

Abbreviations for notes:

SC = self-consciousness

SeC = Sense-certainty

F&U = Force and Understanding

PN = Perception

P = philosophy

Hx = history/historically

SCF = Spirit of Christianity and its Fate

PS(G) = Phenomenology of Spirit (Geist) – sorry for using both

SD = Self-determining

C = Consciousness

NCP(E) = necessary condition for the possibility (of experience)

TUA = Transcendental unity of apperception

Ds = Descartes

R = Rationalist

E = Empiricist

TD = transcendental deduction

TI = Transcendental Idealism

Syllabus Notes:

- Course's focus: Hegel's completion of Kant's Copernican turn which created a non-skeptical idealism (this is attempted through advocacy of three ideas which become fateful for contemporary thought):
 - **(1) Full, human SC requires inter-subjectivity**
 - **(2) SC emergence and thus philosophy as a reflective discipline occurs historically**
 - **(3) Fundamental categories of the possibility of experience are practical and ethical (not epistemic or theoretical)**
- SCF central theme = dialectic of inter-subjectivity which operates according to the 'causality of fate'
 - SCF metaphysical presuppositions are seen as false by Hegel but they provide the orientation for the ethical project of the PS
 - Goal of the PS is to restructure the presuppositions of the causality of fate to make them compatible w/ modernity (our freedom from the authority of nature – the SD character of subjectivity)
- The first part of the book – C, SC, and Reason – have two cruxes
 - (1) Overcoming the standpoint of representational knowing
 - (2) The account of inter-subjectivity in the dialectic of master/slave

- The second half of book – Reason, Spirit, Religion, Absolute Knowing (Preface dealt with at the end)
 - Ch. on Spirit – emphasize Antigone, French Revolution, and critique of Kant’s moral P
 - The end of the chapter on Spirit – on evil and forgiveness – is the key to the text as a whole
 - The chapter on Religion is a defense of Atheism

1A: Introduction

- Modern P begins w/ discovery of SC (subjectivity, *cogito*) - which is certain of itself and grounds and makes possible all other knowledge
 - SC = self’s relation to itself which is a NCP for its relation to the world
 - Kant deepens Ds thought w/ TUA – the “I think” must accompany all my representations (does not just begin thought but is constitutive of thought)
- Hegel changes the topic of Cartesian-Kantian P in three moves (3rd move shows how other two are achieved)
 - (1) **The minimal unit for SC agency is 2:**
 - No SC relation to ourselves w/o mediation by the other
 - SC = “The I that is a We and the We that is an I”
 - “We think” is implied or involved in the notion of *Geist*
 - PS is a phenomenology of *Geist*
 - *Geist*, Spirit, “We that is an I and I that is a We” all interconnected
 - “Language is the *Daesin* of Spirit” – the medium through which community passes itself on, recognizes itself, talks to itself, etc
 - Hegel has an idea of mindedness or *Geist* which is not in the head but bound up w/ practices and relations w/ others
 - (2) **Rejection of metaphysical and methodological individualism**
 - Fundamental unit necessary for P is:
 - Ds and Kant – the individual, the mind knowing itself
 - Hegel – The “We think” which is conditioned by a history on our linguistic community (language, resources, relations, etc)
 - We are dependent on a concrete history as a NCP SC – we are a community of the living of the dead – chapter on Antigony and absolute knowledge is how to live with the dead
 - We do not have “free” thought but are bound by our hx
 - (3) **Part-whole relation replaces universal-particular relation**

- Hegel wanted to avoid the atomism and formalism of Kant
 - *Atomism* – belief in irreducible particulars
 - *Formalism* – belief in a priori universals
 - Problem: the relation of universal to particular (debate of R vs. E)
 - If beginning with universals, they swallow up particulars
 - If beginning with particulars we get nominalism, skepticism, and relativism
 - Part-whole logic is another way of thinking how to start off (we are now parts of a wider linguistic community, but two will not be enough in the end b/c our community is dependent on hx)
- Kant → Hegel = Formal/Subjective idealism → absolute idealism
 - *Formal/Subjective idealism* – appearances not things-in-themselves
 - *Absolute idealism* – unity of thought and being
 - Hegel's goal: to show that the NCP of SC are grounded in SC's relation to things-in-themselves – this is how Hegel is going to complete Kant
 - Kantian TUA is replaced w/ Hegelian Spirit (has notion of community/hx) – this completes Kant (How does he do this? see below)
- Kantian subjective idealism
 - Forms of understanding vs. intellectual intuition = subjective vs. objective
 - *Forms of understanding* – objects are always mediated with categories and concepts
 - *Intellectual Intuition* – God point of view – modally no diff btw possibility and actuality, so no diff in possibility and necessity
- Hegel questions Kant: What are the grounds for posing an infinite standpoint as the NCP of intelligibility and meaning of our standpoint?
 - Kant's forms of understanding are defined on an unknowable perspective
 - If intellectual intuition does not limit our knowledge, ours would be infinite (when we disallow talk of unknowable things our subjective standpoint is infinite) – see Donald Davidson
 - Problem of traditional metaphysics: not its attempt to know the infinite, but its attempt to know something transcendent to ordinary experience
 - Hegel takes all transcendent knowledge and makes it immanent to human experience within his part-whole logic (nothing outside the world)
 - This is an Aristotle to Plato – bringing universals down to earth
- Kant's view of totality (idea of infinite striving w/o a view of the whole)
 - (1) *Infinite progress* – Morality (highest good as object of infinite striving)
 - (2) *Infinite regress* – Causality; one condition to another to another, etc
 - Our finitude means no knowledge of the totality b/c to think about the totality is to be outside it – so this infiniteness is inferred

- Hegel's unhappy C – strives to be one w/ something beyond it and never achieves it (once you know the limit you have crossed it)

1B: Introduction

- Kant's 3rd antinomy (on freedom): subject as known vs. subject as free and SD (we can not know we are free but must act as if we were = practical faith/reason)
 - **Theoretical Reason** - Subject as known = empirical self = phenomenal self
 - **Practical Reason** - Subject as free and SD = unknown = moral agent = noumenal self
 - Problem: Practical subject is unknown and given – so unknown and unconditioned – idea of immediacy where all knowledge is mediated
 - Kant's entire P was to say nothing is unconditioned; he could not follow this b/c he wanted a practical self (no E way to have it)
- Hegel avoids Kant's immediacy of the moral/practical/noumenal self by:
 - Freedom and SC emerging through practices and hx, i.e. not given, known historically
 - Agency/practical freedom (ethics) - how we know ourselves as hx agents
- Hegel's critique of Kant
 - Kant kept E as first P - the self is related to the world by representations of it, i.e., to be in the world is to have veridical representations of it (this is why skepticism is so scary b/c we can lose the world – Hume knew this)
 - Copernican turn was supposed to remedy the problem – a theory of representation w/o having to think if these were veridical or not b/c representations already have the idea of being in the world, we do not have to ask if they match the world (see McDowell)
 - For Hegel our mode of being in the world is as SC agents not knowers
 - First 4 chapters of PS are about overcoming E - not knowing but recognizing (we are related to the world as SC agents)
- Hegel's resolution of theoretical vs. practical reason (give practical primacy)
 - Ethical ontology – structures of thought based on practical reason
 - Knowing becomes a social practice regulated by collective norms (see Kuhn)
 - Problem: Our relation to ourselves, one another, and the world are all going to have a completely different status
- Kant's TD B – Hegel and Fichte think Kant goes beyond his philosophy
 - They argue everything must be related to us as SC beings: "Everything that is substance must become subject"

- All substance, things, materials, individuals, thought, etc get related to us as SC agents – the absolute is as much subject as substance (all gets related to us as SC agents)
- Kant's TD B – the connection of two planes
 - (1) **The “I think” provides the NCPE** – we know by judging
 - This is the only way we can know (to judge), so the world must be mirror image of our forms used in judgment (the x is y)
 - We think about the world by using our forms therefore imposing structure - things accommodate to our ways of thinking (syntax entails semantics)
 - The forms for the NCPE are the categories
 - (2) **NCPE are also the NCP of the objects of experience**
 - Nothing can appear in space and time w/o conforming to our structured ways of knowing (the categories)
- How does Kant get from 1 → 2? – footnote in B160: **“Space represented as object as we are required to do in geometry contains nothing more than the mere form of intuition - it also contains combination of the manifold given according to the form of sensibility in intuitive representation so that the form of intuition give only a manifold, the formal intuition gives unity of representation”**
 - Space as a form of intuition (empty given container independent of SC as in the TA) → space as a formal intuition (an actual object of cognitive awareness subject to categories)
 - If space (a NC for any object appearing to us) must conform to the categories then all appearances must conform to the categories (even the intuitive manifold of space and time is subject to conceptual conditions)
 - The NCPE *are also* the NC for the objects of experience
 - Therefore everything is determined by the spontaneity of the subject
- Fichte's *Wissenschaftslehre* (Doctrine of Scientific Knowledge)
 - Says if subject is spontaneous (subjective agency) then our ways of thinking mediate *everything* that might appear to us
 - Problem: How can we have original passivity of intuitions? (for Kant, to know is to have original passivity of intuitions synthesized to concepts)
 - If the TD is right passivity can not be absolute or unconditioned
- Kant presupposes space and time as forms of intuitions (TA) to work with the categories, to get to the schematism, to get to things
 - Hegel: time is not empty container where events occur but a contentful process (history, *Geist*)
 - This is a movement from:

- Time → Temporality
 - History → Historicity
- Nothing can be given (nothing is a substance by itself) – even space and time are not empty forms to be filled; everything is related to SC agency
- Our enquiry turns into the conditions of how we determine ourselves as agents in the world; to the thoughts of SD (the absolute is SD)
- Nothing is absolutely passive/given – there is nothing but the SD of thought (if there is no given then there is only SD thought)
 - Freedom is the discovery of this SD which unifies theoretical and practical reasoning (and destroys Platonic epistemology)
 - Kant is Platonist b/c form-matter distinction (which gives rise to transcendental-empirical distinction and a priori-a posteriori dist.)
 - Hegel rejects form-matter distinction so loses all distinctions
 - Hegel: there are categories of thought, they are just uncovered or generated, not absolutely a priori (Hegel never denies the premise of TI)
- (20): **“The true is the whole but the whole is nothing other than the essence consummating itself through development”**
 - The whole is what becomes so P is ultimately a discovery of becoming’s SD movement where the absolute is the historical result (not the Cx God)
 - This history is the examination of different concepts of objects historically proposed (different ways the absolute understood its relation to the world)
 - Concept = thinking of a fundamental way we are related to reality – forms of self-relatedness – our mediate relation to world
 - Different concepts: form, matter, life, SC, work, freedom, etc
 - Each concept tells a fundamental way we are related to reality (and Hegel phenomenologically investigates the historical progression of concepts)
 - Hegel shows that our concepts are forms of self-relatedness (ways we mediate the relation btw ourselves and the world)
- The PS is phenomenological and historical as well as a logical unfolding of our concepts – How is this done? – 2 premises (when taken together = TI)
 - **(1) Ancient over modern skepticism**
 - Ancient – doubts everything (nothing given or immediate)
 - Modern – does not doubt mindedness
 - **(2) Consciousness is defined by negativity (no intellectual intuition)**
 - Pure ‘I’ of spontaneity is negation of the world – the first way we are free is by our power to say no, by death
 - The power of negation is how we relate to the other – first we kill it by naming it and then place this concept btw it and ourselves
 - We can not intuit w/o a mediate gesture (no intellectual intuition)

- (32): **“But that an accident as such, detached from what circumscribes (restricts) it, what is bound and is actual only in its context with others, should attain an existence of its own and a separate freedom – this is the tremendous power of the negative; it is the energy of thought, of pure ‘I’. Death, if that is what we want to call this non-activity, is of all things the most dreadful, and to hold fast what is dead requires great strength. Lacking strength, beauty hates the understanding for asking of her what it cannot do. But the life of Spirit is not the life that shrinks from death and keeps itself untouched by devastation, but rather the life that endures it and maintains itself in it. It wins its truth only when, in utter dismemberment, it finds itself.”**
 - The force of the negative (our ability to negate the world) is what propels the PS – this is Hegel’s first definition of freedom
 - Our relation to ‘the other’ is by negation/death (we name things and take away the reality/actuality of it and replace it with *our* concept)
 - This idea is from (1) nothing is safe from doubt and (2) consciousness is defined by negativity (the opposite is realism)
- Realism vs. Idealism
 - **Realism** – reality is ontologically independent of our conceptual schemes and truth consists in a beliefs correspondence to the world
 - Realism says we can intuit w/o a mediate gesture, but we know there is always a gap btw evidence and truth (veil of perception)
 - Entire tradition tries to close the gap (Ds benevolence of God)
 - **Idealism** – all thought and all relation to objects is mediated (this is what Hegel calls the primacy of negation, i.e., mediation by death)
 - This is the Copernican Turn – that every relation to an object is mediated by our concept of an object
- Pickett p.98 (handout) – **“that is the only strategy Hegel can use consistent with his own idealism will be to undercut the presuppositions involved in standard realist assumptions as being as it is in itself. That is, Hegel will try to undermine and exclude the relevance of such doubts progressively and systematically rather than answer them directly”**
 - Hegel will undercut the presuppositions in realism to tease us out piece by piece (argumentative therapy)
- Pickett cont - **“he will try to show determinately why given some putative notional determination of objects (concept of objects in general; some broad categorical account of what objects are) he will show that doubts about if objects must or even can be so notionally specified or the relevant**

determinate doubts they are only as a consequence of that notions own incompleteness”

- What starts the problem of doubt is by showing that our conditions for knowledge require further conditions, and these are the ground for doubt (all P thinks it knows the conditions for knowledge)
- Hegel here is ‘summarizing everything’ b/c even the idea of subjects and objects is just one more categorical determination of concept and object
- Doubts about our conceptual scheme must have some basis for it to be a serious thought – for Hegel, the only basis for serious doubts is knowledge of Spirits experience of SD by the developing notion
- All the notions we have for doubting the infinite turn out to be part of the process in which we come to understand ourselves – once we understand ourselves these doubts will fall away
 - This is absolute knowing - that knowing is unconditioned - that nothing is outside knowing (no exteriority; no God, monads, things in themselves, etc) – in this respect Hegel completes Kant
 - Historical eras involve fundamental concepts of an object which are part of the meditations on our thought and part of our education (historical concepts teach us about ourselves – a novel of how we are who we are)
- Three introductive points:
 - (1) **The PS is not presupposition-less**; it begins in the middle
 - (2) **The fundamental structure of the movement of Spirit is ethical relations** (so ontology of spirit is ethical ontology)
 - (3) **PS is part tragedy** – absolute knowing involves discovery of disappointment in knowledge/philosophy (negative dialectic)

2A: Early Theological Writings

- Summary: Hegel’s move is from “I think” → “We think” (removal of externality)
 - Movement is from epistemology → ethics
 - Ethical vision: *SCF* modeled after Kant’s *Religion within the Limits of Reason Alone* (really a critique of Kant)
 - Movement from universal law (Kant) → ethical living (Hegel)
 - Hegelian idealism est. by identifying logic of ethical life with structure of experience – ethical logic made model of world (ethics as first P not E)
- Center of ethical vision is ‘causality of fate’ = ethical logic of action and re-action
 - Fichte’s thought: to act against another immorally is to destroy your own life (not break a transcendent law)
 - In immorality we call down avenging fates – with harm of others we harm ourselves (All breaking bonds of love destroys other and yourself)

- If logic is right, good life for me = good life of everyone (Marx: If one is unfree then all are unfree)
- Social space is structured ethically where subjects are formed/de-formed, freed/ oppressed, etc through their structuring w/ one another
 - Ethical life significant independent of particular norms, laws, gains, etc
 - Ethical life is about quality of inter-subjective life not our relation to some abstract morality – all of this is embedded in inadequate metaphysics of life and love (which will be changed in the PS)
- SCF based in metaphysics of life and love
 - **Love** = invisible bonds connection w/ others
 - **Life** = practical and biological aspects interconnected
- Is SCF theological or anti-theological?
 - Anti – all God-talk expresses metaphysics of life and love; ethical life; no transcendent God
 - This is Cx → ethics – Hegel is picking up Kant's program (he did this in his work *The Life of Jesus*)
- Is there an immanent God? Pantheism? Atheism?
 - W/ no transcendent God we drift from pantheism to atheism
- Early Cx logic of experience–Jesus does practically what Hegel does theoretically
 - Jesus goes from law → love; Hegel goes from Kantian law → ethical love
 - In Hegel's program God becomes our relation to each other
- SCF is metaphysics of life which changes relation of U-P to relation of P to W (uses 3rd critique model)
 - U to P: Noah, Abraham, the State, positive law, Kant ---replace with
 - P to W: Love, Jesus, Life
- Language of life naturalizes ethical language - life talk is talking about living, dying, injury, suffering, etc
 - Vicissitudes of body maps vicissitudes of spirit – Hegel is trying to make body to spirit talk as literal as possible so talk of one is talk of the other
 - Problem: language of life ends up w/ pantheism – In PS he will replace:
 - Language of Love → Recognition
 - Language of Life → Spirit
- Why does SCF begin with flood when Abraham is progenitor of Jews?
 - Man and nature harmonious → flood → nature indifferent → man needs to master and control nature

- So Western rationality began after Noah, before no need to control nature
- SCF is a genealogy of moral reasoning: critiques Kant for copying Jewish reason
 - God red-herring in Judaism – need to control nature
 - All concepts of God are concepts of life (needs in life)
 - Inner structure of morality is rationality of mastery of nature – it is the internalizing of nature logic – to master ourselves is to master nature
 - This is instrumental logic – this is at what point Hegel will critique Kant
- Kant said he has to limit reason to make room for faith
 - He wanted to limit Newtonian science, cause and effect, our theoretical reason to make room for faith
 - Kant thought if Newtonian science expressed all rationality in the world
 - (1) There would be no freedom
 - (2) We could not understand science b/c it's a human project
 - For truth we have to limit science and bring it to SD reason and then show there is a different logic of morality
 - Hegel argues Kant failed b/c his theoretical reason is not diff from his moral reasoning – the same logic he criticized he brought into morality
- Hegel proposes two ways to master nature (by instrumental rationality)
 - (1) **Nimrod** – through a collective practical activity (city, tower, boat, etc)
 - (2) **Noah** – through thought (creating Jewish God) – 2 steps
 - 1. Pose an ideal against hostile nature
 - 2. Give the ideal reality – being
- Theological Contract (TC) – how God helps me master nature
 - TC – God promises to restrain nature as long as I master within by laws
 - I become medium of God to nature – if I am bad, nature is bad
 - Abraham begins in direct relation to world – then by TC his relation to the world goes through God so he is never again in direct relation
- This expresses that there are only two possible relations to the world by instrumental reasoning
 - (1) Nimrod = Kantian = subjecting yourself to law in the CI
 - (2) Noah = Reason = subjecting nature to law
 - Both are two sides to a single self-defeating strategy – the casual manipulation and self-subjection to external authority by:
 - 1. Subjecting nature to law
 - 2. Subjecting yourself to law in the CI
 - Both assume relation to antagonist which must be mastered and controlled
- All vertical ethical geometries (indirect relation) are deforming

- This is b/c moral law, God, the good, etc do not exist – so we project outside life falsehood and then subject ourselves to it
- This deforms our horizontal ethical geometry (direct relation) – our relations of life and love
- Abraham is the first to deform his horizontal relations (leaves family) b/c of a vertical ethics (law to God) – this is the beginning to Western Rationality
 - Abraham wants to be autonomous by freeing himself from a family which had not wronged him, to found a new state – he replaced love by law
 - This is the movement from a family structure → political structure
- The grounds of Western Rationality is the refusal of love to ground relations
 - Noah's strategy is fulfilled – we self-subject to an external ideal as the authoritative norm of conduct - the new nation will replace internal norms of communal sentiment with moral norms and laws
 - This leads to discontinuity of family vs. state, love vs. law
- Stepping out of nature the Jewish people shed their human shape and appearance
 - Abraham is an ontological stranger on earth b/c he rejected his likeness to nature – human rejecting his humanness – this is what we call morality

2B: Early Theological Writings

- The horizontal axis is replaced with us in relation to others by morality or ideality
 - This replacement occurs b/c radical break btw the sensible and intelligible which ontologically structures the distinction btw U and P (Plato)
 - The fundamental notion of the intelligible is that there is no way of sensing it (this comes from Judaic autonomy – where we get the idea of non-natural, non-sensible, invisible, etc)
 - This is why we can not name God (b/c it would kill the non-sensible and make it sensible)
 - We can not make the intelligible sensible b/c it would obscure its authority which is its non-sensibility and coldness – makes the intelligible unchallengeable
- **“The world for Abraham regarded as his opposite – he looked upon it as sustained by the God who is alien to it – nothing in nature was supposed to have any part in God, everything is under his mastery”**
 - Nothing can count against God's authority so we need to question authority itself – on what grounds do we obey, value and how does it becomes authoritative

- We do not know the ontological status of truth, goodness, or beauty - we need to ask why they are authoritative and on what grounds do we obey and value them (not what it is - why we value it – this is Weberian/Neiz.)
- God's authority comes from his oneness, the source of meaning – God then can only appear in the form of command, the CI
 - God is outside the realm of evidence and rational criticism – we can not know God, we can only obey him
- This is seen from Abraham/Isaac story read from Isaac's viewpoint – the playing out of the context of love and law
 - Abraham is only anxious/doubtful/troubled in this narrative – this shows that he could not stop loving Isaac and knew this was not a loving act
 - Love was the counterclaim to God – he placed his law vs. love – we can only accept God's authority by sacrificing the material world which severs our relationship to the world
 - This is the sacrifice of the particular to the transcendent universal – this is why Kant is a Platonist
 - For Kierkegaard if God is God then nothing mundane can count – there must be a teleological suspension of the ethical (suspend sense for CI)
 - Sacrifice is the relation btw particulars to any transcendent U (in this case the sacrifice of the material world to God)
- **“Abraham achieves peace in accepting the necessity of sacrifice and *his heart was quieted only through the certainty of the feeling that this love was not so strong as to render him unable to slay his beloved son with his own hand*”**
 - Faith quieted Abraham's heart when he knew he could sacrifice Isaac to God (all faith is dangerous/hurtful to the other)
 - Abraham is the vision of the law – Isaac vision of dead man living (their relationship is mediated through God's command)
 - The relationship can not be transformed but by remnant of love – once we accept faith we place ourselves outside the human (and are able to destroy life for the universal – ex. Car bombers)
 - Once Hegel took the point of view of the son and not the father, he rejected the patriarchal logic
- PS does not have a logic to defeat antagonists – it is a logic of conversion (P job is not to refute the skeptic, it is not that powerful – it looks for a remnant of love)
 - Hegel is interested in the occasions we change our mind
 - PS is logic of the notion of experience, change, conversion – not proof
 - Hegel shows us the disappointment in knowledge and P – can not solve problem of the world but give internal rational grounds to a way of life (but we have to start with something)

- Kant does not start w/ skepticism but with belief that we can know the world – you can *not* go from non-knowledge to knowledge
- Hegel begins with thought that we are attracted and appalled to Kant's morality
 - He provides a genealogy, not to refute, but to unlock our own logic – he starts with our sentiments
- The logic of Hegel's genealogy is another perspective of our existing beliefs
 - Hegel allows us to transform our beliefs in a productive way – he makes explicit congealed moments of difficulty in human life
 - P does this with concepts – it takes the implicit logic of a set of experiences/practices and gives it conceptual shape
- Problem: Is Hegel reproducing another form of mentality and attacking Abraham for doing the same thing? (is not this just the definition of idealism?)
 - JB wants to avoid this idea b/c he does not think of Hegel as this type of idealist (that we sacrifice all for the intelligible – see Kant and Marx)
 - The difference is that Hegel has a notion of experience which supports the concepts he is trying to make explicit in a logic that is not itself conceptual
 - The whole is true so all false steps are part of whole so necessary – we do not condemn the steps but learn from them
- The power of Hegel's story is that movement is necessary and not necessary
 - The necessity is that there will always be a instrumental reasoning b/c there will always be hostile nature and relations of mastery/domination
 - All other P mistakes is to make this partial truth a whole truth
 - The PS shows this mistake, but still makes it a necessary part of the whole story
- Noah starts with a necessity – when he says that Abraham left for no reason, this is the thought that reason/necessity did not have to become everything – that only under certain circumstances does this happen and he explains how it happens
 - The power of a genealogy is that the beginning is not arbitrary - Nietzsche is wrong in saying the beginning is arbitrary – false steps are necessary
 - The moment of necessity is a rational kernel – figuring out a certain logic – namely that there is a relation of U and P
- Hegel does not deny there is U and P, he finds a new concept of universality – the concrete U (whatever that is)
 - Hegel accepts the U and P but transforms the sacrificial logic that universalizes a particular (to P that are part of the whole)
 - Kant had an insight (U are necessary) – we just do not want the remnants of his concept

- Jesus' initial gesture is to set human needs against the law
 - If human needs trump religious commands then no command is absolute
 - There is a logic to human need which trumps law – there is no 'ought' to this b/c to learn someone has need is to know a satisfaction is asked for
 - Logic of ought is that something un-human (anti-moral) is above human
 - There is an internal logic to human need – to see is to satisfy
- Jesus' "love thy neighbor" is nothing but learning the meaning of human concepts of need (hunger, loneliness, hurt, etc) – this is an ethical logic
 - We do not learn this by principles, norms, laws
 - All art and literature is about how a problem unravels by internal logic
- Hegel - **"the satisfaction of the commonest human wants rises superior to actions like these religious ones b/c there lies directly in such a want the sensing or preserving of a human being no matter how empty his being may be"**
 - If our first question when seeing someone hungry is "Do you deserve food" – if there is hunger, to recognize it as hunger is to recognize that they need food – any further thoughts about that hunger is some kind of rationalization into some wider, overly rationalized, set of concerns
 - His thought here is that the satisfying of a need is an internal co-relative of seeing it as a need
 - To learn that someone has a need is to know that a certain satisfaction is asked for
- With all this we are trying to avoid a certain word – ought
 - The word ought has no place in morality – the logic of all 'oughts' is that something inhuman has come on top of something human
 - What we think of morality is anti-moral
 - If we think this we have to think that there is an internal logic to human needs, wants, satisfactions
 - Internal logic is...if we see an animal drowning – we don't ask "Ought the animal be saved"
 - The question is what is it to accurately perceive an animal drowning – the only reasonable description of that is that we save it if we can – that we see something that needs saving – this is what it is to see something drowning, seeing it as needful
- This is what all art and literature is about – b/c all plays are about how a problem unravels by an internal logic w/o morality on top and learning that internal logic is how we make our way through the world
 - It is not by learning principles, and norms, and abstract objects

- So there is here a certain contestation (competition to find the best) btw P and literature – so it is no accident that all of this is arising in a narrative setting – and no accident that Hegel is going to give us something new to doing P which he will call phenomenology – that this is going to be descriptive, not deductive or inductive, and that we are going to have to find a way of thinking about concepts that gives them a different shape than what they had previously
- Does Hegel’s internal logic eliminate choice?
 - (1) Learning about freedom is learning about what is necessary
 - (2) There is still contingency in our choice b/c we ‘learn’ – so we can fail to learn or harden our hearts

3A: Early Theological Writings

- Review: SCF is a genealogy of morals, of Kantian morality
 - It is genealogy b/c all P can do is recollect – its a path of how we got here
 - Judaism is a genealogy of Western reason – that reason is notion of law which arose as a form of mastering nature – instrumental rationality
- How is morality equal to notion of lawfulness (Kantian morality)?
 - Notion of law originally arose as a form of controlling/mastering nature
 - Our notions of lawfulness are notions of instrumental reason (this is his critique of law – it is nothing but instrumental reason)
 - All Germans at the time were not satisfied as reading everything as law (Newtonian paradigm) – seen in Kantian morality
- Law depends on the notion of authority which ultimately is command – to ground an external command we need:
 - (1) Something beyond particulars – we control/subsume/have particulars in our grasp by conceptualizing it (see Schiller’s *Grace and Dignity*)
 - (2) To anchor distinction btw U vs. P we need intelligible vs. sensible
 - Particular sensible = Life
 - Particular intelligible = Law
 - We now have the fundamental conflict of law vs. life (law adds ought to life)
- **“Jesus came along and wanted to lift nature so that it became holier than the temple”**
 - He means that if someone is hungry we feed them, if they need warmth, give them clothes – to “love thy neighbor” makes nature holier than the temple

- Hegel thinks that we can have morality w/o any “ought”
 - Anscombe - when we hear “ought” there is God lurking somewhere
 - What we need is different ears – b/c if you can hear the phrase “ought” and not hear something fishy then you are not hearing well
- What does ‘ought’ add to “you ought not kill”
 - Ought is anxiety – it is morality seen as it is failing – it is the conflict of vertical and horizontal – so we need all vertical or all horizontal
 - All other moral theories use ought (Kant, Utilitarian, Virtue, etc) and think it is ok – they have not heard Jesus yet (we need to hear love in place of law – or the same thing - to replace vertical w/ horizontal ethics)
- P.209 – **“Since laws are unifications of opposites in a concept which thus leaves them as opposite while it exists itself in opposition to reality it follows that the concept expresses an ought”**
 - “Unification of opposites in a concept” – of killing your neighbor, don’t kill them – there are two thoughts in a moral concept
 - (1) A state of affairs
 - (2) Its negation
 - Every moral principle is saying both P and not-P – Hegel does think that we can not have contradictions in reality
 - So the only thing that moral laws can be (since they are unifications of opposites) are concepts – which means they can not enter the world, only *regulate* – so to regulate is their ‘oughtishness’ – which is their being beyond life
 - So with the notion of ought you know morality has gone vertical into the world of concepts and propositions and left the world of life
- Problem: With what authority are these laws sustained? 3 paradigmatic ways:
 - (1) **Divine Fiat** – obey the law b/c God says so (God is a place holder for the problem of authority)
 - (2) **King/State authority** – states have monopoly over coercion (practically useful but arbitrary until democracy)
 - (3) **Positivity** – reification, heteronomy – obligatory b/c universalizable – Kantian morality
- Kantian morality
 - A good will is the only good w/o condition – it is not good by what it wills but how it wills – not content but form (what it wills is particular therefore empirical therefore contingent – it can not give us authority/rationality)
 - Form vs. content distinction requires U vs. P
 - Form = universalizability

- Kant's Thesis: Maxims of action (subjective principle of action) needs to be universalizable (a maxim everyone *could* act on)
- Why is this authoritative and what does it have to do with reason? 2 steps
 - (1) Imagine a world where the maxim was universalized
 - Ex. The maxim "I will break my promise when convenient" if universalized would bring chaos – this is *not* Kant's criticism
 - (2) If the universal maxim is contradictory then it is immoral
 - To will the maxim I must will that I will break promises and assume that the institution of promise keeping remains
 - When I use immoral maxims I am a parasite on others good will while making an exception in my own case
 - Logic/reason reveals that what is immoral is egoism – making myself different - so we are bound to each other logically
- Hegel and Kant agree that all acts are legislative – to do an action is *a fortiori* to claim that the action is the right and proper thing to do (no exceptions)
 - We all legislate out of a kingdom of ends (everything we do is an act of legislation)
 - Kant says out of reason itself we can find morality – universality overcomes divine/state law b/c command is grounded in autonomy of will
 - When I obey moral law I am obeying myself – reason as SD
- Problem: Hegel claims that Kant's theory has a moment of heteronomy - coercing ourselves (being ruled by something outside ourselves)
 - CI made man independent from Newtonian nature, therefore of cause and effect – though this achievement was positivity and therefore heteronomy
 - With reason I have something in me which I let rule over me – the moral law – which is opposed to my natural self-interest (b/c if we were governed by our sensibility we would be subject to casual things like drives, etc)
 - Our reverence for the moral law is a reverence for the LNC – we need to see this in its genealogical chain:
 - The genealogical chain is from God → feudal monarch → reason
- **P.211 - "the difference btw the European prelate who rules the church and the man who listens to the command of duty is not that the former make themselves slaves while the latter is free but the former have their Lord outside themselves while the latter carries his Lord in himself while at the same time is his own slave"**
 - Problem: the moral law is it has to do two jobs simultaneously – it can't
 - (1) Be a punishing superego
 - (2) Be the ego idea – something we desire, reverence (desire the LNC?)

- **“For particulars, inclinations, pathological love, sensuous experience, or whatever else it is called by Kant, the universal is always something alien and objective”**
 - To make someone a slave to himself we have to make something internal become absolutely outside us – this is the moral law
 - My subjectivity (reason) is to explode outside me and lift me into a domain of universality outside time and nature
 - So the moral law is something alien within me – objective to particulars
 - So we have made a reason vs. nature where reason rules nature
- At one level Kant would say – Of course, but it needs to be alien and objective b/c we have to humble and humiliate our pathological drives b/c on their own they are bits of nature
 - So the problem is about bits of nature – us – and another part of us – reason
 - Kant wants to have the bit of us that is non-nature – reason – regulate the part of us that is nature – our self-interestedness, inclination, etc
- Hegel’s Nietzschean objection: moral law is a slave morality – it makes an abstract ideal (moral law) out of a product of life
 - For Kant the moral law did not come from anywhere but everything comes from somewhere b/c no Platonic forms therefore it must be part of life
 - So there is an opposition btw law and life – Kant takes a part of life, calls it non-life and then gives it authority as non-life
 - So we need to go one step further and internalize the abstract ideal – this is the Lutheran idea of taking the priest and putting it inside you
 - If complete we will not see products of law vs. life – so we can then drop the universal vs. particular and replace it with every product of life
 - So we go from U vs. P to a morality of potentiality to actuality – to a virtuous disposition to love thy neighbor to actually loving them
- Logic of Modes: everything is a mode of something else – this is a holistic logic of modes, potentiality, and actuality
 - Love is a modification of life, reconciliation is a mode of love, virtue modification of love
 - Commands lose their ‘ought’ b/c there is nothing for the self to be opposed to (for Hegel there is no intrinsic source of resistance to doing the right thing)
 - Emotions and affects are culturally saturated and not intrinsically self-interested or other interested (we are born w/ drives that get expressed in many ways)

- For Kant, the problem of self-interest comes from thinking of morality in a Newtonian framework where self-preservation is a process of inertia
 - This is a problem taken from Hobbes theory of emotions – for Hobbes we desire until we are dead so desire is the idea of motion (a false naturalization of human desires and drives)
- Hegel wants to propose an immanent ethics - where the notions of egoism is not the structure of the universe but of a particular society, time, place
 - Rousseau argued this against Hobbes
- If we are to go beyond Hobbes, Kant, and Newton and keep our particular emotions, drives, etc then what do we do?
 - So since we have these emotions we need another view of human nature and society –love is the clue

Lecture 3B: Early Theological Writings

- Review: The universal needs further internalization – absorbed into the self – so that our particular inclinations become lawful – law and inclination → life
 - The synthesis of law and inclination is life – the relation of difference to one another becomes love (a unification of reason w/ sensible object)
 - Schiller – the concept of love is a unification of reason and sensibility
 - Love is the inclination of reason to unite or unify itself w/ a sensible object
- Dieter Heinrich’s quote of Schiller in the philosophical letters – **“in beauty in general reason sees sensibility fulfilling its demand** (that is from objectivity and unity) **and to its own surprise one of its own ideas confronts it in appearance”**
 - So the surprise of beauty is something that we thought belonged only to the world of ideas and then reason appears
 - **“This unexpected harmony awakens a feeling of joyous approbation and an attraction to the sensible object must result. We call this attraction benevolence – love”**
- Why is love thought of as a unification of reason and inclination? – see 3 moments to grammar of love – Jean Luc Nancy
 - (1) **All love poses itself as *not* self-love**
 - Love is the *experience* of finding your whole self in another – this removes all self-interest (torture when lover does not love in return)
 - Lack of reciprocity shows that love is not self-love which is why it hurts – when she hurts I hurt, when she is joyful I am joyful
 - Moral law thought inclination was the problem – it is not

- We start our life as lovers (our mom) and we never get ourselves back – we are always outside ourselves
 - (2) **Love is the extreme moment beyond the self of a being reaching completion**
 - The discovery of complete fulfillment through other – self reaching completion beyond self
 - If in love I lack nothing then love is neither restricting nor restricted (it is not finite)
 - This is Hegel's immanent absolute – that which is not finite or conditioned – this is knowledge of the infinite w/ no exteriority
 - (3) **Actual love is the moment of being broken into by love – we are fractured and formed by our relation to other in this brokenness**
 - The narcissist is a monad with no possibility for love (there is nothing we can do with them b/c they are engulfed w/ themselves)
 - Love is the moment of being broken into and fractured by the other – we are constituted by our relation to the other in this brokenness
 - For Hegel death is central to spirit b/c it is the replacement of love and life
- Two things that make an other, other for Hegel
 - (1) **It has free will** – we can not make the other will anything
 - Being and Nothingness is about trying to touch another's freedom, which we can't do (nor can we touch desire)
 - (2) **The other is infinitely other** – independent of me where I can not touch their will of desire
 - When our desires/wills do match up it is luck – so the infinitely other is completely unified with me
 - This is why Hegel says that life is the union of union and non-union – a marriage of togetherness and absolute difference
 - Absolute difference remains – the other can will to stop loving
 - See this logical love is how Hegel goes from subjective to objective idealism (he is going to make the logic of love interpret life and therefore potentially infinite)
- The model of love is an ethical theory w/o ought
 - to see this Hegel looks at punishment – morality from the point of view of its failing – to show the difference btw horizontal and vertical morality
 - Thinking about morality when it fails finds the difference btw vertical and horizontal ethics by asking how they deal w/ criminality
 - Hegel thinks we should think of criminal law as moral justice institutionalized – Kantian moral logic institutionalized
 - This is b/c law is a universal set of rules people should obey – when people break this we have to think of their punishment

- Punishment represents authority of law where authority has been rejected
 - If we have no 'ought' - what are we to do w/ immoral people?
 - Punishment is not what we do – it is an admission that there is nothing we can do – all we can do according to the logic of law is punish them
 - Punishment is getting rid of – a version of the death penalty – this is the essence of punishment, there is no punishment w/o death
 - If we are legislators, criminal acts put individual law vs. state law – a claim that state law has no authority, only our individual law is true law
- Performing an act makes us a legislator – so to be criminal is to place our law vs. state law
 - If we believe the state law we must negate the individual law act
- Problem: how can we undo particular criminal acts?
 - The problem is not the act but the actor's claim to universal legislation
 - The actor must be put to death to show the authority of state law – he can not apologize b/c we can not believe the apology of a criminal
- State law = our beliefs and will – this is what the criminal is against - for a criminal to act against this is against everyone
 - In democracy the law represents everyone, not just the majority
 - Revolution can not be part of law – we are implicated in every act of our government or else there is no government
- Majority thinking is a mechanism for reaching decisions *not* the authority itself
 - The authority is the form of life lived according to laws – it is about laws not the mechanism for establishing them
 - Kant assumed that monarch represented the U – democracy was not seen as a magical way to get law – it is about the form of life to live with law
 - All accounts of living according to the law it has nothing to do with the majority – it represents the state and its citizens
 - This does not reject rehabilitation – it only shows what the logic is and that the idea of punishment is part of law
- Hegel wants a logic which does not see punishment as what the state does – he does defend punishment though
 - This is Abraham and Isaac logic – what it is to have a law and to sacrifice the individual to the authority of that law – logic of authority of the law
 - There is no way of making an action undone even with punishment b/c punishment does not do anything – we need the death of the opposing law
 - So punishment is not a law but a fate – how does this change the topic?

- P.229 – a clue to Hegel’s entire philosophy – **“Only through a departure from united life (the community as a unit) which is neither regulated by law nor at variance with law - only through the killing of life is something alien produced. Destruction of life is not the nullification of life.”**
 - Remember - life is a synthesis of inclination and law - so the idea of life here is not a norm of which other things can correspond to or fail to correspond to – to be accordance with or at variance with
- To change the topic - we have to rethink what transgression is – the mystery that needs to be solved is how we are connected with one another
 - The answer is the logic of family/couple (i.e. relationship) – it is not about our togetherness being in accordance with the law or not – law is a red-herring here
- How are humans connected with one another? This is the mystery Hegel needs to solve
 - Hegel proposes that we are not connected by laws or sentiment (early version of life) but need a model of united life – making something alien, removing it from us
 - Destruction of life is not the nullification – killing one life is not killing all life, it is not killing my connectedness with the others - not fully undoing that connectedness, but rather it is ‘diremption’
 - To ‘dirempt’ is to separate, to pull apart, to pull into two – it is a violent act of making two from what was one
 - The destruction consists in its transformation into an immanent – the illusion of the trespass, the criminal, is the belief that it destroys the other life and thinks itself enlarged there by
- Illusion of the criminal – to destroy life is to enlarge myself, remove my obstacles
 - The obstacle, what is in my way, is what makes me limited and finite and therefore if I think that the other is my limit and makes me finite then the only thing which I need to expand is to kill – and we all want to expand
 - This is the logic of murder, the belief of the murder – otherwise those Shiite’s would not be murdering one another, they think that the other is getting in their way and they feel that each death they are enlarged by
 - Hegel says that the belief in enlargement by the criminal is false logic – the murdered life is not blotted out, the trespasser destroys his own life
- The trespasser has destroyed his own life – his life is not different from life since life dwells in a single life in the Godhead – he has perverted life into an enemy
 - The unpacking of this statement will be partial b/c the logic of this is the causality of fate and Hegel thinks that something like this must be true

- This is his metaphysical gamble and he has to figure out how it can be true and in this context what is carrying all the weight is the idea of united life – the Godhead just means united life
 - The thought here that he is struggling with is that human beings are interconnected with one another in ways that we can not even spell out – we are in fact almost completely ignorant of who our others are
 - Judy Butler – I know my others when I find out who I am grieving
- Hegel's thought is that we are connected -our fates are interconnected – the model of love is life of community
 - To kill another is not to enlarge myself but destroys my own web of life that binds us all together and makes the conditions for my life
 - To kill another is anti-transcendental act – undoing the necessary conditions for the possibility of my life – I make life impossible
 - Derrida says this is irreversible and this is the problem – once the criminal commits murder this is all he can do b/c he is dead
- For Hegel, when we transgress we necessarily suffer fate – life become alien – so we can not get back in touch with ourselves or others – we are excluded from the life we lived no matter what
 - We do not need to throw you in prison, you are in hell
 - The reason for this is not mechanical – in Greek tragedy the plot is a structure of fate – another way of talking about fate
 - This is why it is important that there is no plot in Hamlet – the first great modern play – this is tragedy w/o plot b/c it is about discovering the meaning of the impossibility of life w/o relying on all the structures given to us
 - That is, Hamlet is not in any play he thought he might be in – he was an individual and therefore had to face up to this fate himself
 - So the thought is that fate is “the manner of receiving and reacting against the others deed”
- Ex. Think of trust as the basic condition of our life together
 - I am not worried now about someone shooting me – there are certain conditions of trust (which are not based on laws)
 - This trust is b/c we have certain confidence in certain settings – others not
 - If I can not be trusted in my environment then I can not trust anyone else – I destroy the possibility of life with others
 - Life becomes unfriendly b/c I am untrustworthy – the problem-diremption
- Can we reverse diremption – of making life unfriendly?

- Transgression is not breaking an abstract law but a modification of life and therefore must be open to further modification
- When I confess and repent I can re-modify my fate and long for lost life
- **“The fate in which the man senses what he has lost creates longing for lost life”**
 - (1) Notice that I can be separated from life and not know it = objective guilt/despair
 - (2) Only when I sense loss can I long for a lost life
 - This is why criminals are tough to deal with - they can experience guilt and not know they are longing for lost life
 - Longing recognizes what has been lost is life which was once friendly, but it acknowledges my answerability and creates confession
 - So forgiveness is the central metaphysical concept of Hegel’s system – it is guilt that pushes me towards confession and apology
- Can there be collective apology and forgiveness? Are there acts which are unforgivable? Who is to forgive and under what conditions?
 - How long does guilt last, and if collective does it go down generations?
 - We are guilty of slavery, our civil society wound which we do not know how to confess b/c we are unsure what to confess
- These questions only come up with Jesus, where Cx is seen as a collective moment in the cultural learning process – Cx changes the conversation
 - Are we undoing the action with forgiveness? Remaking the past?
 - Hegel says we can make life friendly and leave no wounds behind by a speech act – I forgive you
 - Everything about the power of the Spirit is connected to the speech act b/c it makes the past not past – the negative has a place within the whole (this is objective idealism)

4A: Phenomenology Of Spirit - Introduction

- Review: SCF is a model of Spirit where the original notions were life and love
 - This will be translated into the notion of Spirit where
 - Love → Recognition
 - Life → historical society
- Before we start the PS – there is no God in Hegel – Spirit does not posit itself – all of this has nothing to do with the PS
 - PS talks about Cx as a kind of historical society
- The notion of idealism/infinite in Hegel is two people in love – no externality

- With absolute other internally related there is no externality so the totality is infinite – so the model of love is the model of the infinite (the other is internal, there is no outside, therefore you are infinite)
 - Keep in mind that in the PS the model of love is the infinite which is immanent
- Hegel (Aristotelian) reacts against Kant (Platonic) and notion of law/outsideness
 - Hegel wants a concrete U – a U where actuality precedes possibility (this is the test for all Platonic vs. Aristotelians)
- Causality of fate – we start with the notion that we are bound together which is experienced when we lose our togetherness
- Hegel realizes that SCF uses pre-modern notion of enclosed communities by reading Adam Smith and Ferguson
 - Concept of causality of fate based on everything being ancient polis but modern societies were not like this – we are connected complicated ways
 - An individual's independence and dependence could be things that happened unknown to the individual (Kant's notion of individualism was something found in society, not just P)
 - Hegel thought there was something about Abraham he did not understand
- SCF – **“Only in diremption myself from the other does the other become object”**
 - In love do we *not* experience the other as other, we experience this in death – before then their otherness is unimaginable
 - So now for Hegel diremption, distance is necessary to becoming SC
- Hegel begins to think that this notion of distance, severance, diremption, is not antagonistic to becoming SC but necessary
 - We can only really become SC when we have distance from the other
 - Severance is constitutive (essential part) of the self and that it is only by acknowledging the necessity of severance, transgression, can we avoid bad metaphysics
 - What we are avoiding is the idea of pantheism of closure
- Diremption first appears in Hegel as criminal murder – Abraham left society from mentally killing Isaac – history began with murder of another
 - History begins when natural bonds of life and love are negated – so the PS is going to begin with law breaking – history begins with transgression
 - When other is not my internal correlate and becomes external hx begins – in the PS history begins with Antigone

- When the other stops being my internal correlate and becomes an external object then history begins
- How did we leave paradise?
 - We leave paradise by breaking the bonds that we did not know existed – we can only have paradise after the fact
 - History beginning with loss of object of love – PS is about loss w/ final chapter about memory of the loss, mourning, and trying to recover it
- We begin w/ the intro. b/c Hegel did – preface assumes knowledge of the whole
 - Preface expresses anxiety that we can not begin, intro. affirms it – the first sentence says we can have no knowledge w/o knowledge – no beginning
 - The myth that Hegel has a presupposition-less P is false – it does not have a neutral, non-question begging beginning which he builds on
 - All P is historical, conditioned, and socially mediated – P begins with problems
- **“all philosophy is an expression of the need for philosophy, but the need for philosophy always emerges from the diremption in a culture”**
 - Every P is a crossroads btw two historical forces – these two steps show that there can never be a presupposition-less starting point
 - (1) **Cultural diremption of own time** – P is conditioned btw hx and culture
 - P is always doubly conditioned w/ the forces of culture and the history of P
 - (2) **There can not be a method which is also not a content** – no neutral method
 - Hegel’s presuppositions and claims in the intro are about the way that we think about the present – they are true for a people living in a certain time and place
- With saying P is always hx and cultural we mean it emerges from a crisis
 - Bad academic P begins with a puzzle not a crisis
 - Plato was dealing with crisis of collapse of authority of Homeric texts – the gods had lost their authority b/c everyone had their god – Plato was trying to resurrect some form of authority
 - Ds begins with crisis of authority of knowledge – science vs. religion
- Hegel begins with crisis of diremption found in Schiller
 - (1) Reason/Rationality leads to skepticism
 - w/o thing in itself I can’t begin Kant’s system w/ it I leave system
 - This is in Pascal – reason leads to skepticism
 - (2) Newtonian physics shows natural world vs. killing nature

- Nature is not a living totality but a corpse
- (3) Enlightenment leads to social reform vs. bloody revolution and terror
 - Some see this chapter on French revolution as core to PS – this new humanism and materialism leads to hedonism and crude morality
- (4) New individualism leads to autonomy vs. alienation from society
 - So on the upside we get autonomy, but with that society becomes atomized – we become alienated from society
- All good features of modern life have bad consequences – this is diremption – that society can not get a hold of itself b/c its ideals have a negative side
 - PS is about these diremptions which are problems with our modern categories – with what we mean by liberty, society, reason, nature, etc
 - Everyday life is constituted w/ many categorical commitments – and these give shape to our world
 - Our categories are in massive disorder which is shown in a series of radical dualisms
- Dualisms are ways life has become partial and fragmented and why we experience forms of life that are internally self-defeating
 - Man/nature vs. God is seen in Deism – a way to push God out of the world
 - Man vs. nature is seen in the mechanization of nature
- Ds Discourse on Method (part IV) shows that morality is provisional
 - Make no commitments that you can not withdraw from for reasons of self-interest – this is the way isolated/alienated individuals coordinate actions
 - Ds thinks that this is rational b/c if you do not do this then it is a form of self harm (Ds only understood morality as action coordination)
 - Hobbes, Rawls, and Habermas all think morality is about coordinated action – they do not realize morality has disappeared
 - Their notions of justice are about the actions of justice – this is justice w/o really having justice
- Ds separates fact vs. value – facts = representations and value = desire (the notion of truth is independent of desire/want)
 - Whatever is good or bad is not T or F – what is T or F is not good or bad
 - Notions of good/evil fall outside reason and cognition – what I desire is up to me, it is what I find good/pleasing
 - Liberal state is life formed on base of skepticism (this is what we mean by the right over the good)
 - On this notion we do not know what the good is, but think we can all go after our own goods as long as we leave everyone else alone

- This is a form of life for society based on skepticism – the liberal achievement
- Reason is cut off from love – reason is neutral fact finding w/ no erotic pursuit
 - This is why the mind loses relation to the body in Ds – reason is separate from feeling
 - PS is about finding unity in these dualisms – showing that cultural dilemma and current philosophical debates are internally connected
 - Our forms of one-sidedness are false and need to be hooked up with the other – PS shows history of this one-sidedness and outlines how to overcome it
 - The connection – ordinary life is philosophical already since it is constituted by a set of our categorical commitments
 - The problems of metaphysics (problem of categories) and the problems of living a life are connected
- This anticipation of what is going to happen in the PS is different than the other interpretations of the PS that we will be reading
 - PS is going to be a progression of these forms of consciousness – whatever these are they are going to be discovered to be internally contradictory and in having these contradictions which are internal to each form and consciousness – it is going to require us to somehow move on
 - This is how the book unfolds – so the questions of the books tend to be about
 - Transitions – how do they happen, what do they mean, and what are they for the sake of
- We know that Hegel's original project – the science of the experience of consciousness was to write 150 page text to introduce his logic
 - So the PS was meant as a introduction to Hegel's logic - this makes interpreters think that the transitions in the PS depend on his logic for their cogency and intelligibility and therefore deny that the PS stands on its own
 - In itself JM finds this reading unintelligible – he is unsure how we are to read the book and get to the end if we have to be at the end to find the transitions in the Logic
 - This account does not explain how we read the book in the first place to get to the logic so that we can come back and ground the transitions in the Logic
 - This is a traditional view – the Logic is central to Hegel's system and the PS is introduction to the system
 - Hegel afterwards seems to think that but he seem not to know what to do with the PS himself – he did not know where to place it
 - JM thinks that we should take it as a free standing text

- Contemporary view (Pippen) - PS written to overcome epistemological realism
 - Truth should not be seen as independent of our minds – the gap btw truth and belief can only be closed with idealism
 - Idealism – there are internal relations btw our thoughts and truth
 - TI - That we know appearances and not things in themselves affirms idealism and leaves God's eye point of view
 - This reading sees the PS as a massive TD where each form of consciousness reveals previous presuppositions of previous forms
 - When the book ends we have a complete set of the NCP of consciousness of ordinary knowledge and the defeat of skepticism

- JM does not say that the critique of realism and idealism are not part of the PS, he just begins with the story of diremption – it is E for the first 75 pages
 - The Chicago/Pittsburg reading is overly E and does not take into account the problems of diremption which were part of German P at the time

- Stern says the fundamental expression of the PS is therapeutic
 - At the end of the PS we can feel at home in the world by letting go of our categorical prejudices and one-sidedness (of course part of the PS is therapeutic – he has to show our temptation to one-sidedness in modern interpretations)
 - This account depends on Hegel's demonstration of why one-sidedness is tempting at all – he must expose the fantasy, hope, despair, structure, etc that leads someone to this type of belief
 - So, we need a diagnosis *and* a therapy which gives insight into our loss and separation, negativity, death of overcoming our dualisms – only in the moment of last can we begin
 - This will be difficult b/c the depth of the pathologies have to be learned and we have to see how these are formed – where they came from (it must go back to some original scene where this was uncomfortable) and then give insight into the loss and separation
 - Over and over Hegel is going to find that the motivating fantasy of P is that it should overcome all loss and separation (all disassociation and disconnection)
 - Coming to acknowledge that inevitability, necessity of transgression, negativity, death – are all essential in overcoming these dualisms – this is the therapy and healing
 - This therapy and healing are complex b/c they are cognitive and affective (no other text apart from Plato has this affective investment)
 - Only in that moment of loss of self assurance, narcissism, vanity, independence, autonomy, etc can we begin

- Despair begins in the cave, the doubt in the 1st meditation, etc – this is doubt at the beginning – Hegel wants us to doubt in the middle which is why the introduction lodges us in the middle
- How can we begin from the beginning if we have never been there?

4B: Phenomenology of Spirit – Introduction

- (73) **“It is a natural assumption that in philosophy, before we start to deal with its proper subject matter – the actual cognition of what truly is - one must first of all come to an understanding about cognition – which is regarded either as the instrument to get hold of the absolute or the medium through which one discovers the absolute”**
 - P assumes that before we begin with the cognition of what is we must know what cognition is – either (1) an instrument or (2) a medium - to discover absolute
 - (1) *Instrument* – w/ Ds, Locke, and Hume – all step back from knowing and ask how we can know
 - (2) *Medium* – Kantian categories; medium to which we interpret the world
 - This is *not* a natural assumption - it began w/ Ds – this is rhetoric in another’s voice – when reading we have to see whether he is quoting
 - (1) **Voice of the time**
 - (2) **Voice of the philosopher**
 - (3) **Voice of a particular form of consciousness**
- From these two ideas Hegel dismissed modern project as a mistake
 - Both 1 and 2 abstract from everyday experience and ask how we know and in doing this set themselves us in a difficult position – this is modern methodology
 - Hegel will step aside from modern methodology
- Hegel begins with knowledge as power (Baconian) – an instrument for controlling nature
 - The Baconian idea is making reason a tool to control nature so that we place ourselves as masters above nature w/ knowledge as the medium
 - Thinking of knowledge as a tool (instrumental reasoning) is to think of it as for a task which makes a separation of S and O which makes knowing problematic
 - Gadamer does the same critique for an instrumental theory of language
 - So instrumental knowledge presupposes S-O dualism – knowledge is a way to negotiate a world independent of us (not how we inhabit the world)

- Paradoxes which come from treating knowledge as an instrument or medium
 - (1) If instrument then the object is altered which creates a category and leaves the object behind – the instrument does what it does not want to do
 - (2) If passive medium then we do not receive truth as it is in itself but only as it exists through this medium
- Treating knowledge as instrument creates a S-O gap (btw knower and known)
 - This is *not* to say that we do not use Categories, categorical synthesis, language, etc – these are all mediums but not the issue
 - The issue is the language of instrumentality – if I can not know the world then why can I know it when I stand back and look at with an instrument
 - Stepping back can only create a second order realism about the instruments of knowledge – this is why E is a series of futile debates
- **“If the absolute is supposed to be merely brought nearer to us through this instrument, w/o anything being altered, like a bird caught by a lime-twig, it would surely laugh our little ruse to scorn, if it were not with us, in and for itself, all along, and of its own volition”**
 - If the absolute is going to be brought near to us w/o being altered then it is methodologically necessary to presuppose that the actual is rational – this is a methodological postulate b/c all other assumptions are skeptical
 - All other assumptions make beginning impossible b/c we should mistrust our mind as well as outside it (ancient skepticism)
 - Why is it methodologically necessary to postulate the absolute?
- (74) **“If the fear of falling into error sets up a mistrust of science, which in the absence of such scruples gets on with the work itself, and actually cognizes something, it is hard to see why we should not turn round and mistrust this very mistrust. Should we not be concerned as to whether this fear of error is not just the error itself?”**
 - Fear of error makes us mistrust science – should we mistrust this fear?
 - From fear/anxiety that we might be wrong we step back and reflect on E which is the cause of S-O dualism which creates the E problem (and we can never get back to the object)
- This is the structure of jealousy – “How do I know she is being faithful” – once there is doubt certainty is lost b/c you can not control the will/LON
 - You can lock her in a room, but her thoughts then will be unfaithful – nothing she can do will be trustworthy b/c you questioned it
 - E is a form of the anxiety of the jealous lover – this is part of the motor of this text
 - Fear of error is the error – fear generates responses which separate forever – and once these responses get going there is no way back

- Part of the reason that modern P can do this and not realize that it is a trap is that they had a view that mind was better known than the world – you could have a non-inferential knowledge of your own mental states and therefore self-knowledge w/o knowledge of the world
 - A psychotic is someone who knows their mind and not the world – Hume knew this – you have to put behind your certainty to enter the world
- The language of instrument and medium generates S-O dualism and other forms of deception (ex. we know appearances and not things-in-themselves)
 - We either adopt the crazy position of talking about internal certainty and external skepticism or start talking about the ‘absolute’
 - This is the end of E as first P for Hegel – the solution is that science appears – the turning point is in (76)
- (76) **“We could with better justification simply spare ourselves the trouble of paying any attention whatsoever to such ideas and locutions; for they are intended to ward off Science itself and constitute merely an empty appearance of knowing, which vanishes immediately as soon as Science comes on the scene. But science just because it comes on the scene, is itself an appearance: in coming on the scene it is not yet science in its developed and unfolded truth”**
 - Platonic P is going from appearances to ideas but science begins with appearances/opinions so they are not transcended but the soil of knowledge
 - When any knowledge (science included) appears its has to distinguish itself from illusion – if it does not appear we can not know about it – essence must appear (the assumption is all appearance are illusion – false)
 - The appearance vs. knowledge distinction is internal to the world of appearances not an object outside it – science is the activity of distinguishing those appearances
 - As science progresses we can confidently distinguish the two but we can not prepare for science and make sure that it does not fail – the effort is the effort of making those distinctions
 - An appearance vs. reality distinction assumes scientific knowledge – so knowledge is not product (we do not have a criterion for knowledge) but process – this is what E skips
 - Most importantly, knowledge progresses over time and the mistakes matter to what we know – learning does not disregard the bad
 - Process dominates over product and learning (education) over knowledge for Hegel
- This is different from Plato’s remembrance b/c for Plato knowledge is already there – there are no mistakes, it is not a process

- Our ideas depend on hx and we are that hx congealed – the process is one of unpacking the errors in hx – all hx belongs to us and is in us
 - P wants purity – no children, errors, oldness – purity is one of the last pre-modern ideas – but this is not human – this is why the very structure of the intro depends on error – E is dependent on fear/anxiety – jealousy
 - P is the search for self-assurance – it wants to negate things and escape from them but there is no escape (we have to keep the negative)
 - The intelligibility of a product depends on a process – science is non-detachable from learning – now Hegel is going to have to find a way of writing P that shows that science appears
- (77) **“Now because it has only phenomenal knowledge for its object, this exposition seems not to be Science, free and self-moving in its own peculiar shape; yet from this standpoint it can be regarded as the path of the natural consciousness which presses forward to true knowledge; or as the way of the Soul which journeys through the series of its own configurations as though they were the stations appointed for it by its own nature, so that it may purify itself for the life of the Spirit, and achieve finally, through a completed experience of itself, the awareness of what it really is in itself”**
 - Many take Hegel here to be talking about Greek consciousness but it is natural consciousness whose claims are complicated
 - **Natural C** = any form of C which spontaneously, unreflectively, and immediately takes itself to be in possession of truth
 - Natural C takes itself to be a-historical and a-social – not conditioned
 - This is like Plato’s *Theatetus* – knowledge is just there, we do not worry about how it got there
 - Science is the processes by which natural C tries to work through and reassure itself that it possesses truth which it claims to have – fails in those stations go on to another station of the cross and try again (we will end up with a series of failures on the road to the cross)
 - Natural C is the notion of knowledge, *not* real knowledge, but a concept of knowledge – where knowledge can stand for any categorical determination possible of proving an anchor for a fundamental orientation of interpreting the world (God, morality, politics, etc)
 - One way people think they are connected to the world is by having representations of it, others think it is in believing in God – fundamental modes of accessing the world (how we are connected to the world)
 - (78) **Natural consciousness will show itself to be the only notion of knowledge, or in other words, not to be real knowledge. But since it directly takes itself to be real knowledge, this path has a negative significance for it, and what is in fact the realization of the Notion, counts for it rather as the loss of its own self; for it does lose its truth on this path. The road can therefore be regarded**

as the pathway of *doubt*, or more precisely as the way of despair. For what happens on it is not what is ordinarily understood when the word ‘doubt’ is used: shilly-shallying about this or that presumed truth, followed by a return to that truth again, after the doubt has been appropriately dispelled – so that at the end of the process the matter is taken to be what it was in the first place. On the contrary, this process is the conscious insight into the untruth of phenomenal knowledge, for which the supreme reality is what is in truth only the unrealized notion. Therefore this thoroughgoing skepticism is also not the skepticism with which an earnest zeal for truth and Science fancies it has prepared and equipped itself in their service: the *resolve*, in Science, not to give oneself over to the thoughts of other, upon mere authority, but to examine everything for oneself and follow only one’s own conviction, or better still, to produce everything oneself, and accept only one’s own deed as what is true”

- Natural C *takes* itself to be true knowledge – it does not see itself as having mere opinions about what knowledge is – there is conviction – so when we are in possession of it we act in ways which try and register the truth
 - In trying to register our truth, by acting from it, we lose it (we will fight revolutions, war, etc) – these are categorical passions of our orientation to the world (“nothing great appears w/ passion”)
 - When our categorical passions collapse we lose everything – despair – we put our all in sense certainty, moral law, God, etc in order to prove to ourselves the truth and to make the world correspond to it, if we lose this, we ourselves are lost
 - This is not just about E but is the way of despair of our modes of world constitution – this is not about ideas but *life* – this is why the stages of this which break apart are seen as stages of the cross – ways in which Western humanity has tested itself, our history of failure of finding ourselves
 - The series of configurations of C are the reality of the history of education of C from the standpoint of science
- (28-29) (about education) **“The single individual is incomplete Spirit , a concrete shape in which whole existence one determinateness predominates, the others being present only in blurred outline. In a Spirit that is more advanced than another, the lower concrete existence has been reduced to an inconspicuous moment; what used to be the important thing is now but a trace; its pattern is shrouded to become a mere shadowy outline...”**
 - Man is nothing but a sedimentation or congealing of our own history of consciousness which exist in us a cultural unconsciousness which needs to be unpacked in the education of ourselves, to internalize the movement of C

- History is hx of our own coming to be – we need to learn to recognize ourselves in blurred moments of hx – we should see our alter egos in hx
- We read hx as an externality, as our inorganic nature but the goal is to make substance (inorganic nature) subject – to take hx and make it our own coming to be of our SC
- This hx of our SC is laborious to search through – when searching we go through a therapeutic process of the unfolding of ourselves – a wise investment
- **“...we shall recognize the history of the cultural development of the world traced, as it were, in silhouette. This past existence is already acquired property of universal Spirit which constitutes the Substance of the individual, and hence appears externally to him as his inorganic nature.”**
 - That is, we tend to read this stuff in textbooks and it appears not as our living stuff but as inorganic nature appears, namely as an externality
 - The goal is to make substance (inorganic nature) subject – that is to take this stuff and make it not an external fact but come to recognize it as the coming to be of our own SC
- (29) Hegel puts this idea in an ironic way – **“Since the substance of the individual, the World-Spirit itself, has had the patience to pass through these shapes over the long passage of time, and to take upon itself the enormous labor of world history, in which it embodied in each shape as much of its entire content as that shape was capable of holding, and since it could not have attained consciousness by itself by any lesser effort, the individual certainly can not by nature of the case comprehended his own substance more easily.”**
 - This is a message that this text is going to be a long hard text – if the history was hard then we have to go through the labor of unearthing that stuff as your moment and work through it
 - This is just like what a therapeutic process is – Freud said he knew the patients problem when we first walked in but Freud says that this knowledge is useless b/c you have not worked through it – to acknowledge that you can love someone and want to kill them, that you want to sleep with your mother, etc
 - We need to define this and work through it – this is the sort of investment that Hegel is proposing here for us to go through