Renewal and science[[1]](#footnote-0)

How is the renewal of a culture possible? a) Conditions of the option of a “true” culture as such, of a “true” community life as such; b) and therein conditions of the option to grant the form of a true, valuable [life] to an untrue, not genuine, invaluable one. More concisely the question: a) in how far does it belong to the essence of a community and of community life [44] that it can only have the form of a “genuinely human” community in that it had ascended, starting from a lower form, that of a not genuine human life, e.g. from the level of an “animal” community or of a human community of an non-valuable level, to a “genuinely human” one: that a “human” one cannot be there in advance, but only through a development, through a becoming, which, whether constantly or discretely, whether passively or actively or in which way ever, performs a change of value, an overthrow, a turn of value. a’) The question, in how far the rearrangement of an untrue culture into a true one can be a practical purpose, subject to the will, a will, which has the character of the community’s will, so that a human humanity can only be one usefully determining itself towards humanity. a’’) Which ways come into question for that.

1. The essence, the option of a true cultural community

What belongs to a life community as such, in how far is it subject to ideal absolute norms, to conditions of the option to be an “absolutely valuable” one? Every single man is subject to an absolute norm, a categorical imperative (the Kantian expression does not say that we take over the Kantian formulation and the Kantian causation, in brief, the Kantian theories, only one thing shall be said that the single man lives a life which has its value, if it is not lived along in a contingent way). Furthermore, a naively reflectionless living along leads to sin. Man by being man is inflicted with the hereditary sin, it belongs to the essential form of man. He is subject of self-reflection as a man, that is, a statement on himself, a valuing and practical one, subject of a “conscience”, and as that he is subject to an absolute norm of value: He shall decide practically in any case in the best of his knowledge and belief, he shall let himself flow, shall freely wish and then freely decide for the good, for that, which he cognizes as the good in a cognizing way (even if possibly erring). He can only then be a “good man”. But he can overview his whole life as a free man and in relation to the whole [45] make a choice, the universal choice of life, he can appreciate that he is subject to this unconditional value norm and that it is not fulfilled on its own accord, but that he has the power over it, that he can take a universal will according to it; in short, he can cognize that he is subject to a categorical imperative to make such a life choice, and that he is only good, if he takes it into his will. Afterwards a new human form emerges, the unconditionally higher and the required one, that of the man, who makes himself subject to the categorical imperative and demands and wishes a certain form of life on his own accord. That is the type of the ethical man and the necessary form of the “true” man.

But thereby he is not the best possible as such yet. He is now in a daily struggle and performs an ever new decision and feels responsible in it. Passions overrun his good will, he is motivated to considerations, how he may insure himself against them, how to weaken their force or to strengthen his force against them. He also deeply errs in the judgment of decisive conditions, he takes the wrong means and chooses the harmful instead of the useful, a less noble value instead of the nobler one. Or he judges other people in a wrong way, and also where he is not guided by any egotistical motives, but lives in true brotherly love, he does them wrong and grieves himself in them. All such experiences show him that he is imperfect, that he needs to learn to guard off any error, to investigate his sense in his cognitive faculty, etc. Thus he has apart from the responsibility of the decision also responsible cares for the preparation of abilities, of forces, which could secure in a general way better options of single decisions for classes of cases. Man does not live as a single one – also the efficacy of the others’ observations belong here, the learning from their struggle, the cares of noble models, etc.

But every man’s being involved in human community, the situation that his life has its place within community life, has its consequences determining the ethical behavior in advance, giving closer formal demarcations to the categorically demanded in advance. As the nature of the surrounding world, thus does the manifoldness of “neighbor” men belong to the realm of a surrounding world as well, to its practical sphere and possible sphere of goods, as he himself and his life [46] belong to it as well, insofar as he, having woken up from naivety, wants to shape his life as a good life and himself as a good one, as the right will subject, actualizing true and authentic goods in any case and in the whole life. He sees in social relation that the other one, insofar as he is a good one, has a value for him as well, not a merely useful value, but a value in itself; he thus has a pure interest in the ethical self-work of the other one, he has as such a self-interest in their fulfilling their good wishes as far as possible, leading their lives in the correct form, and therefore his ethical will has to direct himself to do itself that, which is possible. This then also belongs to the categorically demanded, the best possible being and wishing and realizing of the other ones also belongs to my own being and wishing and realizing and vice versa. This belongs thus to a true human life thus, that I do not have to wish for me as a good one, but the whole community as a community of good ones, and as far as I may, have to take it into my practical circle of will and purpose. Being a true man is wishing to be a true man and it includes the wish to be a member of some “true” humanity, or to wish the community, to which one belongs, to be a true one, within the limits of practical option. And this includes the idea that an ethical communication must take place and must be decided in “equalizing justice and equity” and the acting must be distributed according to way and goal, wherever practical incongruencies result into the same surrounding world in common acting (insofar <as we> cannot realize the same good for them without any further ado any more). This implies an ethical organization of the acting life, in which the single ones do not act next to and against one another, but in different forms of the community of the will (volitional communication).

Man, considering and uttering suchlike in general thereby only clarifies to himself that, which he understands by living in the best conscience, and insofar as he arrives at such clarity and the better this is, the higher he himself stands, the more is he a true man. As indeed all good men agree in such things, and in common talking go over from the single case into general talking, the sense of which also proceeds without any finer conceptual form in the described type.

A respective community however is a multitude of men, [47] guided in part by egotistic, in part by altruistic motives and passively guided in most cases, men, among whom some have self-discipline, practice free consideration, free decision and some have an ethical life-sense, at least an ethical life disposition, a tendency for an ethical behavior (and not a firm, effective will decision directed towards a truly good life). Thus the community life and therein the life of the single ones happens in a rough and ready way, and in such a life has the culture of community grown historically with its manifold, historically transforming or newly establishing institutions, organizations, cultural “goods”, rough and ready ones, of any kind. It is a mixture of something valuable and worthless that has possibly once been useful or according to a higher sense of value, meanwhile a devaluated remains, obstructing higher formation of value. Men live in this historical community milieu, in such a surrounding world determining and binding the practical behavior, among them those who have woken up ethically, who know themselves to be subject to the categorical demand to be good, to act good, who have freely subjected themselves to it and have tried to practically clarify its sense. The ethical sense investigation, in advance encompassing the community as our surrounding world, says to us in such a situation that the ethical form of our individual life can only give quite a limited value content to it, and that we, as everyone investigating a good sense, would have to aim at making the community approach the idea of a good community as far as possible in the above mentioned sense.

To do singly the best possible under given circumstances, that is, to also reasonably have regards for other ones and to acknowledge their own right, shows our ethical disposition, makes us be subjects of an absolute value, and still only subjects having a form of values that cannot be lost, but we and our life thereby have only a relative value, insofar as we can give a far higher sense to our life in the same ethical form (as having a truly ethical disposition). This sense would already be the higher the larger the circle of good ones was, of like-minded ones. Even by our human surrounding world being of a higher value, our life related to them would then be a more beautiful one, of a higher value. But the community life proceeds in social acts, in personal motivations, from which common cultural works [48] <grow>, works, for which the “united” forces of more and many act in common, whether it be in the form of common volition and common setting a purpose, whether it be in the form of a single volition, a single setting a purpose and act, which is however demanded by the other ones, living there as well, being interested as well by their ethical disposition or is also motivated by their example. Thus everyone’s whole value level depends on that of the others, and correlatively thereby the whole community itself has not only a changing and possibly growing value through the changing value of the single ones and of the growing number of valuable single ones – in a summatory way -, but the community has a value as a unity of a cultural community and as an area of founded values not dissolving into single values, but which are based in the work of the single one, in all their values of single unities, and award them a higher, nay, unlike higher value.

It becomes clear in this connection that concrete communities, in community organizations, community cultures, may indeed only be true human communities, if they have their carriers in true single men (men of the form designated by the categorical imperative), but that, however, the value’s level of the single man and that of the concrete community are functionally related to one another, and it is especially clear that the forms of life, of the acting, of the shaping of culture, in which a community is a concrete one and has its determined typical shape of form all in all, must be of the highest value importance: that they must be subject to norms, which present the condition of a valuable community’s option and, *eo ipso* included in that, of the single one’s relative value.

But the most important fact is that the community is not a mere collective of single ones and the community life and the community’s performance are not a mere collective of single lives and single performances; but that a unity of life goes through all single being and single life, although founded in single lives, that via the subjective surrounding worlds of the single ones goes a common surrounding world founded in them, that a whole performance founded in them is constituted in the performances of the single ones as a proper thing. And eventually, via the single subjects and subjects of different steps up to the free personality in the pregnant sense [49] a subjectivity of the community founded in them is built; whereby within that, which is founded in a most all-encompassing way, there may also be based other community subjectivities at the same time, which are likewise content pieces, members of the most encompassing ones. These founded subjectivities can as well have different steps and on a higher step the step of personality; a community as a community has a consciousness, but it can also as a community have some self-consciousness in the pregnant sense, it can have a self-valuing, and a will directed towards them, a will of self-shaping. All acts of the community are founded in acts of the single ones founding it. Hereto belongs the option that, as the single subject can become an ethical subject related in a valuing and willing way to itself, the same holds true for a community, whereby necessarily single subjects who have already been judged ethically, and their ethical reflections on them, and their community (relatively to themselves to be called a surrounding world) form the essence’s preconditions. Essentially this includes that these reflections of the single ones experience a communalization, propagate themselves in a social “movement” (an analogon of physical reproduction, but something completely new and proper of the community’s sphere), motivate social effects of a proper kind and eventually a volitional direction towards the self-shaping and new shaping of the community as an ethical community in the ideal marginal case – a volitional direction, which is one of the community itself and not a mere sum of the single ones’ founding volitions.

All that now is subject to scientific research, that is, to a formal and apriori research as well, and this alone is the fundamental one. The case is to then apprehend the idea of the man and of a life community of men in the “formal” or “fundamental” generality, and to form all corresponding concepts like individual surrounding world, common surrounding world, physical and organic, animal surrounding world and eventually a human one itself, etc., to differ the formally possible shapes of finitely determined and infinitely open communities (e.g. marriage, friendship – people, church, state), or rather, to develop systematically, to norm under ethical ideas themselves and the forms of the life belonging to them, that is, to scientifically work out the respective norm ideas.

[50] It is then a scientific question how, beginning from low steps of value, which need to be formally characterized and from those of negative value, an intended development towards higher ones becomes possible; Whether a community as such passively living along, a personally not constituted one, has a positive value and even could be that with the highest value, has already been decided in advance; The question then is though, if it has been cognized that only a personal community, making itself subject to a categorical social imperative, can fulfill the demands of such a community being valuable as a community, and can thereby have an absolute form of value, how the community comes from the step of a mere life community onto the step of a personal and then of an ethically personal one; that this also fundamentally implies that the single ethical consciousness awakens and that it has become determining for the will in single ones; that first the idea of ethical community must be an intentional shape in single ones, even if with a still unclear horizon, that is, not in final clarity, etc. Finally it needs to then be scientifically considered, how an ethical community, which as such thus needs to imply a personally constituted will to shape itself and the respective purpose idea (its own “true “ self), could gain higher steps of value and an ongoing development within this normative and absolutely value-giving form. It needs to be considered, which options exist that in one the ethical force, the ethical constancy, the concrete ethical insight and motivation of the will through insight, the right valuing and the cognition of true value orders as basis, that all develops as ethical equipment <for> the single thing and in one with that, founded in it but still new the respective for the community itself, proceeded to an ever higher level. It needs to be considered, if this does not demand a conscious setting of a goal, and how this setting of a goal itself must enter the content of the categorical imperative of the single one and the collectivity.

All that is the science’s matter, of the inseparable united scientific ethics, which inseparably encompasses individual ethics and social ethics, presupposes a formal community doctrine and can itself only formally be as an ethical doctrine of principles.

But science is itself one of the cultural forms, an area of a possible community life and its community performance. [51] And like science as such, thus ethical science as well. Thereby are both, science as such and ethics, subject to the ethical norm, to the categorical imperative. Like single subjects and community subjectivity are consciously related to themselves, and have their highest shape as that of a subjectivity cognizing itself, valuing, willing, that is, one, shaping itself according to a self-set categorical norm, thus the de facto science is related back to itself from this subjectivity as shaping itself thus, and this means, it needs to get to that question as well and answer it scientifically, in how far science, specifically ethical science, has an ethical function in community and single life; also the question will then play a role in how far, if ethical science shall become a necessary means, ethical science was a necessary means, which is supposed to develop within a community, in order to enable it to climb to fundamentally higher value levels, and following that, in how far science, universal science, philosophy, necessarily needs to have developed within a community first, in order that it may gain the form of an ethically personal community, shaping itself consciously according to the ethical idea itself and may take the way of a conscious higher development.

The question on the possibly necessary function of science, whether it be for the first development or for the proceeding development up (development in the sense of continued leveling of values) of a humanity determining itself as a humanity and consciously shaping itself according to this purpose idea of true humanity.

Humanity has in a certain way woken up to humanity, if single ones within it have, and if they, looking beyond themselves, do not only have the idea of the ethical man determining himself towards the good, but also have already conceived of the idea of a community of many good ones as an ideal [community], and if they now want to give a concretely shaped option to this concept and consider it as a practical option. Humanity as humanity thereby has not yet awoken to some proper self-consciousness, and has not awoken as some true human humanity.

But this may indeed awake in certain other forms. This may be considered thus. If the individual ethical man [52] has cognized for others the value of a reasonable life and the value of the moral in relation to other ones, the same value of all men, as far as they are good or intend something good in detail, etc., and thereby the overwhelming value of a community of only good ones, and of a respective community life, if he has cognized that every reasonable one, if he would only cognize this accordingly, would have to judge and value likewise, and to likewise willingly contribute to the realization as far as possible, it seems a practical option to win others with the help of a moral sermon, and as such through ethical indoctrination, and thereby in the way of having an impact on others, who for their part would procreate the effect (mental Huygens principle), that is, the creation of a mental movement.

It would be conceivable in so doing as well that the single ones, or single ones who are especially thoughtful in the gradual movement, arrived at the cognition that a valuable life of the single ones and of all depended on a world cognition, that is, a motivation, directed towards the development of a theoretical interest in the world, but in the function of an ethical interest, is conceivable. This could at first thus lead to some general intuitive world wisdom, theory and practice, which would be spread vocally and literarily and through education by the individuals. It is also understandable that the like-minded ones, also without entering into personal contact, find themselves consciously related to one another, and consciously united under the common idea of a true humanity and of a universal “science” serving it, as world science. Furthermore, that a proceeding movement of the will spreads from there, that at first consciously a univocality of the will, a unity of the will’s direction towards the on-going realization of these common ideas <emerges> within the like-minded ones, and thus the community would proceed towards the practically guiding idea of a community of single good ones living all in the consciousness of a community’s being and supposed to be being, and of a community, which is to be constantly preserved through self-work, and also to be preserved through constant culture in the form of education of those growing into it. And this community was no more a pure collection of individuals with the same will according to the same ideals, but a community of the will was already constituted; a community will would already go through the unity of the single life and the single subjects and the single volitions [53], similarly to all mathematicians now forming a volitional community, insofar as every single one’s work is devoted to the same science, which is a common object, therefore is intended for every other mathematician, and everyone’s work gets its use from every other one’s, and the consciousness of the allness and of the common purpose and of the supposed work determining reciprocally and being determined is present in everyone. There is a universal combination of the will, which produces a unity of the will, without an imperialistic will organization being there, a central will, in which all single wills focus, to which they all volitionally submit and as whose functionaries the single ones know themselves.[[2]](#footnote-1) Here is the consciousness of the community purpose, of the common good to be demanded, of the allness will, as the functionaries of which all know themselves, but as free and not subjected functionaries, and not even as giving up their freedom. (It is different in special organizations of the will, like academies, etc.)

But this is another step, in which an ethical common mind develops and the ethical community idea gains force and the character of a proceeding final idea of community itself. We need to remark thereby that this final idea can especially then be called that of the community, if a universal “estate” of functionaries had given generally accepted authority to this idea within the community. The authority of the philosophers and their philosophy in the ancient times, the authority of the clergy men of a community encompassed by the unity of a religion. Certainly there is the question on the source of this authority: which is a different one for the religious representation, that of a religion originally grown in a naïve way, and traditionally procreated and further formed, and the representation of a philosophy grown in originally creative activity and developing in the form of some taken over and newly generating activity.

In this case it grows within the community, together with an estate representing the world wisdom, itself as a lasting , developing cultural shape, as philosophy. It is a proper realm of ideal objective values, but not only of generically related [54] values to be overviewed in a collectively unitary way, but interconnected within a system, in which they are combined to a higher total value. Peculiar conditions are the result here.

We cognize on the one hand: The requirement for the option that a true community of reason is constituted is that an estate of philosophers and an objective shape of common goods, or rather, philosophy as an objectively emerging cultural system presents itself beyond philosophizing single ones. The philosophers are the appointed representatives of the spirit of reason, the mental organ, in which community originally and lastingly arrives at the consciousness of its true destination (its true self), and the appointed organ for the procreation of this consciousness into the circle of “laymen”.

Philosophy itself is the objective manifestation of its wisdom, and thereby of the wisdom of community itself; it implies the idea of the right community, that is, the final idea, which community has created for itself through its estate of philosophers, documented and in this objective shape any time ready for every philosopher as a community organ (or rather, for every layman as a community member following in understanding) to be actualized and to have a respective effect. Likewise all objectivated cognition of the world within philosophy is every time a means already to enable a reasonable acting within the surrounding world in a rationally higher form than a pre-philosophical practical intelligence would be.

But philosophy is on the other hand a realm of ideal objective self-values (absolute values). Every creation of ideal absolute values raises the value of the creating man, and the creating is, regarded in and by itself, a layer of absolutely valuable life. And since every good of that kind is a common good, thus the same holds true for the community itself, which is as [a community] performing such things performing absolutely valuable things, and thereby already lives within a layer in such a way as is demanded by the purpose of higher humanity.

<II The higher form of value of a human humanity>

Let us now consider the higher form of value of a truly human humanity, living in self-creation towards true humanity and developing. [55] It is that one, in which the philosophy as world wisdom has taken the shape of philosophy as a universal and strict science, in which reason has been formed and objectivated in the shape of the “logos”.

Let us immediately draw the ideal. Strict science examines all possible forms and norms of human life and becoming a man, of the individual life and community life, of the single personality’ becoming and the becoming of possible personal communities, especially of course according to the norms, of the becoming “true” humanity and “truly human” communities, through its method of all-sided cognition creating objective truth of an evidence reaching into the final roots of cognition. The widest and ideally secured spheres of practical options are to be predelineated, in order to bring humanity, in which this philosophy may grow or is growing, bring on the way of development towards true humanity; strict social philosophy and especially then the social doctrine of reason delivers the theory, which may practically function, which could be adjusted to the given concrete conditions. Science itself performs by its describing and determining these conditions themselves in a scientific way and by relating them back to the theory of pure options, the giving of rules for application, it shapes itself as a “technical” science. The community thus gains an incomparably higher self-consciousness in its scientists (philosophers as strict scientists) as consciousness of form and norm of its truly human being, and of the methods to realize it and to bring itself on the way of a proceeding development.

We need to immediately note thereby that all this may not be understood in a static way, but in a dynamic-genetic way. Strict science is not an objective being, but a becoming of an ideal objectivity; and if <it> is essential only in becoming, then is the idea of true humanity and its method of self-shaping only in the becoming. Like the becoming of science, as soon as it has taken the step of true science, of the true logos, is a system of becoming of absolute values and an already realized absolute value on every step – only with a horizon of further increments of value and value risings -, thus also the community shaping itself and adopting its idea. It has its idea on this step already [56] and in every phase of its becoming, and in absolute truth, but on different steps of determination of the wealth of special demands. It still has open horizons on every step, determinable indeterminacies.

The science, carried by the authority of most perfect insight and achieving general appreciation, and the common will to regulate all life in the sense of logical reason motivated by it, now determine the community to not only follow the science in theoretical convictions, but to simply let itself be guided by it in a technical-practical way. The technique we are talking about here though, is the “ethical” technique, the technique of self-actualization of true humanity. Thus the determination of the will is directed towards the remodeling of the common life according to all its pregiven shapes, to show its true norms to the community institutions (the norms of the genuineness corresponding to its special shape) and afterwards every human, individual thing as such in its sphere and to form the community thing in its own, in all its bindings.

Strict science however does not only play its ethicizing role as a science of the mind in the form delineated here; it also has the founding task to examine all performances being conducted in the personal, single and common acting according to their basic kinds and forms and to determine their normative principles as well as their normative shapes and to thereby deal with the possible fields of culture and their normal forms. By its doing so, it also examines in relating back to itself, as a theory of science, its own essential options and conditions of its normal possibility. Only in this back relatedness does it first establish the practical options for itself, in order to actualize the shape of strict science – to develop it in the constant self-becoming. The development of the universal theory of science (theory of reason and logic) is an organ and itself a trait of development of humanity towards a humanity bringing itself towards a higher self-actualizing, and on the other hand the theory of science as the strict science becoming through it is a basis for higher culture in the objectivated sense, in the sense of the objective mental world of values developing as correlates of the humanity’s development of reason. With the help of their distinct [57] cultivating function the doctrine of science and universal science itself have a distinct position in contrast to the cultural field of art, for which it shall not for example be provable that the art necessarily deserved an analogous function (as Schiller attempted to prove).

But science does not only have an importance in any limited spheres and directions of research, especially as a universal and absolute science it performs its highest functions; notwithstanding the fact that as a universal science it enables man to cognize the all of actualities and options according to the laws of facts and the laws of essence and to thereby give an effusively large and beautiful realm of values to humanity as correlate of a large and beautiful life of cognition. And not only that as a natural science it enables the man to technically shape nature according to his practical needs, as on the other hand the sciences of the mind can become practically useful for the pedagogic, political, etc. practice. The usefulness is subject to ethical norms, and as such they are only to be regarded in a relative way. But universal and finally established science is scientific philosophy and makes the all of actualities and possibilities be finally cognizable, creates understanding in the “sense” of the world and thereby the option of a life having the character of an absolute life being conscious of itself, actualizing the absolute sense of the world in a living way, actualizing in cognizing, in the evaluating, in the creatively aesthetical shaping and in the ethical acting as such.

It is then the task of strict science to consider in pure consideration of the essence, in that of pure options, and on the other hand in the concretely actual consideration, in how far the community of the will, carried by mere authority of free reason and by the estate of scholars and by general education (willingly subjecting itself to the authority of science, of the learned world) is to be transferred into an imperial community, i.e., into a community, in which all single subjects of the will are related to a centralization of the will, in the form of an organization of power of reigning and serving, in which everyone has to fulfill functions that have been conveyed on him and may only freely decide within the limits given to him. All possible forms of organization as such and thus those [58] of the state need to be examined in their ethical importance and thus especially the question, whether it is essentially humanity’s task, as a life community only being within the becoming, to approach the ideal of an ethical community of the will from free reason only by way and by the means of an empire, a state. Similarly the questions, whether all or just some areas of life and culture may be ruled by the state’s force or which may not, in how far an incremental reduction of the state’s power organization has to take place within the progress of ethical development, etc.

Like a single man, anyway, is only as an ethical one by his becoming, and like he only becomes within constant struggle and within ethical progressing, thus an ethical community is becoming and progressing. But the form of the ethical humanity is presupposed on both sides as that of one, in which self-consciousness has awoken and the final idea of true humanity constituted therein is determining for a self-education, self-shaping. This absolute value form then determines the other value forms, that of ethical development as increase (positively valued form of development), the sinking as negatively valued form of development.

Furthermore we need to consider the question, how we should organize the relations of state and nation, how the idea of nation has to decide as a special ethical idea, how it has to function as a practical final idea, which specific national organizations are necessary for that and how they may become organizations of the will. The question on the peculiar value and right of “venerable” tradition is important thereby, in how far the historical as such needs to be respected, even if it has lost its original sense of reason as a “vestige” and under which circumstances it still needs to be given up in favor of values of proper rationality.

Eventually the question is then, whether every self-contained cultural humanity, if, as an ethical one, it has taken on the shape of a “super nation” above all single nations, possibly of a super state above all single states, shall, as a self-contained one, be closed against the exterior as well, whether it was not ethically demanded to let an ethical community grow out over the whole world – as far as the option of a reciprocal understanding and thereby communalization [59] reaches. Thus we arrive at the final idea of a universal ethical humanity, at a true human world people above all single peoples and at super peoples encompassing them, unity cultures, a world state above all single state systems and single states.

1. Unpublished article for *The Kaizo*, 1922/23. [↑](#footnote-ref-0)
2. We could also speak of a communistic unity of the will in contrast to an imperialistic one. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)