joseph-Ignace Guillotin (later the popularizer of the guillotine). They concluded that Mesmer’s method was useless. Abbé Faria, an Indo-Portuguese priest, revived public attention in animal magnetism. Unlike Mesmer, Faria claimed that the effect was 'generated from within the mind' by the power of expectancy and cooperation of the patient. Although disputed, the magnetic tradition continued among Mesmer’s students and others, resurfacing in England in the 19th century in the work of the physician John Elliotson (1791–1868), and the surgeons James Esdaile (1808–1859), and James Braid (1795–1860) (who re-conceptualized it as property of the subject’s mind rather than a power of the Mesmerist’s, and relabeled it hypnotism). Mesmerism also continued to have a strong social (if not medical) following in England through the 19th century (see Winter, 1998). Faria’s approach was significantly extended by the clinical and theoretical work of Ambroise-Auguste Liébeault and Hippolyte Bernheim of the Nancy School. Faria’s theoretical position, and the subsequent experiences of those in the Nancy School made significant contributions to the later autouggestion techniques of Émile Coué. It was adopted for the treatment of hysteria by the director of Paris’s Salpêtrière Hospital, Jean-Martin Charcot (1825–1893).

“Phrenology began as organology, a theory of brain structure developed by the German physician, Franz Joseph Gall (1758–1828). Gall argued that the brain is divided into a large number of functional organs, each responsible for particular human mental abilities and dispositions – hope, love, spirituality, greed, language, the abilities to detect the size, form, and color of objects, etc. He argued that the larger each of these organs are, the greater the power of the corresponding mental trait. Further, he argued that one could detect the sizes of the organs in a given individual by feeling the surface of that person’s skull. Gall’s ultra-localizationist position with respect to the brain was soon attacked, most notably by French anatomist Pierre Flourens (1794–1867), who conducted ablation studies (on chickens) which purported to demonstrate little or no cerebral localization of function. Although Gall had been a serious (if misguided) researcher, his theory was taken by his assistant, Johann Gaspar Spurzheim (1776–1832), and developed into the profitable, popular enterprise of phrenology, which soon spawned, especially in Britain, a thriving industry of independent practitioners. In the hands of Scottish religious leader George Combe (1788–1858) (whose book *The Constitution of Man* was one of the best-sellers of the century), phrenology became strongly associated with political reform movements and egalitarian principles (see, e.g., Shapin, 1975; but also see van Wyhe, 2004). Phrenology soon spread to America as well, where itinerant practical phrenologists assessed the mental well-being of willing customers (see Sokal, 2001).
Emergence of German experimental psychology: “Johann Friedrich Herbart (1776–1841) took issue with what he viewed as Kant’s conclusion and attempted to develop a mathematical basis for a scientific psychology. Although he was unable to empirically realize the terms of his psychological theory, his efforts did lead scientists such as Ernst Heinrich Weber (1795–1878) and Gustav Theodor Fechner (1801–1887) to attempt to measure the mathematical relationships between the physical magnitudes of external stimuli and the psychological intensities of the resulting sensations. Fechner (1860) is the originator of the term psychophysics. Meanwhile, individual differences in reaction time had become a critical issue in the field of astronomy, under the name of the personal equation. Early researches by Friedrich Wilhelm Bessel (1784–1846) in Königsberg and Adolf Hirsch led to the development of a highly precise chronoscope by Matthäus Hipp that, in turn, was based on a design by Charles Wheatstone for a device that measured the speed of artillery shells (Edgell & Symes, 1906). Other timing instruments were borrowed from physiology (e.g., Carl Ludwig’s kymograph) and adapted for use by the Utrecht ophthalmologist Franciscus Donders (1818–1899) and his student Johan Jacob de Jaager in measuring the duration of simple mental decisions.”

“The 19th century was also the period in which physiology, including neurophysiology, professionalized and saw some of its most significant discoveries. Among its leaders were Charles Bell (1774–1843) and François Magendie (1783–1855) who independently discovered the distinction between sensory and motor nerves in the spinal column, Johannes Müller (1801–1855) who proposed the doctrine of specific nerve energies, Emil du Bois-Reymond (1818–1896) who studied the electrical basis of muscle contraction, Pierre Paul Broca (1824–1880) and Carl Wernicke (1848–1905) who identified areas of the brain responsible for different aspects of language, as well as Gustav Fritsch (1837–1927), Eduard Hitzig (1839–1907), and David Ferrier (1843–1924) who localized sensory and motor areas of the brain. One of the principal founders of experimental physiology, Hermann Helmholtz (1821–1894), conducted studies of a wide range of topics that would later be of interest to psychologists – the speed of neural transmission, the natures of sound and color, and of our perceptions of them, etc. In the 1860s, while he held a position in Heidelberg, Helmholtz engaged as an assistant a young M.D. named Wilhelm Wundt. Wundt employed the equipment of the physiology laboratory – chronoscope, kymograph, and various peripheral devices – to address more complicated psychological questions than had, until then, been investigated experimentally. In particular he was interested in the nature of apperception – the point at which a perception occupies the central focus of conscious awareness.”

“In 1874 Wundt took up a professorship in Zürich, where he published his landmark textbook, Grundzüge der physiologischen Psychologie (Principles of Physiological Psychology, 1874). Moving to a more prestigious professorship in Leipzig in 1875, Wundt founded a laboratory specifically dedicated to original research in experimental psychology in 1879, the first laboratory of its kind in the world. In 1883, he launched a journal in which to publish the results of his, and his students’, research, Philosophische Studien (Philosophical Studies) (For more on Wundt, see, e.g., Bringmann & Tweney, 1980; Rieber & Robinson, 2001). Wundt attracted a large number of students not only from Germany, but also from abroad. Among his most influential American students were G. Stanley Hall (who had already obtained a PhD from Harvard under the supervision of William James), James McKeen Cattell (who was Wundt’s first assistant), and Frank Angell (who founded laboratories at both Cornell and Stanford). The most influential British student was Edward Bradford Titchener (who later became professor at Cornell). Experimental psychology laboratories were soon also established at Berlin by Carl Stumpf (1848–1936) and at Göttingen by Georg Elias Müller (1850–1934). Another major German experimental psychologist of the era… was Hermann Ebbinghaus (1850–1909).”
Early American Psychology: “Around 1875 the Harvard physiology instructor (as he then was), William James, opened a small experimental psychology demonstration laboratory for use with his courses. The laboratory was never used, at that time, for original research, and so controversy remains as to whether it is to be regarded as the first experimental psychology laboratory or not. In 1878, James gave a series of lectures at Johns Hopkins University entitled ‘The Senses and the Brain and their Relation to Thought’ in which he argued, contra Thomas Henry Huxley, that consciousness is not epiphenomenal, but must have an evolutionary function, or it would not have been naturally selected in humans. The same year James was contracted by Henry Holt to write a textbook on the "new" experimental psychology. If he had written it quickly, it would have been the first English-language textbook on the topic. It was twelve years, however, before his two-volume The Principles of Psychology would be published. In the meantime, textbooks were published by George Trumbull Ladd of Yale (1887) and James Mark Baldwin then of Lake Forest College (1889).”

“In 1879 Charles Sanders Peirce was hired as a philosophy instructor at Johns Hopkins University. Although better known for his astronomical and philosophical work, Peirce also conducted what are perhaps the first American psychology experiments, on the subject of color vision, published in 1877 in the American Journal of Science (see Cadwallader, 1974). Peirce and his student Joseph Jastrow published "On Small Differences in Sensation" in the Memoirs of the National Academy of Sciences, in 1884. In 1882, Peirce was joined at Johns Hopkins by G. Stanley Hall, who opened the first American research laboratory devoted to experimental psychology in 1883. Peirce was forced out of his position by scandal and Hall was awarded the only professorship in philosophy at Johns Hopkins. In 1887 Hall founded the American Journal of Psychology, which published work primarily emanating from his own laboratory. In 1888 Hall left his Johns Hopkins professorship for the presidency of the newly founded Clark University, where he remained for the rest of his career.”

“Soon, experimental psychology laboratories were opened at the University of Pennsylvania (in 1887, by James McKeen Cattell), Indiana University (1888, William Lowe Bryan), the University of Wisconsin (1888, Joseph Jastrow), Clark University (1889, Edmund Sanford), the McLean Asylum (1889, William Noyes), and the University of Nebraska (1889, Harry Kirke Wolfe). However, it was Princeton University's Eno Hall, built in 1924, that became the first university building in the United States to be devoted entirely to experimental psychology when it became the home of the university's Department of Psychology. In 1890, William James' The Principles of Psychology finally appeared, and rapidly became the most influential textbook in the history of American psychology. It laid many of the foundations for the sorts of questions that American psychologists would focus on for years to come. The book's chapters on consciousness, emotion, and habit were particularly agenda-setting. One of those who felt the impact of James' Principles was John Dewey, then professor of philosophy at the University of Michigan. With his junior colleagues, James Hayden Tufts (who founded the psychology laboratory at Michigan) and George Herbert Mead, and his student James Rowland Angell, this group began to reformulate psychology, focusing more strongly on the social environment and on the activity of mind and behavior than the psychophysics-inspired physiological psychology of Wundt and his followers had heretofore. Tufts left Michigan for another junior position at the newly founded University of Chicago in 1892. A year later, the senior philosopher at Chicago, Charles Strong, resigned, and Tufts recommended to Chicago president William Rainey Harper that Dewey be offered the position. After initial reluctance, Dewey was hired in 1894. Dewey soon filled out the department with his Michigan companions Mead and Angell. These four formed the core of the Chicago School of psychology.”
“In 1892, G. Stanley Hall invited 30-some psychologists and philosophers to a meeting at Clark with the purpose of founding a new American Psychological Association (APA). (On the history of the APA, see Evans, Staudt Sexton, & Cadwallader, 1992.) The first annual meeting of the APA was held later that year, hosted by George Stuart Fullerton at the University of Pennsylvania. Almost immediately tension arose between the experimentally and philosophically inclined members of the APA. Edward Bradford Titchener and Lightner Witmer launched an attempt to either establish a separate "Section" for philosophical presentations, or to eject the philosophers altogether. After nearly a decade of debate, a Western Philosophical Association was founded and held its first meeting in 1901 at the University of Nebraska. The following year (1902), an American Philosophical Association held its first meeting at Columbia University. These ultimately became the Central and Eastern Divisions of the modern American Philosophical Association. In 1894, a number of psychologists, unhappy with the parochial editorial policies of the American Journal of Psychology approached Hall about appointing an editorial board and opening the journal out to more psychologists not within Hall's immediate circle. Hall refused, so James McKeen Cattell (then of Columbia) and James Mark Baldwin (then of Princeton) co-founded a new journal, Psychological Review, which rapidly grew to become a major outlet for American psychological researchers.”

“Beginning in 1895, James Mark Baldwin (Princeton, Hopkins) and Edward Bradford Titchener (Cornell) entered into an increasingly acrimonious dispute over the correct interpretation of some anomalous reaction time findings that had come from the Wundt laboratory (originally reported by Ludwig Lange and James McKeen Cattell). In 1896, James Rowland Angell and Addison W. Moore (Chicago) published a series of experiments in Psychological Review appearing to show that Baldwin was the more correct of the two. However, they interpreted their findings in light of John Dewey's new approach to psychology, which rejected the traditional stimulus-response understanding of the reflex arc in favor of a "circular" account in which what serves as "stimulus" and what as "response" depends on how one views the situation. The full position was laid out in Dewey's landmark article "The Reflex Arc Concept in Psychology" which also appeared in Psychological Review in 1896.

Titchener responded in Philosophical Review (1898, 1899) by distinguishing his austere "structural" approach to psychology from what he termed the Chicago group's more applied "functional" approach, and thus began the first major theoretical rift in American psychology between Structuralism and Functionalism. The group at Columbia, led by James McKeen Cattell, Edward L. Thorndike, and Robert S. Woodworth, was often regarded as a second (after Chicago) "school" of American Functionalism (see, e.g., Heidbredder, 1933), although they never used that term themselves, because their research focused on the applied areas of mental testing, learning, and education. Dewey was elected president of the APA in 1899, while Titchener dropped his membership in the association. (In 1904, Titchener formed his own group, eventually known as the Society of Experimental Psychologists.) Jastrow promoted the functionalist approach in his APA presidential address of 1900, and Angell adopted Titchener's label explicitly in his influential textbook of 1904 and his APA presidential address of 1906. In reality, Structuralism was, more or less, confined to Titchener and his students.[citation needed] (It was Titchener's former student E. G. Boring, writing A History of Experimental Psychology [1929–1950, the most influential textbook of the 20th century about the discipline], who launched the common idea that the structuralism/functionalism debate was the primary fault line in American psychology at the turn of the 20th century.) Functionalism, broadly speaking, with its more practical emphasis on action and application, better suited the American cultural "style" and, perhaps more important, was more appealing to pragmatic university trustees and private funding agencies.”
Chapter III. History of Philosophy

7. Psychoanalysis: Sigmund Freud and Carl G. Jung

“Psychoanalysis is a set of theories and therapeutic techniques related to the study of the unconscious mind, which together form a method of treatment for mental-health disorders. The discipline was established in the early 1890s by Austrian neurologist Sigmund Freud and stemmed partly from the clinical work of Josef Breuer and others. Freud first used the term psychoanalysis (in French) in 1896. Die Traumdeutung (The Interpretation of Dreams), which Freud saw as his most significant work, appeared in November 1899. Psychoanalysis was later developed in different directions, mostly by students of Freud such as Alfred Adler and Carl Gustav Jung, and by neo-Freudians such as Erich Fromm, Karen Horney and Harry Stack Sullivan. Freud retained the term psychoanalysis for his own school of thought. The basic tenets of psychoanalysis include: (1) a person’s development is determined by often forgotten events in early childhood, rather than by inherited traits alone; (2) human behavior and cognition is largely determined by irrational drives that are rooted in the unconscious; (3) attempts to bring those drives into awareness triggers resistance in the form of defense mechanisms, particularly repression; (4) conflicts between conscious and unconscious material can result in mental disturbances such as neurosis, neurotic traits, anxiety and depression; (5) unconscious material can be found in dreams and unintentional acts, including mannerisms and slips of the tongue; (6) liberation from the effects of the unconscious is achieved by bringing this material into the conscious mind through therapeutic intervention; (7) the centerpiece of the psychoanalytic process is the transference, whereby patients relive their infantile conflicts by projecting onto the analyst feelings of love, dependence and anger. During psychoanalytic sessions, which typically last 50 minutes and ideally take place 4–5 times a week, the patient (the analysand) may lie on a couch, with the analyst often sitting just behind and out of sight. The patient expresses his or her thoughts, including free associations, fantasies and dreams, from which the analyst infers the unconscious conflicts causing the patient’s symptoms and character problems. Through the analysis of these conflicts, which includes interpreting the transference and countertransference (the analyst’s feelings for the patient), the analyst confronts the patient’s pathological defenses to help the patient gain insight. Psychoanalysis is a controversial discipline and its validity as a science is contested. Nonetheless, it remains a strong influence within psychiatry, more so in some quarters than others. Psychoanalytic concepts are also widely used outside the therapeutic arena, in areas such as psychoanalytic literary criticism, as well as in the analysis and deconstruction of film, fairy tales and other cultural phenomena.”

History: 1890s: “The idea of psychoanalysis (German: Psychoanalyse) first started to receive serious attention under Sigmund Freud, who formulated his own theory of psychoanalysis in Vienna in the 1890s. Freud was a neurologist trying to find an effective treatment for patients with neurotic or hysterical symptoms. Freud realized that there were mental processes that were not conscious, whilst he was employed as a neurological consultant at the Children's Hospital, where he noticed that many aphasic children had no apparent organic cause for their symptoms. He then wrote a monograph about this subject. In 1885, Freud obtained a grant to study with Jean-Martin Charcot, a famed neurologist, at the Salpêtrière in Paris, where Freud followed the clinical presentations of Charcot, particularly in the areas of hysteria, paralyses and the anaesthesias. Charcot had introduced hypnotism as an experimental research tool and developed the photographic representation of clinical symptoms. Freud's first theory to explain hysterical symptoms was presented in Studies on Hysteria (1895), co-authored with his mentor the distinguished physician Josef Breuer, which was generally seen as the birth of psychoanalysis. The work was based on Breuer's treatment of Bertha Pappenheim, referred to incase studies by the
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Photo III-7-1. Sigmund Freud (1856-1939), the founder of psychoanalysis, Austrian
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Photo III-7-2. Carl Jung, Swiss psychoanalyst
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Photo III-7-3. International Psychoanalytic Congress. Photograph, 1911. Freud and Jung in the center
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pseudonym Anna O., treatment which Pappenheim herself had dubbed the talking cure. Breuer wrote that many factors that could result in such symptoms, including various types of emotional trauma, and he also credited work by others such as Pierre Janet; while Freud contended that at the root of hysterical symptoms were repressed memories of distressing occurrences, almost always having direct or indirect sexual associations. Around the same time Freud attempted to develop a neuro-physiological theory of unconscious mental mechanisms, which he soon gave up. It remained unpublished in his lifetime.478

“In 1896 Freud published his so-called seduction theory which proposed that the preconditions for hysterical symptoms are sexual excitations in infancy, and he claimed to have uncovered repressed memories of incidents of sexual abuse for all his current patients. However, by 1898 he had privately acknowledged to his friend and colleague Wilhelm Fliess that he no longer believed in his theory, though he did not state this publicly until 1906. Though in 1896 he had reported that his patients had no feeling of remembering the [infantile sexual] scenes, and assured him emphatically of their unbelief, in later accounts he claimed that they had told him that they had been sexually abused in infancy. This became the received historical account until challenged by several Freud scholars in the latter part of the 20th century who argued that he had imposed his preconceived notions on his patients. However, building on his claims that the patients reported infantile sexual abuse experiences, Freud subsequently contended that his clinical findings in the mid-1890s provided evidence of the occurrence of unconscious fantasies, supposedly to cover up memories of infantile masturbation. Only much later did he claim the same findings as evidence for Oedipal desires.479

1900-1940s: By 1900, Freud had theorized that dreams had symbolic significance, and generally were specific to the dreamer. Freud formulated his second psychological theory - which hypothesizes that the unconscious has or is a primary process consisting of symbolic and condensed thoughts, and a secondary process of logical, conscious thoughts. This theory was published in his 1900 book, *The Interpretation of Dreams*. Chapter VII was a re-working of the earlier Project and Freud outlined his Topographic Theory. In this theory, which was mostly later supplanted by the Structural Theory, unacceptable sexual wishes were repressed into the System Unconscious, unconscious due to society's condemnation of premarital sexual activity, and this repression created anxiety. This topographic theory is still popular in much of Europe, although it has fallen out of favor in much of North America. In 1905, Freud published *Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality* in which he laid out his discovery of so-called psychosexual phases: oral (ages 0–2), anal (2–4), phallic-oedipal (today called 1st genital) (3–6), latency (6–puberty), and mature genital (puberty-onward). His early formulation included the idea that because of societal restrictions, sexual wishes were repressed into an unconscious state, and that the energy of these unconscious wishes could be turned into anxiety or physical symptoms. Therefore, the early treatment techniques, including hypnotism and abreaction, were designed to make the unconscious conscious in order to relieve the pressure and the apparently resulting symptoms.480

“In *On Narcissism* (1915) Freud turned his attention to the subject of narcissism. Still using an energetic system, Freud characterized the difference between energy directed at the self-versus energy directed at others, called cathexis. By 1917, in *Mourning and Melancholia*, he suggested that certain depressions were caused by turning guilt-ridden anger on the self. In 1919 in *A Child is Being Beaten* he began to address the problems of self-destructive behavior (moral masochism) and frank sexual masochism.[26] Based on his experience with depressed and self-destructive patients, and pondering the carnage of World War I, Freud became dissatisfied with considering only oral and sexual motivations for behavior. By 1920, Freud addressed the power of identification (with the leader and with other members) in groups as a motivation for behavior
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(1920) Freud suggested his dual drive theory of sexuality and aggression in *Beyond the Pleasure Principle*, to try to begin to explain human destructiveness. Also, it was the first appearance of his structural theory consisting of three new concepts: id, ego, and superego. In that same year (1920) Freud suggested his dual drive theory of sexuality and aggression in *Beyond the Pleasure Principle*, to try to begin to explain human destructiveness. Also, it was the first appearance of his structural theory consisting of three new concepts: id, ego, and superego. In that same year (1920) Freud suggested his dual drive theory of sexuality and aggression in *Beyond the Pleasure Principle*, to try to begin to explain human destructiveness. Also, it was the first appearance of his structural theory consisting of three new concepts: id, ego, and superego. In that same year (1920) Freud suggested his dual drive theory of sexuality and aggression in *Beyond the Pleasure Principle*, to try to begin to explain human destructiveness. Also, it was the first appearance of his structural theory consisting of three new concepts: id, ego, and superego.

“Three years later, he summarized the ideas of id, ego, and superego in a book entitled, *The Ego and the Id*. In the book, he revised the whole theory of mental functioning, now considering that repression was only one of many defense mechanisms, and that it occurred to reduce anxiety. Hence, Freud characterized repression as both a cause and a result of anxiety. In 1926, in *Inhibitions, Symptoms and Anxiety*, Freud characterized how intrapsychic conflict among drive and superego (wishes and guilt) caused anxiety, and how that anxiety could lead to an inhibition of mental functions, such as intellect and speech. *Inhibitions, Symptoms and Anxiety* was written in response to Otto Rank, who, in 1924, published Das Trauma der Geburt (translated into English in 1929 as *The Trauma of Birth*), analyzing how art, myth, religion, philosophy and therapy were illuminated by separation anxiety in the phase before the development of the Oedipus complex. Freud's theories, however, characterized no such phase. According to Freud, the Oedipus complex, was at the center of neurosis, and was the foundational source of all art, myth, religion, philosophy, therapy—indeed of all human culture and civilization. It was the first time that anyone in the inner circle had characterized something other than the Oedipus complex as contributing to intrapsychic development, a notion that was rejected by Freud and his followers at the time.

“By 1936 the "Principle of Multiple Function" was clarified by Robert Waelder. He widened the formulation that psychological symptoms were caused by and relieved conflict simultaneously. Moreover, symptoms (such as phobias and compulsions) each represented elements of some drive wish (sexual and/or aggressive), superego, anxiety, reality, and defenses. Also, in 1936, Anna Freud, Sigmund's famous daughter, published her seminal book, *The Ego and the Mechanisms of Defense*, outlining numerous ways the mind could shut upsetting things out of consciousness.”

1940s-present. “When Hitler's power grew, the Freud family and many of their colleagues fled to London. Within a year Sigmund Freud died. In the United States, also following the death of Freud, a new group of psychoanalysts began to explore the function of the ego. Led by Heinz Hartmann, Kris, Rappaport and Lowenstein, the group built upon understandings of the synthetic function of the ego as a mediator in psychic functioning. Hartmann in particular distinguished between autonomous ego functions and synthetic functions which were a result of compromise formation. These "Ego Psychologists of the 1950s paved a way to focus analytic work by attending to the defenses (mediated by the ego) before exploring the deeper roots to the unconscious conflicts. In addition, there was burgeoning interest in child psychoanalysis. Although criticized since its inception, psychoanalysis has been used as a research tool into childhood development and is still used to treat certain mental disturbances. In the 1960s, Freud's early thoughts on the childhood development of female sexuality were challenged; this challenge led to the development of a variety of understandings of female sexual development, many of which modified the timing and normality of several of Freud's theories. Several researchers followed Karen Horney's studies of societal pressures that influence the development of women.”

In the first decade of the 21st century, there were approximately 35 training institutes for psychoanalysis in the United States accredited by the American Psychoanalytic Association (APA), which is a component organization of the International Psychoanalytical Association (IPA), and there are over 3000 graduated psychoanalysts practicing in the United States. The APA accredits psychoanalytic training centers through such component organizations throughout the rest of the world, including countries such as Serbia, France, Germany, Austria, Italy, Switzerland, and many others, as well as about six institutes directly in the U.S.”
Freud was an Austrian neurologist and the founder of psychoanalysis, a clinical method for treating psychopathology through dialogue between a patient and a psychoanalyst. Freud was born to Galician Jewish parents in the Moravian town of Freiberg, in the Austrian Empire. He qualified as a Doctor of Medicine in 1881 at the University of Vienna. Upon completing his habilitation in 1885, he was appointed a docent in neuropathology and became an affiliated professor in 1902. Freud lived and worked in Vienna, having set up his clinical practice there in 1886. In 1938 Freud left Austria to escape the Nazis. He died in exile in the United Kingdom in 1939.”

“In creating psychoanalysis, Freud developed therapeutic techniques such as the use of free association and discovered transference, establishing its central role in the analytic process. Freud's redefinition of sexuality to include its infantile forms led him to formulate the Oedipus complex as the central tenet of psychoanalytical theory. His analysis of dreams as wish-fulfillments provided him with models for the clinical analysis of symptom formation and the underlying mechanisms of repression. On this basis Freud elaborated his theory of the unconscious and went on to develop a model of psychic structure comprising id, ego and super-ego. Freud postulated the existence of libido, an energy with which mental processes and structures are invested and which generates erotic attachments, and a death drive, the source of compulsive repetition, hate, aggression and neurotic guilt. In his later work Freud developed a wide-ranging interpretation and critique of religion and culture. Though in overall decline as a diagnostic and clinical practice, psychoanalysis remains influential within psychology, psychiatry, and psychotherapy, and across the humanities. As such, it continues to generate extensive and highly contested debate with regard to its therapeutic efficacy, its scientific status, and whether it advances or is detrimental to the feminist cause. Nonetheless, Freud's work has suffused contemporary Western thought and popular culture.”

Photo III-7-4. Psychoanalytic Theory: Sigmund Freud and Carl Jung lectures


In July and September 1909, Austrian neurologist Sigmund Freud and Swiss psychologist and psychiatrist Carl Jung presented a series of lectures on psychoanalytic theory at Clark University in Worcester, Massachusetts.
Life and Training: “Freud’s father, Jakob, was a Jewish wool merchant who had been married once before he wed the boy’s mother, Amalie Nathansohn. The father, 40 years old at Freud’s birth, seems to have been a relatively remote and authoritarian figure, while his mother appears to have been more nurturant and emotionally available. Although Freud had two older half-brothers, his strongest if also most ambivalent attachment seems to have been to a nephew, John, one year his senior, who provided the model of intimate friend and hated rival that Freud reproduced often at later stages of his life. In 1859 the Freud family was compelled for economic reasons to move to Leipzig and then a year after to Vienna, where Freud remained until the Nazi annexation of Austria 78 years later. Despite Freud’s dislike of the imperial city, in part because of its citizens’ frequent anti-Semitism, psychoanalysis reflected in significant ways the cultural and political context out of which it emerged. For example, Freud’s sensitivity to the vulnerability of paternal authority within the psyche may well have been stimulated by the decline in power suffered by his father’s generation, often liberal rationalists, in the Habsburg Empire. So too his interest in the theme of the seduction of daughters was rooted in complicated ways in the context of Viennese attitudes toward female sexuality.”

In 1873 Freud was graduated from the Sperl Gymnasium and, apparently inspired by a public reading of an essay by Goethe on nature, turned to medicine as a career. At the University of Vienna, he worked with one of the leading physiologists of his day, Ernst von Brücke, an exponent of the materialist, antivitalist science of Hermann von Helmholtz. In 1882 he entered the General Hospital in Vienna as a clinical assistant to train with the psychiatrist Theodor Meynert and the professor of internal medicine Hermann Nothnagel. In 1885 Freud was appointed lecturer in neuropathology, having concluded important research on the brain’s medulla. At this time, he also developed an interest in the pharmaceutical benefits of cocaine, which he pursued for several years. Although some beneficial results were found in eye surgery, which have been credited to Freud’s friend Carl Koller, the general outcome was disastrous. Not only did Freud’s advocacy lead to a mortal addiction in another close friend, Ernst Fleischl von Marxow, but it also tarnished his medical reputation for a time. Whether or not one interprets this episode in terms that call into question Freud’s prudence as a scientist, it was of a piece with his lifelong willingness to attempt bold solutions to relieve human suffering.”

Freud’s scientific training remained of cardinal importance in his work, or at least in his own conception of it. In such writings as his Entwurf einer Psychologie (written 1895, published 1950; Project for a Scientific Psychology) he affirmed his intention to find a physiological and materialist basis for his theories of the psyche. Here a mechanistic neurophysiological model vied with a more organismic, phylogenetic one in ways that demonstrate Freud’s complicated debt to the science of his day. In late 1885 Freud left Vienna to continue his studies of neuropathology at the Salpêtrière clinic in Paris, where he worked under the guidance of Jean-Martin Charcot. His 19 weeks in the French capital proved a turning point in his career, for Charcot’s work with patients classified as “hysterics” introduced Freud to the possibility that psychological disorders might have their source in the mind rather than the brain. Charcot’s demonstration of a link between hysterical symptoms, such as paralysis of a limb, and hypnotic suggestion implied the power of mental states rather than nerves in the etiology of disease. Although Freud was soon to abandon his faith in hypnosis, he returned to Vienna in February 1886 with the seed of his revolutionary psychological method implanted.”

“Several months after his return Freud married Martha Bernays, the daughter of a prominent Jewish family whose ancestors included a chief rabbi of Hamburg and Heinrich Heine. She was to bear six children, one of whom, Anna Freud, was to become a distinguished psychoanalyst in her own right. Although the glowing picture of their marriage painted by Ernest Jones in his

biography of Freud has been nuanced by later scholars, it is clear that Martha Bernays Freud was a deeply sustaining presence during her husband’s tumultuous career. Shortly after his marriage Freud began his closest friendship, with the Berlin physician Wilhelm Fliess, whose role in the development of psychoanalysis has occasioned widespread debate. Throughout the 15 years of their intimacy Fliess provided Freud an invaluable interlocutor for his most daring ideas. Freud’s belief in human bisexuality, his idea of erogenous zones on the body, and perhaps even his imputation of sexuality to infants may well have been stimulated by their friendship.”

“A somewhat less controversial influence arose from the partnership Freud began with the physician Josef Breuer after his return from Paris. Freud turned to a clinical practice in neuropsychology, and the office he established at Berggasse 19 was to remain his consulting room for almost half a century. Before their collaboration began, during the early 1880s, Breuer had treated a patient named Bertha Pappenheim—or “Anna O.,” as she became known in the literature—who was suffering from a variety of hysterical symptoms. Rather than using hypnotic suggestion, as had Charcot, Breuer allowed her to lapse into a state resembling autohypnosis, in which she would talk about the initial manifestations of her symptoms. To Breuer’s surprise, the very act of verbalization seemed to provide some relief from their hold over her (although later scholarship has cast doubt on its permanence). “The talking cure” or “chimney sweeping,” as Breuer and Anna O., respectively, called it, seemed to act cathartically to produce an abreaction, or discharge, of the pent-up emotional blockage at the root of the pathological behavior.”

**Psychoanalytic Theory:** “Freud, still beholden to Charcot’s hypnotic method, did not grasp the full implications of Breuer’s experience until a decade later, when he developed the technique of free association. In part an extrapolation of the automatic writing promoted by the German Jewish writer Ludwig Börne a century before, in part a result of his own clinical experience with other hysteries, this revolutionary method was announced in the work Freud published jointly with Breuer in 1895, *Studien über Hysterie* (Studies in Hysteria). By encouraging the patient to express any random thoughts that came associatively to mind, the technique aimed at uncovering hitherto unarticulated material from the realm of the psyche that Freud, following a long tradition, called the unconscious. Because of its incompatibility with conscious thoughts or conflicts with other unconscious ones, this material was normally hidden, forgotten, or unavailable to conscious reflection. Difficulty in freely associating—sudden silences, stuttering, or the like—suggested to Freud the importance of the material struggling to be expressed, as well as the power of what he called the patient’s defenses against that expression. Such blockages Freud dubbed resistance, which had to be broken down in order to reveal hidden conflicts. Unlike Charcot and Breuer, Freud came to the conclusion, based on his clinical experience with female hysteric, that the most insistent source of resisted material was sexual in nature. And even more momentously, he linked the etiology of neurotic symptoms to the same struggle between a sexual feeling or urge and the psychic defenses against it. Being able to bring that conflict to consciousness through free association and then probing its implications was thus a crucial step, he reasoned, on the road to relieving the symptom, which was best understood as an unwitting compromise formation between the wish and the defense.”

“At first, however, Freud was uncertain about the precise status of the sexual component in this dynamic conception of the psyche. His patients seemed to recall actual experiences of early seductions, often incestuous in nature. Freud’s initial impulse was to accept these as having happened. But then, as he disclosed in a now famous letter to Fliess of September 2, 1897, he concluded that, rather than being memories of actual events, these shocking recollections were the residues of infantile impulses and desires to be seduced by an adult. What was recalled was not a
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genuine memory but what he would later call a screen memory, or fantasy, hiding a primitive wish. That is, rather than stressing the corrupting initiative of adults in the etiology of neuroses, Freud concluded that the fantasies and yearnings of the child were at the root of later conflict. The absolute centrality of his change of heart in the subsequent development of psychoanalysis cannot be doubted. For in attributing sexuality to children, emphasizing the causal power of fantasies, and establishing the importance of repressed desires, Freud laid the groundwork for what many have called the epic journey into his own psyche, which followed soon after the dissolution of his partnership with Breuer.\textsuperscript{489}

“Freud’s work on hysteria had focused on female sexuality and its potential for neurotic expression. To be fully universal, psychoanalysis—a term Freud coined in 1896—would also have to examine the male psyche in a condition of what might be called normality. It would have to become more than a psychotherapy and develop into a complete theory of the mind. To this end Freud accepted the enormous risk of generalizing from the experience he knew best: his own. Significantly, his self-analysis was both the first and the last in the history of the movement he spawned; all future analysts would have to undergo a training analysis with someone whose own analysis was ultimately traceable to Freud’s of his disciples. Freud’s self-exploration was apparently enabled by a disturbing event in his life. In October 1896, Jakob Freud died shortly before his 81st birthday. Emotions were released in his son that he understood as having been long repressed, emotions concerning his earliest familial experiences and feelings. Beginning in earnest in July 1897, Freud attempted to reveal their meaning by drawing on a technique that had been available for millennia: the deciphering of dreams. Freud’s contribution to the tradition of dream analysis was path-breaking, for in insisting on them as the royal road to a knowledge of the unconscious, he provided a remarkably elaborate account of why dreams originate and how they function.”\textsuperscript{490}

(a) \textit{Screen Memories:} “At first, however, Freud was uncertain about the precise status of the sexual component in this dynamic conception of the psyche. His patients seemed to recall actual experiences of early seductions, often incestuous in nature. Freud’s initial impulse was to accept these as having happened. But then, as he disclosed in a now famous letter to Fliess of September 2, 1897, he concluded that, rather than being memories of actual events, these shocking recollections were the residues of infantile impulses and desires to be seduced by an adult. What was recalled was not a genuine memory but what he would later call a screen memory, or fantasy, hiding a primitive wish. That is, rather than stressing the corrupting initiative of adults in the etiology of neuroses, Freud concluded that the fantasies and yearnings of the child were at the root of later conflict. The absolute centrality of his change of heart in the subsequent development of psychoanalysis cannot be doubted. For in attributing sexuality to children, emphasizing the causal power of fantasies, and establishing the importance of repressed desires, Freud laid the groundwork for what many have called the epic journey into his own psyche, which followed soon after the dissolution of his partnership with Breuer.”\textsuperscript{491}

“Freud’s work on hysteria had focused on female sexuality and its potential for neurotic expression. To be fully universal, psychoanalysis - a term Freud coined in 1896 - would also have to examine the male psyche in a condition of what might be called normality. It would have to become more than a psychotherapy and develop into a complete theory of the mind. To this end Freud accepted the enormous risk of generalizing from the experience he knew best: his own. Significantly, his self-analysis was both the first and the last in the history of the movement he spawned; all future analysts would have to undergo a training analysis with someone whose own analysis was ultimately traceable to Freud’s of his disciples.”
“Freud’s self-exploration was apparently enabled by a disturbing event in his life. In October 1896, Jakob Freud died shortly before his 81st birthday. Emotions were released in his son that he understood as having been long repressed, emotions concerning his earliest familial experiences and feelings. Beginning in earnest in July 1897, Freud attempted to reveal their meaning by drawing on a technique that had been available for millennia: the deciphering of dreams. Freud’s contribution to the tradition of dream analysis was path-breaking, for in insisting on them as the royal road to a knowledge of the unconscious, he provided a remarkably elaborate account of why dreams originate and how they function.”

(b) The Interpretation of Dreams: “In what many commentators consider his master work, Die Traumdeutung (published in 1899, but given the date of the dawning century to emphasize its epochal character; The Interpretation of Dreams), he presented his findings. Interspersing evidence from his own dreams with evidence from those recounted in his clinical practice, Freud contended that dreams played a fundamental role in the psychic economy. The mind’s energy—which Freud called libido and identified principally, but not exclusively, with the sexual drive—was a fluid and malleable force capable of excessive and disturbing power. Needing to be discharged to ensure pleasure and prevent pain, it sought whatever outlet it might find. If denied the gratification provided by direct motor action, libidinal energy could seek its release through mental channels. Or, in the language of The Interpretation of Dreams, a wish can be satisfied by an imaginary wish fulfillment. All dreams, Freud claimed, even nightmares manifesting apparent anxiety, are the fulfillment of such wishes. More precisely, dreams are the disguised expression of wish fulfillments. Like neurotic symptoms, they are the effects of compromises in the psyche between desires and prohibitions in conflict with their realization. Although sleep can relax the power of the mind’s diurnal censorship of forbidden desires, such censorship, nonetheless, persists in part during nocturnal existence. Dreams, therefore, have to be decoded to be understood, and not merely because they are actually forbidden desires experienced in distorted fashion. For dreams undergo further revision in the process of being recounted to the analyst.”

“The Interpretation of Dreams provides a hermeneutic for the unmasking of the dream’s disguise, or dreamwork, as Freud called it. The manifest content of the dream, that which is remembered and reported, must be understood as veiling a latent meaning. Dreams defy logical entailment and narrative coherence, for they intermingle the residues of immediate daily experience with the deepest, often most infantile wishes. Yet they can be ultimately decoded by attending to four basic activities of the dreamwork and reversing their mystifying effect. The first of these activities, condensation, operates through the fusion of several different elements into one. As such, it exemplifies one of the key operations of psychic life, which Freud called overdetermination. No direct correspondence between a simple manifest content and its multidimensional latent counterpart can be assumed. The second activity of the dreamwork, displacement, refers to the decentering of dream thoughts, so that the most urgent wish is often obliquely or marginally represented on the manifest level. Displacement also means the associative substitution of one signifier in the dream for another, say, the king for one’s father. The third activity Freud called representation, by which he meant the transformation of thoughts into images. Decoding a dream thus means translating such visual representations back into intersubjectively available language through free association. The final function of the dreamwork is secondary revision, which provides some order and intelligibility to the dream by supplementing its content with narrative coherence. The process of dream interpretation thus reverses the direction of the dreamwork, moving from the level of the conscious recounting of the dream through the preconscious back beyond censorship into the unconscious itself.”
(c) **Further theoretical development:** “In 1904 Freud published *Zur Psychopathologie des Alltagslebens* (The Psychopathology of Everyday Life), in which he explored such seemingly insignificant errors as slips of the tongue or pen (later colloquially called Freudian slips), misreadings, or forgetting of names. These errors Freud understood to have symptomatic and thus interpretable importance. But unlike dreams they need not betray a repressed infantile wish yet can arise from more immediate hostile, jealous, or egoistic causes. In 1905 Freud extended the scope of this analysis by examining *Der Witz und seine Beziehung zum Unbewussten* (Jokes and Their Relation to the Unconscious). Invoking the idea of joke-work as a process comparable to dreamwork, he also acknowledged the double-sided quality of jokes, at once consciously contrived and unconsciously revealing. Seemingly innocent phenomena like puns or jests are as open to interpretation as more obviously tendentious, obscene, or hostile jokes. The explosive response often produced by successful humor, Freud contended, owes its power to the orgasmic release of unconscious impulses, aggressive as well as sexual. But insofar as jokes are more deliberate than dreams or slips, they draw on the rational dimension of the psyche that Freud was to call the ego as much as on what he was to call the id.”

“In 1905 Freud also published the work that first thrust him into the limelight as the alleged champion of a pansexalist understanding of the mind: *Drei Abhandlungen zur Sexualtheorie* (Three Contributions to the Sexual Theory, later translated as Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality), revised and expanded in subsequent editions. The work established Freud, along with Richard von Krafft-Ebing, Havelock Ellis, Albert Moll, and Iwan Bloch, as a pioneer in the serious study of sexology. Here he outlined in greater detail than before his reasons for emphasizing the sexual component in the development of both normal and pathological behavior. Although not as reductionist as popularly assumed, Freud nonetheless extended the concept of sexuality beyond conventional usage to include a panoply of erotic impulses from the earliest childhood years on. Distinguishing between sexual aims (the act toward which instincts strive) and sexual objects (the person, organ, or physical entity eliciting attraction), he elaborated a repertoire of sexually generated behavior of astonishing variety. Beginning very early in life, imperiously insistently on its gratification, remarkably plastic in its expression, and open to easy maldevelopment, sexuality, Freud concluded, is the prime mover in a great deal of human behavior.”

(d) **Sexuality and development:** “To spell out the formative development of the sexual drive, Freud focused on the progressive replacement of erotogenic zones in the body by others. An originally polymorphous sexuality first seeks gratification orally through sucking at the mother’s breast, an object for which other surrogates can later be provided. Initially unable to distinguish between self and breast, the infant soon comes to appreciate its mother as the first external love object. Later Freud would contend that even before that moment, the child can treat its own body as such an object, going beyond undifferentiated autoeroticism to a narcissistic love for the self as such. After the oral phase, during the second year, the child’s erotic focus shifts to its anus, stimulated by the struggle over toilet training. During the anal phase the child’s pleasure in defecation is confronted with the demands of self-control. The third phase, lasting from about the fourth to the sixth year, he called the phallic. Because Freud relied on male sexuality as the norm of development, his analysis of this phase aroused considerable opposition, especially because he claimed its major concern is castration anxiety.”

“To grasp what Freud meant by this fear, it is necessary to understand one of his central contentions. As has been stated, the death of Freud’s father was the trauma that permitted him to delve into his own psyche. Not only did Freud experience the expected grief, but he also expressed disappointment, resentment, and even hostility toward his father in the dreams he analyzed at the
time. In the process of abandoning the seduction theory he recognized the source of the anger as his own psyche rather than anything objectively done by his father. Turning, as he often did, to evidence from literary and mythical texts as anticipations of his psychological insights, Freud interpreted that source in terms of Sophocles’ tragedy Oedipus Rex. The universal applicability of its plot, he conjectured, lies in the desire of every male child to sleep with his mother and remove the obstacle to the realization of that wish, his father. What he later dubbed the Oedipus complex presents the child with a critical problem, for the unrealizable yearning at its root provokes an imagined response on the part of the father: the threat of castration. The phallic stage can only be successfully surmounted if the Oedipus complex with its accompanying castration anxiety can be resolved. According to Freud, this resolution can occur if the boy finally suppresses his sexual desire for the mother, entering a period of so-called latency, and internalizes the reproachful prohibition of the father, making it his own with the construction of that part of the psyche Freud called the superego or the conscience."

“Sexual development, however, is prone to troubling maladjustments preventing this outcome if the various stages are unsuccessfully negotiated. Fixation of sexual aims or objects can occur at any particular moment, caused either by an actual trauma or the blockage of a powerful libidinal urge. If the fixation is allowed to express itself directly at a later age, the result is what was then generally called a perversion. If, however, some part of the psyche prohibits such overt expression, then, Freud contended, the repressed and censored impulse produces neurotic symptoms, neuroses being conceptualized as the negative of perversions. Neurotics repeat the desired act in repressed form, without conscious memory of its origin or the ability to confront and work it through in the present. In addition to the neurosis of hysteria, with its conversion of affective conflicts into bodily symptoms, Freud developed complicated etiological explanations for other typical neurotic behavior, such as obsessive-compulsions, paranoia, and narcissism. These he called psycho-neuroses, because of their rootedness in childhood conflicts, as opposed to the actual neuroses such as hypochondria, neurasthenia, and anxiety neurosis, which are due to problems in the present (the last, for example, being caused by the physical suppression of sexual release).”

“Frend’s elaboration of his therapeutic technique during these years focused on the implications of a specific element in the relationship between patient and analyst, an element whose power he first began to recognize in reflecting on Breuer’s work with Anna O. Although later scholarship has cast doubt on its veracity, Freud’s account of the episode was as follows. Freud came to see in this troubling interaction the effects of a more pervasive phenomenon, which he called transference (or in the case of the analyst’s desire for the patient, counter-transference). Produced by the projection of feelings, transference, he reasoned, is the reenactment of childhood urges cathexed (invested) on a new object. As such, it is the essential tool in the analytic cure, for by bringing to the surface repressed emotions and allowing them to be examined in a clinical setting, transference can permit their being worked through in the present.”

(e) **Toward a general theory:** Freud composed a series of 12 papers during World War I on so-called metapsychology, becoming basis for wide-ranging speculations about cultural, social, artistic, religious, and anthropological phenomena. “Their general findings appeared in two books in the 1920s: Jenseits des Lustprinzips (1920; Beyond the Pleasure Principle) and Das Ich und das Es (1923; The Ego and the Id). In these works, Freud attempted to clarify the relationship between his earlier topographical division of the psyche into the unconscious, preconscious, and conscious and his subsequent structural categorization into id, ego, and superego. The id was defined in terms of the most primitive urges for gratification in the infant, urges dominated by the desire for pleasure through the release of tension and the cathexis of energy. Ruled by no laws of logic,
indifferent to the demands of expediency, unconstrained by the resistance of external reality, the id is ruled by what Freud called the primary process directly expressing somatically generated instincts. Through the inevitable experience of frustration, the infant learns to adapt itself to the exigencies of reality. The secondary process that results leads to the growth of the ego, which follows what Freud called the reality principle in contradistinction to the pleasure principle dominating the id. Here the need to delay gratification in the service of self-preservation is slowly learned in an effort to thwart the anxiety produced by unfulfilled desires. What Freud termed defense mechanisms are developed by the ego to deal with such conflicts. Repression is the most fundamental, but Freud also posited an entire repertoire of others, including reaction formation, isolation, undoing, denial, displacement, and rationalization. 

“The last component in Freud’s trichotomy, the superego, develops from the internalization of society’s moral commands through identification with parental dictates during the resolution of the Oedipus complex. Only partly conscious, the superego gains some of its punishing force by borrowing certain aggressive elements in the id, which are turned inward against the ego and produce feelings of guilt. But it is largely through the internalization of social norms that the superego is constituted, an acknowledgement that prevents psychoanalysis from conceptualizing the psyche in purely biologistic or individualistic terms. Freud’s understanding of the primary process underwent a crucial shift in the course of his career. Initially he counterposed a libidinal drive that seeks sexual pleasure to a self-preservation drive whose telos is survival. But in 1914, while examining the phenomenon of narcissism, he came to consider the latter instinct as merely a variant of the former. Unable to accept so monistic a drive theory, Freud sought a new dualistic alternative. He arrived at the speculative assertion that there exists in the psyche an innate, regressive drive for stasis that aims to end life’s inevitable tension. This striving for rest he christened the Nirvana principle and the drive underlying it the death instinct, or Thanatos, which he could substitute for self-preservation as the contrary of the life instinct, or Eros.”

Social and Cultural Studies: “Freud’s mature instinct theory is in many ways a metaphysical construct, comparable to Bergson’s *élan vital* or Schopenhauer’s Will. Emboldened by its formulation, Freud launched a series of audacious studies that took him well beyond his clinician’s consulting room. These he had already commenced with investigations of Leonardo da Vinci (1910) and the novel *Gradiva* by Wilhelm Jensen (1907). Here Freud attempted to psychoanalyze works of art as symbolic expressions of their creator’s psychodynamics.”

“The fundamental premise that permitted Freud to examine cultural phenomena was called sublimation in the Three Essays. The appreciation or creation of ideal beauty, Freud contended, is rooted in primitive sexual urges that are transfigured in culturally elevating ways. Unlike repression, which produces only neurotic symptoms whose meaning is unknown even to the sufferer, sublimation is a conflict-free resolution of repression, which leads to intersubjectively available cultural works. Although potentially reductive in its implications, the psychoanalytic interpretation of culture can be justly called one of the most powerful “hermeneutics of suspicion,” to borrow the French philosopher Paul Ricoeur’s phrase, because it debunks idealist notions of high culture as the alleged transcendence of baser concerns.”

“Freud extended the scope of his theories to include anthropological and social psychological speculation as well in Totem und Tabu (1913; Totem and Taboo). Drawing on Sir James Frazer’s explorations of the Australian Aborigines, he interpreted the mixture of fear and reverence for the totemic animal in terms of the child’s attitude toward the parent of the same sex. The Aborigines’ insistence on exogamy was a complicated defense against the strong incestuous desires felt by the child for the parent of the opposite sex. Their religion was thus a phylogenetic anticipation of the
ontogenetic Oedipal drama played out in modern man’s psychic development. But whereas the latter was purely an intrapsychic phenomenon based on fantasies and fears, the former, Freud boldly suggested, was based on actual historical events. Freud speculated that the rebellion of sons against dominating fathers for control over women had culminated in actual parricide. Ultimately producing remorse, this violent act led to atonement through incest taboos and the prohibitions against harming the father-substitute, the totemic object or animal. When the fraternal clan replaced the patriarchal horde, true society emerged. For renunciation of individual aspirations to replace the slain father and a shared sense of guilt in the primal crime led to a contractual agreement to end internecine struggle and band together instead. The totemic ancestor then could evolve into the more impersonal God of the great religions.”

“A subsequent effort to explain social solidarity, Massenpsychologie und Ich-analyse (1921; Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego), drew on the antidemocratic crowd psychologists of the late 19th century, most notably Gustave Le Bon. Here the disillusionment with liberal, rational politics that some have seen as the seedbed of much of Freud’s work was at its most explicit (the only competitor being the debunking psychobiography of Woodrow Wilson he wrote jointly with William Bullitt in 1930, which was not published until 1967). All mass phenomena, Freud suggested, are characterized by intensely regressive emotional ties stripping individuals of their self-control and independence. Rejecting possible alternative explanations such as hypnotic suggestion or imitation and unwilling to follow Jung in postulating a group mind, Freud emphasized instead individual libidinal ties to the group’s leader. Group formation is like regression to a primal horde with the leader as the original father. Drawing on the army and the Roman Catholic Church as his examples, Freud never seriously considered fewer authoritarian modes of collective behavior.”

Religion, civilization, and discontents: “Freud’s bleak appraisal of social and political solidarity was replicated, if in somewhat more nuanced form, in his attitude toward religion. Although many accounts of Freud’s development have discerned debts to one or another aspect of his Jewish background, debts Freud himself partly acknowledged, his avowed position was deeply irreligious. As noted in the account of *Totem and Taboo*, he always attributed the belief in divinities ultimately to the displaced worship of human ancestors. One of the most potent sources of his break with former disciples like Jung was precisely this skepticism toward spirituality.”

“In his 1907 essay ‘Zwangshandlungen und Religionsübungen’ (Obsessive Acts and Religious Practices, later translated as Obsessive Actions and Religious Practices) Freud had already contended that obsessional neuroses are private religious systems and religions themselves no more than the obsessional neuroses of mankind. Twenty years later, in *Die Zukunft einer Illusion* (1927; *The Future of an Illusion*), he elaborated this argument, adding that belief in God is a mythic reproduction of the universal state of infantile helplessness. Like an idealized father, God is the projection of childish wishes for an omnipotent protector. If children can outgrow their dependence, he concluded with cautious optimism, then humanity may also hope to leave behind its immature heteronomy.”

“The simple Enlightenment faith underlying this analysis quickly elicited critical comment, which led to its modification. In an exchange of letters with the French novelist Romain Rolland, Freud came to acknowledge a more intractable source of religious sentiment. The opening section of his next speculative tract, *Das Unbehagen in der Kultur* (1930; *Civilization and Its Discontents*), was devoted to what Rolland had dubbed the oceanic feeling. Freud described it as a sense of indissoluble oneness with the universe, which mystics in particular have celebrated as the fundamental religious experience. Its origin, Freud claimed, is nostalgia for the pre-Oedipal infant’s sense of unity with its mother. Although still rooted in infantile helplessness, religion thus
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derives to some extent from the earliest stage of postnatal development. Regressive longings for its restoration are possibly stronger than those for a powerful father and thus cannot be worked through by way of a collective resolution of the Oedipus complex.”

“Civilization and Its Discontents, written after the onset of Freud’s struggle with cancer of the jaw and in the midst of the rise of European Fascism, was a profoundly unconsoling book. Focusing on the prevalence of human guilt and the impossibility of achieving unalloyed happiness, Freud contended that no social solution of the discontents of mankind is possible. All civilizations, no matter how well planned, can provide only partial relief. For aggression among men is not due to unequal property relations or political injustice, which can be rectified by laws, but rather to the death instinct redirected outward.”

“Even Eros, Freud suggested, is not fully in harmony with civilization, for the libidinal ties creating collective solidarity are aim-inhibited and diffuse rather than directly sexual. Thus, there is likely to be tension between the urge for sexual gratification and the sublimated love for mankind. Furthermore, because Eros and Thanatos are themselves at odds, conflict and the guilt it engenders are virtually inevitable. The best to be hoped for is a life in which the repressive burdens of civilization are in rough balance with the realization of instinctual gratification and the sublimated love for mankind. But reconciliation of nature and culture is impossible, for the price of any civilization is the guilt produced by the necessary thwarting of man’s instinctual drives. Although elsewhere Freud had postulated mature, heterosexual genitality and the capacity to work productively as the hallmarks of health and urged that “where it is, there shall ego be,” it is clear that he held out no hope for any collective relief from the discontents of civilization. He only offered an ethic of resigned authenticity, which taught the wisdom of living without the possibility of redemption, either religious or secular.”

Last Days: Freud’s final major work, Der Mann Moses und die monotheistische Religion (1938; Moses and Monotheism), was more than just the historical novel he had initially thought to subtitle it. Moses had long been a figure of capital importance for Freud; indeed, Michelangelo’s famous statue of Moses had been the subject of an essay written in 1914. The book itself sought to solve the mystery of Moses’ origins by claiming that he was actually an aristocratic Egyptian by birth who had chosen the Jewish people to keep alive an earlier monotheistic religion. Too stern and demanding a taskmaster, Moses was slain in a Jewish revolt, and a second, more pliant leader, also called Moses, rose in his place. The guilt engendered by the parricidal act was, however, too much to endure, and the Jews ultimately returned to the religion given them by the original Moses as the two figures were merged into one in their memories. Here Freud’s ambivalence about his religious roots and his father’s authority was allowed to pervade a highly fanciful story that reveals more about its author than its ostensible subject.”

“Moses and Monotheism was published in the year Hitler invaded Austria. Freud was forced to flee to England. His books were among the first to be burned, as the fruits of a Jewish science, when the Nazis took over Germany. Although psychotherapy was not banned in the Third Reich, where Field Marshall Hermann Göring’s cousin headed an official institute, psychoanalysis essentially went into exile, most notably to North America and England. Freud himself died only a few weeks after World War II broke out, at a time when his worst fears about the irrationality lurking behind the facade of civilization were being realized. Freud’s death did not, however, hinder the reception and dissemination of his ideas. A plethora of Freudian schools emerged to develop psychoanalysis in different directions. In fact, despite the relentless and often compelling challenges mounted against virtually all of his ideas, Freud has remained one of the most potent figures in the intellectual landscape of the 20th century.”
Jung was “Swiss psychologist and psychiatrist who founded analytic psychology, in some aspects a response to Sigmund Freud’s psychoanalysis. Jung proposed and developed the concepts of the extraverted and the introverted personality, archetypes, and the collective unconscious. His work has been influential in psychiatry and in the study of religion, literature, and related fields.”

**Early Life and Career:** “Jung was the son of a philologist and pastor. His childhood was lonely, although enriched by a vivid imagination, and from an early age he observed the behavior of his parents and teachers, which he tried to resolve. Especially concerned with his father’s failing belief in religion, he tried to communicate to him his own experience of God. In many ways, the elder Jung was a kind and tolerant man, but neither he nor his son succeeded in understanding each other. Jung seemed destined to become a minister, for there were a number of clergymen on both sides of his family. In his teens he discovered philosophy and read widely, and this, together with the disappointments of his boyhood, led him to forsake the strong family tradition and to study medicine and become a psychiatrist. He was a student at the universities of Basel (1895–1900) and Zürich (M.D., 1902). He was fortunate in joining the staff of the Burghölzli Asylum of the University of Zürich at a time (1900) when it was under the direction of Eugen Bleuler, whose psychological interests had initiated what are now considered classical studies of mental illness. At Burghölzli, Jung began, with outstanding success, to apply association tests initiated by earlier researchers. He studied, especially, patients’ peculiar and illogical responses to stimulus words and found that they were caused by emotionally charged clusters of associations withheld from consciousness because of their disagreeable, immoral (to them), and frequently sexual content. He used the now famous term complex to describe such conditions.”

**Association with Freud:** “These researches, which established him as a psychiatrist of international repute, led him to understand Freud’s investigations; his findings confirmed many of Freud’s ideas, and, for a period of five years (between 1907 and 1912), he was Freud’s close collaborator. He held important positions in the psychoanalytic movement and was widely thought of as the most likely successor to the founder of psychoanalysis. But this was not to be the outcome of their relationship. Partly for temperamental reasons and partly because of differences of viewpoint, the collaboration ended. At this stage Jung differed with Freud largely over the latter’s insistence on the sexual bases of neurosis. A serious disagreement came in 1912, with the publication of Jung’s Wandlungen und Symbole der Libido (Psychology of the Unconscious, 1916), which ran counter to many of Freud’s ideas. Although Jung had been elected president of the International Psychoanalytic Society in 1911, he resigned from the society in 1914.”

“His first achievement was to differentiate two classes of people according to attitude types: extraverted (outward-looking) and introverted (inward-looking). Later he differentiated four functions of the mind—thinking, feeling, sensation, and intuition—one or more of which predominate in any given person. Results of this study were embodied in Psychologische Typen (1921; Psychological Types, 1923). Jung’s wide scholarship was well manifested here, as it also had been in The Psychology of the Unconscious. As a boy Jung had remarkably striking dreams and powerful fantasies that had developed with unusual intensity. After his break with Freud, he deliberately allowed this aspect of himself to function again and gave the irrational side of his nature free expression. At the same time, he studied it scientifically by keeping detailed notes of his strange experiences. He later developed the theory that these experiences came from an area of the mind that he called the collective unconscious, which he held was shared by everyone. This
much-contested conception was combined with a theory of archetypes that Jung held as fundamental to the study of the psychology of religion. In Jung’s terms, archetypes are instinctive patterns, have a universal character, and are expressed in behavior and images.\textsuperscript{506}

**Character of His Psychotherapy:** “Jung devoted the rest of his life to developing his ideas, especially those on the relation between psychology and religion. In his view, obscure and often neglected texts of writers in the past shed unexpected light not only on Jung’s own dreams and fantasies but also on those of his patients; he thought it necessary for the successful practice of their art that psychotherapists become familiar with writings of the old masters. Besides the development of new psychotherapeutic methods that derived from his own experience and the theories developed from them, Jung gave fresh importance to the so-called Hermetic tradition. He conceived that the Christian religion was part of a historic process necessary for the development of consciousness, and he also thought that the heretical movements, starting with Gnosticism and ending in alchemy, were manifestations of unconscious archetypal elements not adequately expressed in the mainstream forms of Christianity. He was particularly impressed with his finding that alchemical-like symbols could be found frequently in modern dreams and fantasies, and he thought that alchemists had constructed a kind of textbook of the collective unconscious. He expounded on this in 4 out of the 18 volumes that make up his Collected Works.”

“His historical studies aided him in pioneering the psychotherapy of the middle-aged and elderly, especially those who felt their lives had lost meaning. He helped them to appreciate the place of their lives in the sequence of history. Most of these patients had lost their religious belief; Jung found that if they could discover their own myth as expressed in dream and imagination they would become more complete personalities. He called this process individuation. In later years he became professor of psychology at the Federal Polytechnical University in Zürich (1933–41) and professor of medical psychology at the University of Basel (1943). His personal experience, his continued psychotherapeutic practice, and his wide knowledge of history placed him in a unique position to comment on current events. As early as 1918 he had begun to think that Germany held a special position in Europe; the Nazi revolution was, therefore, highly significant for him, and he delivered a number of hotly contested views that led to his being wrongly branded as a Nazi sympathizer. Jung lived to the age of 85.\textsuperscript{507}

“The authoritative English collection of all Jung’s published writings is Herbert Read, Michael Fordham, and Gerhard Adler (eds.), *The Collected Works of C.G. Jung*, trans. by R.F.C. Hull, 20 vol., 2nd ed. (1966–79). Jung’s *The Psychology of the Unconscious* appears in revised form as *Symbols of Transformation* in the *Collected Works*. His other major individual publications include *Über die Psychologie der Dementia Praecox* (1907; *The Psychology of Dementia Praecox*); *Versuch einer Darstellung der psychoanalytischen Theorie* (1913; *The Theory of Psychoanalysis*); *Collected Papers on Analytical Psychology* (1916); *Two Essays on Analytical Psychology* (1928); *Das Geheimnis der goldenen Blüte* (1929; *The Secret of the Golden Flower*); *Modern Man in Search of a Soul* (1933), a collection of essays covering topics from dream analysis and literature to the psychology of religion; *Psychology and Religion* (1938); *Psychologie und Alchemie* (1944; *Psychology and Alchemy*); and *Aion: Untersuchungen zur Symbolgeschichte* (1951; *Aion: Researches into the Phenomenology of the Self*). Jung’s *Erinnerungen, Träume, Gedanken* (1962; *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*) is a fascinating semiautobiographical reading, partly written by Jung himself and partly recorded by his secretary. In 2009 the *Red Book*, a manuscript that Jung wrote during the years 1914–30, was published. It was, by Jung’s own account, a record of his confrontation with the unconscious. Containing both his account of his imaginings, fantasies, and induced hallucinations.”
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