

Dear friends,

we had our first reading group last Sunday and it was absolute fun! Next reading will be on 14th October, 7pm (German time). Please read letters 4 and 5 until then. The discussion was also very good and I'll do a quick summary of that one first, then I'll go into what Schiller said in his first three letters.

Osama had a lot of questions and he told me there are much more. So we all look forward to hearing more of them. He asked, why Schiller is talking so much about the Greeks and why did the French Revolution fail. The Greeks were very advanced in their understanding of the human soul, at least some where, not all society. That is also the reason, why the French Revolution failed, since not enough people understood how they could govern themselves, they didn't understand themselves enough. Schiller would say, their emotions weren't educated. This is what we're doing with the reading of Schiller, so that the next revolution will be a lasting and successful one: as Matthew said, that's the reason why we want to increase the "Schiller-flux-density" in society :-)

Nicholas said that being a political movement takes a lot of responsibility, therefore we need to become better people. And Christine added that the most important duty of poets is to be the true legislators of society, because laws aren't there to be made, but to be discovered.

1st letter

Schiller says that he likes very much to do what the prince, the one he is sending his letters to, is asking of him. He connects the duty with his passion. And this is what the content of the letters is about! He says that everyone can discover this connection: "Your own feeling will furnish me the facts upon which I build, your own free power of thought will dictate the laws, upon which I should proceed." In the end of this letter, he gives a warning that he'll have to describe his ideas rather abstractly, not really close to our senses in order to make them understandable: "... the following inquiries should remove their object from the sense, while they seek to draw it nearer to the understanding."

So, bear with him, if you don't understand his words asap.

2nd letter

"The most perfect of all works of art [is] the construction of a true political freedom." Schiller is connecting here, what most wouldn't: art and politics, ideal and reality. But it's feasible, as he insists. But first, we need to understand the role of beauty in all of this, as the connection between ideal and reality: "In order to solve the political problem in experience, [one] must take the path through the aesthetical, because it is beauty through which one proceeds to freedom."

3rd letter

In order to achieve an ideal nation state with the laws that fit this state, people have to advance. Schiller said that the laws that govern nations today were formed by sensual necessity, not by reason. So, we have to find the way through necessity to reason. But, when we're too much of a "natural character", this won't work, since we're

too close to our sensual needs. If we tried to be too much of a "moral character", this wouldn't work as well, since this "would have pulled the ladder of nature out from under [our] feet." We would stretch too much, I would say. In order to achieve this noble goal, we have to "produce a third character, which, related with these both, prepared a transition from the rule of naked force to the rule of law, without hindering the moral character in its development, but served rather as a sensual pledge of invisible morality."

Adam, who will be with us soon again, once described this 3rd character: something like a natural character with the benefit of morality.

Luc (4th and 5th):

4th letter

Remember at the end of the third letter, Schiller presents a third character which is neither the 'natural' character of man nor is it the moral character. Now in the fourth letter, Schiller asserts a certainty: Only the predominance of such a character in a people can make a state transformation according to moral principles uninjurious and also only such a character can guarantee its duration. It is only in the Absolute Being that physical necessity coincides with the moral. If man is to be truly free, he will need to have his instincts become harmonious with his reason. If that can happen, then we may find it useful in relying on it as if a universal legislation. All humans have this inclination in them, they have an ideal man inside of them. Now this ideal man is represented through the state. The man must maintain himself in the state while the state maintains itself in the individual. Neither can or should abolish the other. State has to respect the subjective and specific character of the individual while conforming to reason and necessity. Totality of character must be found in the people: Neither must man be a savage nor a barbarian. Totality of character is a prerequisite to facilitate an exchange of the state of necessity for the state of freedom.

5th letter

Schiller starts his fifth letter with a question. He's talking about the French Revolution which has been ongoing. Did we find in the actors of the French revolution the same type of third character he was previously talking about? It's true that there's a moment of great opportunity as man is waking up from his indolence and self-deception and he demands to have his rights restored to him. This great opportunity fails to achieve the potential because the moral quality of the people is lacking. There is dichotomy of the savage state confronting the state of enervation. As if in a class war, where the lower more numerous classes they act with lawless instincts while the supposed cultured class is even more pathetic in that they reveal in themselves a depravity of character. Everybody is looking out only for himself and it makes for a sorry state of affairs. The spirit of the time show hesitations and stands still trying to choose between two evil outcomes.

Jonathan (6th)

6th letter

I began this letter with a question to everyone: since Schiller is talking so well about the Greeks in this letter and since he just wrote in the 3rd letter, that a "3rd character" is necessary, not the savage and not the barbarian, to be able to have a nation state which isn't violating people's freedoms. So, is Schiller implying that the way the Greeks developed their characters, that this is this "3rd character"?

We considered laurels like: "the Greek was married to all the charms of art and to all the dignity of wisdom, but without, like [we], being the sacrifice of the same."
And: "at once full of form and full of abundance, at once philosophizing and creating, at once tender and energetic, we see them unite the youth of phantasy with the manliness of reason in a glorious humanity."

Before Schiller solves this question, he counterposed his description with the cultural height of the Greeks, with today's state of the nation (or being the state of 200 years ago, which today's is not better). Since people of today do have so many problems, we see "entire classes of men unfold only a part of their natural gifts, while the rest, as with stunted plants, scarcely are suggested with a faint trace."

And why is there such a big difference between the ancient Greek and the modern people? "Because to the former the all-uniting nature, to the latter the all-deviding understanding imparted his forms."

"Eternally chained to only a single fragment of the whole, man only develops himself as a fragment, [...] he never develops the harmony of his being..."

People, who are not in harmony with themselves and with others, they need a nation state which controls and suppresses. The alternative would be chaos, in which not even physical survival would be possible. But through suppression, people are always unhappy.

Plus, as LaRouche makes the point really clearly, unhappy people can't develop their creativity, wherewith even the physical existence of the economy is threatened. I haven't, as of now, seen this clearly with Schiller, but I'm sure that he at least would concur with this argument. And he probably even knew it, implicitly.

So, we must find a solution, and it cannot be found in the Greeks: "The appearance of Grecian humanity was incontestably a maximum, that could on these steps neither continue nor climb higher. Not continue; for the understanding through the supply, which it already had, had to be compelled inevitably, to separate itself from the feeling and intuition and to strive towards clarity of knowledge: also not climb higher; because only a determinite degree of clearness can exist together with a determinite fulness and warmth."

So, no progress would be possible, therefore this state of character of the Greeks, as beautiful as it was, isn't what Schiller is saying would be the basis for a true political freedom. The search continues from here on.

Nota Bene: Schiller is telling us that happiness is basically around the corner, if we know how to go there: "The harnessing of individual powers of mind can indeed produce extraordinary, but only the uniform temperature of the same, happy and perfect men."

Scott

Notes on the Reading group's call of the 7th and 8th Letter

The meeting was started with John asking the group whether there was any questions or comments about the reading of the previous, 6th, letter.

Scott expressed his appreciation about the insight of Schiller's analysis of the breakdown of the modern state of our '...unnatural humanity' that has '...set [the capacities of Man] one against the another' (page 22) that has yielded the greater empirical achievements and extended the natural capacities of human senses and reason itself, as he puts it

'It is only because the individual powers of man separate themselves in this way, seeking exclusive authority, that they come into conflict with the truth of things and compel an idle common sense, that would not otherwise rise above external appearance, to penetrate to the heart of things.'

versus a *natural humanity* of the Greeks, which '...represented a maximum at which there could be neither pause nor further upward movement' in its collective '..clarity of knowledge.'

7th Letter

Luc read the 7th letter

Scott asked what does Schiller mean by 'Liberal principles' and 'liberty,' "Where natural man misuses so arbitrarily his voluntarism, here one might scarcely show him his liberty; where the man of artifice still needs his liberty so little, one cannot here take his voluntarism from him. (P.25)"

There was discussion about the text on page 25, from both Christine and Matt about the text on page 25, 'The character of the age must...return to its simplicity, truth, and substance; a task that will take longer than a century' to which Matt pointed out that this was the reason

for the failure of the French revolution.

And then some discussion on the latter part of that paragraph, page 25, regarding '... [t]he old principles will remain, but clothed with the garb of the century, and philosophy will lend its name to a repression formely autherized by the Church.'

Scott commented that what Schiller was stating here is evidenced today in the indoctrination we see with the Anthropogenic Global Warming sophistry, parroted by the liberal scientific illiterates of today's academic youth, that is a circular effect of having been excluded from their mental development in creative scientific thought by the imposition of empiricism in the public academic system, that they do not recognize as fraudulent, and pass off for true scientific understanding of earth's climate! How accurate, and correct, was Schiller's understanding of the larger egoic forces and characteristics in human nature!

This generated more comments from people in the group, about this, as an example of what Schiller was talking about, and predicting if you will.

8th letter

on the reading of the 2nd paragraph on page 27, regarding Schiller's admonition to 'Have the courage to use your own understanding!'

Christine made some comments, as did Matt on the modern case of why people do not take up the cause of the injustice in the world today when confronted by the knowledge of the perils lurking to destroy the human race today; the lack of courage to go against the consensus reality for fear of loss of personal wellbeing, either socially, financially, or personally, and psychologically-loss of respect and standing in society, i.e. at work.

Schiller describes the nature of the lack of courage, or fear, which is a self-imposed prison of delusion, in which the individual '...seizes with greedy credulity upon the formulations that [the] state and priesthood have prepared form them in anticipation...' and further describes how this operates in their psyche, in that '....Such people prefer the twilight of obscure belief, in which one can feel more alive and [can] shape the imagination in whatever way one likes, to the rays of truth that chase away the comforting delusions of their dreams. These illusions ...are the basis of all their happiness ; how can they be expected to pay so much for a truth that begins by robbing them of all they hold so dear? To love wisdom, they would already have to be wise, which itself is a truth already felt by those who gave philosophy its name.'

To this Matt made a comment of the idealistic notion that all people ought to be living for the 'love of wisdom' to which Scott responded to challenge the veracity of this claim, and explore why it is that most people do not seek the love of wisdom as a mode of life, and why they may not even understand what advise might actually mean. (It can sound like a cliché) stating the proposition that: '**there is no courage in the absence of fear**' meaning that an act of courage can only be understood as such within an ontological experience of an individual's awareness of a present danger or threat to either to his character , i.e. reputation, and public esteem, and/or his physical person, or a perceived one, which can be indistinguishable from a

physical threat. This proposition was meant to recognize the power of this ontological experience of the individual, which limits the individual's range of action (and thought, and both) in respect to this perceived threat, which only courage can, but not necessarily, overcome to change an otherwise disastrous or immanent outcome from inaction or wrong action of the individual. From this comment brought some pondering of this proposal, from which I continued with a following question to do with the nature of courage; what is courage, and why are we capable of action that arises from this impulse? Although I didn't refer to it at the time, but upon reviewing the 8th letter again, in the 3rd paragraph of this 8th letter, I believe Schiller is talking about what courage is, and where it comes from, where he states,

Reason has done what it can by discovering the law and establishing it; its execution is the task of **resolute will and living feeling**. If truth is to prevail in battle it must itself first become a *force*, establishing an *impelling force* as its champion in the realm of appearances [outcomes?]; for impulses are the only motive forces in the sensible world. If reason has as yet showed little of its victorious power, this is not the fault of an intellect powerless to unveil it, but rather of the heart closed against it, and of the impulse that did not act in its favour. (Page 26. Bold is mine).

Is courage then not the 'resolute Will' prompted by the living feeling to act on the 'law', in other words in a lawful manner i.e. of an understanding of the physical world, a principle of nature) discovered Reason, to become the impelling force that is the motive force upon the body to act against it's condition in distress, to have a larger, new truth prevail in a battle that the individual engaged in? That courage would then be an act based on a higher, synthetic faculty, of Reason, that Schiller refers to here, that could can formulate a course of action that can, and seeks to, resolve the state of distress by debilitating fear that would otherwise lead to doomed outcome? Maybe this is at Reason actually is. And what of humility, and fortitude? Would they not come from the same 'synthetic faculty' of Reason?

The alleged misunderstanding of the word philosophy to be merely that of its literal meaning, i.e. the 'love of wisdom,' meaning to love how 'smart' one is or could be; what one does 'know', or can learn and recite back, as Schiller euclidiates, is not what it actually means by '...those who gave philosophy its name.' For in the literal, superficial interpretation lies the implication that there is no investment, and thus no effect upon the learner, or the one who has made the discovery, in making the discovery or learning the knowledge, or why the knowledge is so, and why that knowledge is relevant to be known! On the contrary, Schiller explains to us that philosophy, '...is to chase away the comforting delusions of their dreams...which the malevolent light of knowledge threatens to scatter...[which is]the basis of their happiness.' He through this refinement process of philosophy can a true happiness be achieved that is not based on illusions, but on a clearer conception of reality. He poses why people, understandable, tend not to seek Truth, when doing so will causes them distress, suffering in the myriad of ways with their fellow men, and likely misfortune in life? Look at the greatest philosophers and artists, to see this the case, such as Leibniz, Leonardo da Vinci, Confucius, Einstein, Plato, and Socrates, Lyndon LaRouche, and one could argue Putin and Xi for standing up against the tyranny of the western empire regarding the lives of their people, and nations.

Why should people 'live for the love of truth?' Do people do that? They hardly know what that means. No, they largely seek to get along, and 'fit in' in their society at large, and at work. And this tendency is strong enough that even confronted with evidence of corruption and fallacies perpetrated upon them, they will 'carry on.' Yet, society has changed for the better only when individuals, usually collaboratively, have challenged the harmful, and injurious long practiced beliefs' or common sense of the day. So why does this occur? If it could occur from the mere intellectual discovery of the impact of an injustice, falsehood, then why wouldn't they be eliminated long ago? It seems that intellectual development alone does not hold the answer to the more complex and subtle problems of human relations, or what we may call our humanity; moreover, that its true development is the result of a '... path opened up through the heart.' (P.28)

Schiller points out the crucial role of the feeling capacity in the human being is what allows us to understand, through distress and emotional suffering or deprivation, the damaging nature of our conflicts with each other, and to ourselves, and other creatures, of the damage we may be causing, and thus, why another way, or resolution to the problem then must then be sought, and cessation or minimization of damage be enacted. Also that this feeling capacity must be safeguarded, cultured, and transmitted to future humanity by means of a culture, so as to make it ubiquitous, and more and more sensitive, so that conflicts are then minimized, and 'nipped in the bud' as they say.

It is not therefore sufficient that all enlightenment of the intellect deserves recognition only insofar as it affects character; in part it derives from character, since the path to the head must be opened up through the heart. Culture of the capacity for feeling is the more urgent need at this time, not merely because it will enable better insight into life, but because it prompts the improvement of such insight itself.

William (9th, 10th and 11th)

9th Letter

1. The refinement of man's character should be the impetus for political improvements.
2. Fine art is the tool by which man develops his character.
3. Both art and science are immune from human capriciousness.
4. Man is born into a particular point in space-time, but his labours must be directed towards the future. The material must be of the present era, but the form from posterity. "The artist is certainly the child of his age, but all the worse for him if he is at the same time its pupil, let alone its minion. May a benevolent divinity tear the infant from his mother's breast and nourish him with the milk of a better age, and allow him to grow into maturity under a distant Greek sky" (30).

5. "Truth survives in the shape of deception" (30). Art is inherently contrived because it must be produced, yet this act of creation is the driving impetus by which the universe is eternally creating and recreating itself.
6. Man must disdain the judgment of the present era to avoid being corrupted by it; he should look upwards to divinity and law to guide him.
7. The ideal is created by connecting the possible with the necessary; man expresses the ideal through invention, viz. by giving the sensuous formal structure, and formal structure sensuous manifestation within time – man projects this ideality into infinity.
8. Man must be alert that his desire for the ideal does not become tainted by personal pride. "But did man not ask himself whether this disorder in the moral world offends his reason, or perhaps instead pains his self-love?" (31). Man resolves this potential problem by directing his moral impulse upward towards the absolute; in doing so, time is annulled, and the future becomes the present.
9. Man must *guide* humanity towards Truth and Beauty through his own noble deeds.
10. "The edifice of delusion and capriciousness will fall, it has to fall, it has already fallen as soon as you are certain that it is tending towards this; but this tendency must be within man's inner self" (31).
11. Man should not create until he is certain that he is "at one with the ideal" (32).
12. Man must live within his century, but he avoids the guilt of his fellows by guiding them through persuasion towards the absolute; cf. Plato's Allegory of the Cave from *Republic* VII.
13. Man leads through courage, and so avoids cowardice; "your own nobility will awaken their [other people's] own, and here their unworthiness will not ruin your purpose" (32).
14. Attacking other people's principles is futile, for one is then attacking the entire foundation of their existence; instead, surround other people with inspirational forms, for they will then rise on their own accord and understanding. "Appearance conquers reality, and art nature" (32).

Commentary:

1. Christine and Luc emphasized Schiller's notion that people can only be persuaded through introducing beautiful forms during their moments of leisure.
2. Matt noted the connection between the Ninth Letter and the Socratic method, that only leading by example brings about truth and justice. Nick furthered this idea by commenting on the connections of the Ninth Letter to the *Republic* in particular.
3. Matt noted that didactic methods of instruction are not effective, and that great artists such as Rembrandt and Brueghel the Elder are so successful at conveying their ideas because they appeal to a higher universality.
4. Scott noted that all great leaders speak to their enemies calmly and with confidence (cf. Schiller's "falling" quotation on page 31). Helga was noted as an example of this exemplary leadership, along with Christ and Thomas More.

10th Letter

1. Man can fall from his destiny by two ways: through lethargy, and through coarseness – Beauty leads him back.
2. Opponents to the idea that the pursuit of Beauty leads man towards moral character claim that the arts only flourish when political liberty and civic virtue have already begun to decline; however, Schiller argues that *energy of character* is the source of man's excellence. "Perhaps *experience* is no sure guide in considering a question like this [whether Beauty serves a moral function or not]" (36).
3. Beauty must be located beyond the senses, so that lower sensuous manifestations of beauty may be compared to it.

4. Beauty is a purely *rational concept* that guides one's judgment; Beauty is always an abstract idea; such a Beauty would be a necessary condition of humanity.
5. "Experience only shows us discrete conditions of individual men, but never humanity itself" (36-37).
6. The pursuit of abstract Beauty will take man beyond the physical senses, but such a transcendental leap is necessary, for "whosoever dares not to venture beyond actuality will never conquer truth" (37).

Commentary:

1. Luc inquired into the second footnote (34), where Schiller refers to the expulsion of the poets from Plato's Republic. William cited the paradox between the artificiality of art and its veracity and the poetic dialecticism of Plato's writing; Plato's *Ion* was mentioned as a further instance of Plato criticizing poets who do not know *how* they write (i.e., they are unaware of the dialectical function of poetry, which operates through metaphor and paradox). Matt seconded the idea that poetic composition is ironic, and noted Plato's acceptance of only those poets who understood their craft. Matt and William discussed how Plato's dialogues are structured similarly to Classical plays, and Christine inquired into the relation of Sophocles' plays to Plato's dialogues.
2. Kevin asked Christine to reread the final sentence of the Tenth Letter; see "Of course, this transcendental path..." (37). The transcendental nature of Beauty was discussed by various members of the group.
3. Christine emphasized Schiller's idea that, while his opponents claim beauty must be lost in order for it to be known (via reclamation), Beauty must preexist and be a necessity for human experience.
4. Luc noted Schiller's emphasis on the notion that Beauty is found not through the senses (36).
5. Scott mentioned how fractals, like Beauty, were only discovered through abstract thought, and were only then projected onto physical existence through models.
6. Matt noted that the Platonic solids were the origins of fractals, and that the conception that Platonic solids are the structure upon which physical space is based was an idea which Kepler had argued for in his own works (see *Mysterium Cosmographicum*). The slight asymmetry of the universe is what allows for geometric patterns to continue *ad infinitum*.
7. Kevin noted the possibility and necessity of truths in Leibniz's work. Matt elaborated on this idea, citing Huxley and H.G. Wells as writers who got lost in abstraction because their assumptions about what is possible and necessary were wrong.
8. Matt noted that oligarchies use necessary truths, but they eliminate the contingent truths that were needed to arrive at the necessary truths in the first place, resulting in the destruction of the internal dialectical movements; this destruction occurred because the oligarchies did not want further discoveries to be made. To quote Matt: "Truth can't be literal for it to be truthful."
9. Scott noted the failure in contemporary mathematics to understand abstractions due to the increasing growth of empirical, inductive thinking methods. Scott continued by arguing that the alienation of mathematics from the process of the mind has led to an internal collapse in math.

Eleventh Letter

1. Two ultimate concepts are reached when one rises to the highest level of abstraction: *person* and *condition*. Person refers to the self, and condition to the self's determinants. "For all constancy of person, its condition changes; for all change of conditions, the person remains constant" (38).
2. "Only in the absolute subject do all determinants remain *with* the personality, because they flow *from* personality" (38).

3. Person and condition are distinct in man because he is a finite being.
4. “We are because we are” (38). Schiller argues that man’s existence (not solely in the physical act of *becoming* in space-time, but as existence *qua* existence in the meaning of the auxiliary verb “to be/*sein/être*” etc.) does not occur through feeling, thinking, or desiring; all feelings, thoughts, and desires arise because something beyond us exists. In other words, “the person is grounded in the self” (38).
5. The absolute grounded in itself is *freedom*.
6. Condition must follow from something because it is the change from one state to another; condition requires a substratum to rest upon, which is *being*.
7. “Time is the condition of all becoming” (39). The person only comes to exist conditionally (as opposed to remaining in existential, nonconditional self-repose) when he enters space-time.
8. Schiller uses the example of the blooming and fading of a flower to describe the idea of being and condition. The flower is the unchanging substratum upon which condition rests.
9. “It is only in the sequence of his ideas that the persisting I itself becomes manifested to itself” (39).
10. “He [man] only *exists* by changing himself; and only by remaining unchanged does *he* exist” (39).
11. Divinity cannot *become* (that is to say, it cannot exist within the conditional temporality of space-time); hence, divinity is necessarily transcendent.
12. Man’s personality is “the disposition for potentially infinite expression” (40).
13. Man’s physical existence is what allows him to express his personality in space-time. “He realizes the form when he brings time into existence” (40).
14. Man faces two opposing challenges: one which is *real*, and one which is *formal*.

Commentary:

1. William noted the poetic nature of Schiller’s own writing, especially in the *Aesthetical Letters*.
2. Scott noted the “cosmological sublimity” of the text as the source of its profundity.
3. Luc noted the paradoxical dialectic between plurality and unity.
4. William suggested reading *Philebus*; Matt suggested reading *Phaedo*.
5. Christine asked why Schiller did not make any scientific discoveries (like Riemann, Einstein, Leibniz, Kepler, et al). She further noted how many composers have scientific minds, and the ways they describe composition is scientific and dialectic.
6. Matt noted that all poets, scientists, and philosophers are different facets of a conceptual paradigm that is a creator. Matt also noted how many great thinkers and artists went unappreciated in their own lifetimes (e.g. Schubert).

Matthew (11th - 13th)

Some words as Pre-ramble

These are among the most challenging letters and after reviewing them several times over, I will do my best to satisfactorily make his thought and intention as transparent as possible. Unfortunately due to the length of time accrued since our group reading of them and my writing these words, I will have to leave out the particulars of individual thoughts and conversation which flowed from the minds of the members of our original reading. My memory is just not that good.

Before I begin, let me first re-establish as a bit of context that Schiller has created a new language based upon the various “opposing” qualities of the human condition (becoming/temporal vs being/eternal).

*What I have written below **in red** are my thoughts which Schiller inspired but are not directly taken from Schiller.*

11th Letter

He establishes in letter 11 the existence of our changing and unchanging aspects which I will go through briefly for context. Schiller explains that our **changing aspect** is determined by external circumstances (determined by otherness) and the **unchanging aspect** is the permanence of the self as **being**, and as such is self-subsisting. He makes a point, **following Nicholas of Cusa** that the **Maximum and Necessary Being** is the only state in which the self and its determinations **are one and the same**. “Divinity is because it is and always will be and was, and is infinite”. For all else in creation, both domains must coexist yet respect the sovereignty of each domain and it is our duty to discover how their partnership must harmonize in order for our ideal nature to become. While this is here stated, it is left for future letters to be proven.

As **Freedom is** in its essential character a pure and eternal idea, our being (is-ness) which is pure and eternal is the basis for our Freedom (ie: we are free to be our true nature- the problem what our TRUE NATURE IS, is not self-evident but must be discovered) but at the same time since the unchanging part of humanity will never be free from the changing/feeling aspect (as we are not God), we must figure out how this works.

He also explains that for MEANING to be discoverable in anything changing, it is required that there exist something unchanging as the necessary context (his example: “we say a flower blooms and fades, but for this to have meaning, the existence of the Ideal concept of Flower must exist”). This is where the idea of TIME is given meaning (“without time, personality would exist in potential but not in actuality”). **A thought that arose in my mind was the existence of a lie. How do we identify a lie? Well we cannot certainly if we have no idea of TRUTH as a context first. How about ugliness or any other vice? What must exist within us to judge any thinkable vice or defect?**

He ends with a clever statement “when man changes, he EXISTS (ie: in time)”, whereas when he remains unchangeable HE exists (the ideal oneness, and unity that we have as divine within us that transcends time). He also says “I lead back to the concept of the divinity from which I have proceeded”.

In case people are still uncertain, his aesthetical concepts flow from the concept of Man as Made in the Living Image of the Creator. This is the basis for our courage when he said earlier that we must DARE TO BE WISE! A nice irony is now created for the coexistence of

bold divine empowerment of having something in common with GOD and prizing the HUMILITY needed to be free which is nice food for thought.

Letters 12 and 13

Here he now develops his language to a greater degree, whereby he introduces the dual concepts of the 1) *Sensuous Instinct* and 2) *Formal Instinct*

The sensuous is tied as you can guess to the Changing/material domain where our passions and feelings are awakened and unfold **BUT NOT their perfectibility**.

The formal instinct is needed to account for the perfectibility of the self as it is where the unchanging ideas of Best/good , Worst/bad exist upon which our judgements of improvement or decay exist. It starts from the Absolute existence of Man and Strives to set him Free. Schiller's words "*it annuls time and encompasses ALL time. It wishes that the real be necessary and eternal and that the eternal be necessary and real. It thus insists upon Truth and Justice*".

I enjoyed his legal reference: "*Where the sensuous forms cases, the formal gives laws*". This awoke a thought in myself that the Civil Law vs Common Law dispute could learn a lot from Schiller. Where Civil law is rooted in "French-catholic custom" and centers upon the Rules of the Legal Code, the "British- Protestant Common Law" derives its authority from particular cases which occur in time and thus over-ride the "unchangeable laws". Compare this to American Constitutional Law (when properly understood) which is much more Schillerian and founded upon a perfectible Natural Law. Edgar Poe made fun of this dichotomy in his Eureka: Thoughts on the Material and Spiritual Origins of the Universe when he eviscerates the apriori system of Ares-totle's creeping and the a-posteriori system of the Hog's (Francis Bacon's) crawling.

The sensuous instinct has its' vital usefulness too says Schiller. It is not merely something which pulls us away from Truth and Justice, but rather helps us from falling into the cold abyss of unfeeling abstraction which gives birth to the Barbarian. He says "*with indestructible bonds it fetters the higher striving spirit to the world of sense, and calls back abstraction to the boundaries of the present form from its wanderings into the infinite.*"

Schiller introduces a wonderful footnote to give his formal description sharper meaning where he explains that the loss of an appreciation for the usefulness in sensual instinct has unnecessarily held back the advance of science and done irreparable harm to our mankind's knowledge of the universe. He explained in this footnote that the scientist will often impose his/her formal/moral concepts onto the way they think the universe should be, and in so doing miss the "empirical" sensory evidence that would give them a true sense of the way the universe actually IS. He gives the concrete example (echoing Plato's Philebus dialogue of the One, the Many and the Infinite) of the formal idea of Harmony which was so long known and adhered to but never discovered properly because too few had taken the time to investigate the causes of the consonant notes that would give the idea meaning and power. In Schiller's words: "*After many centuries one arises, who nears her (Nature) with calm, chaste and open senses and for this reason encounters a number of phenomena, which we by our prevention have overlooked, so we are highly astonished there over, that so many eyes should have observed nothing on such a bright day. This premature striving towards harmony, before one*

hath gathered together the individual tones... is the grounds of fruitlessness of so many thinking heads for the best of science."

This very much brought to my mind Johannes Kepler's discussions about the failure of the Pythagoreans who had a beautiful theory of the harmony of the spheres, but whose formal/mathematical instincts forbade them from acknowledging that certain proportions were dissonant (division of a string by 7ths) and that others were actually consonant.

After bringing us to realize that the objective and subjective can no longer be kept dichotomized (we must admit that we are after all investigating formal/objective truth in our subjective minds and our sensual instincts as an objective phenomenon), he ends with the beautiful statement "*Where therefore the formal instinct exerts dominion and the pure object acts in us, there is the highest enlargement of Being- there disappear all limits – there from the Unity of magnitude, in which the needy sense confined him, has man arisen to the unity of ideas which contains the entire realm of phenomena under itself... we are no more in time but rather time is in us with its entire never ending succession. We are no more individuals but rather we are Species; the judgement of all spirits is expressed by that of our own*".

Jonathan (14th and 15th)

14th letter

„The playful impulse aims at the annulment of *time within time*, uniting becoming with absolute being, and change with identity.“

This one sentence seems very paradoxical. But as soon as we think about its meaning and reach in ourselves, we can feel its truthfulness. Schiller's idea of the playful impulse is that it unites the two fundamental impulses, the moral (or rational) impulse and the sensuous (or natural) impulse. Those two are opposed to each other, but they don't interfere, since they work in two different domains. The first seeks absolute being and no change, the second seeks constant change. The first seeks to annul time, the second is always in time.

But, when the playful impulse unites them, then both their characteristics come together, therefore it's truthful to say that time is annulled in time!

What is the playful impulse? Schiller will explain this in the coming letters. But, he already unveils what it does: it sets man physically and morally free, since it allows man (and woman) to freely work in both domains, and fulfilling the demands of both.

On a sidenote, he here gives a wonderful definition of love: „If we embrace someone passionately who deserves our contempt [according to reason] we are pained by the

compulsion of nature. If we feel enmity [according to the sensuous impulse] towards someone who demands our regard, then we are pained by the *compulsion of reason*. But as soon as he has both engaged our affection and gained our regard, the compulsion of both sensation and conscience disappears, and we begin to love him, that is, play with both our affection and our regard.“

15th letter

The object of the material impulse can be called life, the object of the formal (moral) impulse can be called form. The playful impulse unites both, hence its object is living form! Schiller gives two good examples of this wonderful idea: „A block of marble, although it remains lifeless, can all the same assume living form in the hands of an architect or sculptor; while a man, although he lives and has form, is far from being living form by virtue of this. For that, his form has to be life and his life form.“

At this point, we had in our discussion process a good idea how to transmit this idea to people, especially when they themselves are so consumed by their wrong identity of being all-form (too formal persons). Just tell them, that to have a form, which is at the same time life, is much more beautiful and they will like this much more!

Beauty is the cornerstone of the playful impulse, since we should only play with beauty! And with beauty we should only play! And we're only humans in the fullest sense when we play!

No other emotion or thing deserves our play, and when we deal with beauty, we should treat her beautifully, with ease, hence play. Schiller writes a lot about what beauty is, not only here, but very often, since most people – then as now – have a wrong idea of beauty and of her effects on us. Beauty leads to truth and morality, at the same time, it relaxes us and makes us very easy.

This is the fundamental disagreement that any person from the Old Paradigm will have and very often freak out about. For them, beauty is romantic phantasy, morality and necessity is strict and hard. But we're very lucky that Schiller found a way to tell us how the world really is!

16th letter

In this letter, Schiller continuing from the previous explanation of the reciprocity of two contrary impulses (formal – material), he now *plays* and has fun with the limits of the beautiful. He will alternate between explaining beauty which is in the absolute form, and this counterposed to the beauty that most people experience in this finite world. The main difference between the infinite and the finite is that all encompassing unity will be infinite in the infinite realm of the *ideal* however in the *reality*, as we alternate between *matter* and *form*, we will have limited unity which is contracted in the part unlike in the infinite in which unity was absolute. Each part will have their own unity, which we now understand to be unity, yes, but of only one part.

In the ideal, beauty follows the concept of a perfect, simultaneous and necessary reciprocity while effecting either a releasing or a tensioning. In experience we do not have this example of a *perfect* reciprocity. We have a *fluctuation* between a *deficiency* of one to a preponderance of the other. (p.59 “what then is for the ideal of beauty a distinction made in *imagination* is for the beauty found in experience an existential difference”) In Experience, there is liquifying and energetic beauty. Ideas of reason are to be realized in mankind. So the business of linking the experiences to the abstract forms is the job of the physical and moral culture while making beauty out of beautiful things is the job of the aesthetic culture.

As energetic beauty and liquifying beauty each has their own power to effect men, there is a limit to what each can do. Even though energetic beauty can be useful to invigorate a softened aspect in man, it can also do the opposite on a character which is already tempered and full of convictions and resistant to impressions. We become aware of this limit and another kind of beauty plays counterpart to *energetic* beauty to enable the releasing effect on an entrenched character trait with, this time, *liquifying* beauty. It is not uncommon to “...find in times of strength and abundance the true greatness of imagination paired with the gigantic and the extravagant and the sublimity of conviction paired with the most appalling outbreaks of passion... [p.59]” Without harmony, the proper remedy does not correct the properly intended (patient) ill or unbalance...

So we can start to make sense of the influence of the beautiful but we must first make a few distinctions. We should properly define what we are talking about so that it be possible for our words, that we use as expressions of our meaning, may allow potential agreement in the other who will have been properly situated, whether in the ideal ‘sandbox’ or reality ‘sandbox’. Schiller announces that he intends to pursue this line of reasoning exploring further how and what effect liquifying beauty has on the tensioned man, and energetic beauty on the relaxed man, in the next letter. He further sets out to resolve both contrary kinds of beauty into the unity of the ideal man.

17th letter (liquifying beauty)

We now must go and deduce the general idea of beauty from reason whereas before we (*or most people normally*) would only be deducing this idea of beauty from the concept of human nature. Normally (or maybe he's talking the situation he witnesses during the ongoing French Revolution) we had a problem of beauty being stuck within a limited finite mindset. In

REASON we can now *form* the ideal of mankind along with the ideal of beauty.

But as in the allegory of the cave of Plato, we will descend to the arena of *actuality* to meet a man in a real life condition who's burdened by limitations which are not only due to his erroneous concept but flow from external circumstances and his freedom which is dependent on these external circumstances. There is a myriad of ways that the idea of mankind may be in him, in his mind, but generally there are basically two deviations from the ideal of mankind which is in reason.

A) Lack of *Harmony*

B) Lack of *Energy*.

Hey! (Schiller says...) "You see we haven't even 'Questioned the witnesses of experience' yet but we've already established by pure reason that actual (limited) man will be in state of *tension* or *relaxation*" Depending on how individual forces disturbs the *harmony* of his being or the *unity* of his *nature*... his *sensuous* and *intellectual* powers will have been *uniformly* (*uni + form*) slackened...

Beauty to the rescue! Both contrary limits will be elevated by beauty restoring harmony to the tense man and vitality to the relaxed man... rendering man complete... in HIMSELF.

The function of liquifying beauty is to relax the dominating impulse while energetic beauty aims to strengthen the weaker impulse.

We have to look for beauty in reason because if we only look for it in ourselves, we'll only access a spoiled and corrupted version of beauty because we have yet to develop in ourselves what Schiller previously called the third character. It is man who transfers to beauty the imperfection of his individuality ... Man's limited concept of beauty will limit his understanding.

Man is tense when he is driven by sensations (although this is somewhat counterintuitive since we usually think of the man as being softened when he is easily affected by sensation but in this case he is too much 'stuck', thus tense, in sensations, not free)... But he is also tense when driven by concepts (categorical imperative comes to mind... and Schiller's refutation to Kant, No man must must!)

All exclusive DOMINATION of either one of his basic impulses is for him the contrary of FREEDOM. To be free, man requires HARMONY ... man requires to be in harmony of both necessities. *Form* can free someone who's being unilaterally RULED by his feelings or led by his senses.. He can be released by *form* which offers an abstract beautiful vision of a higher power to show or inspire, in mind, the way to re-orient oneself.

Liquifying beauty;

A) will calm the wildness of life... Sensations will have a bridge to thoughts...

B) As a living image, will arm a shrunken form with SENSUOUS power (See Schiller is always playing? ... He's playing, not stuck at all, He's alternating between opposites, freely!!)

Schiller anticipates that beauty can become a medium through which this problematic dual tension can be removed but we will need to investigate further for that, we'll actually need to investigate the HUMAN SOUL (Dramatic: tan tan taaaan!). He says we're almost done with the abstract concepts ie speculation, but we'll soon move on to experience...after we check out the Human soul...

*Notice how there is no chapter on ENERGETIC BEAUTY (the way that letter 17 has a subtitle: Liquifying Beauty. I was expecting Schiller to present one then the other, but again, Schiller, is free and he's a true poet genius!! Expect the unexpected!) but how energetic beauty is presented all-the-while accompanying his partner in crime, namely 'Liquifying beauty'?

Jonathan

18th letter

In letter 18, Schiller begins with his idea of the third character again and states that from either the "sensuous man" or the "spiritual man", both must arrive at the meeting between the two through beauty alone, meanwhile acknowledging that given that the space between form/activity and matter/passivity is infinite and that there is no physical way of joining the two, we are provided with a contradiction. While it is true that beauty is what combines these forms, there is no absolute middle between them, given that the space between is infinite. "The former is certain through experience, the latter is immediately through reason".

If we are successful in our endeavour, it is certain that it was beauty that had led us and found us the "thread" by which we are to weave the entire world of aesthetics.

And so first it is through Beauty that the two characters are combined even though we know that they are infinitely opposed to one another! It is through the acceptance of this contradiction that we are to unite the two and not merely mix them. To form a complete Union we are accepting to a degree that it is not entirely possible but an endless quest of the mind to form the divine. Secondly we learn that this idea will bring us to a third higher character which through this true Union will in fact cancel out the two former characters and we will be united in our complete form of beauty. If we have merely isolated both, then both would still be visible and in opposition to one another given that they have not truly combined to become one.

He concludes this idea in the fact that philosopher's who merely follow their senses will find nothing individual in those senses given that we are all created the same in the in our form and that philosopher's who only follow their moral guide will never come to find the truth for they are only focusing on how the parts make up the whole, rather than how the parts and the whole are one of the same. "Spirit and matter remain divided eternally to them even in their most perfect unity".

Both are in fear of cancelling beauty, the former for that they do not want to divide their experience into parts and want to only see beauty as she acts and the latter because they only want to see beauty broken into parts, but never reunited in the whole for their logical thinking restricts them. The former wants to simply leave nature at her will, while the latter wants to destroy nature, split her up into multiple factions and then never return to the true complete

form of all. Much like today where we have a good understanding of technology and how things work but we are split into different industries and rarely combine those industries into a rigorous discussion of truth. Because they may contradict each others fields of expertise and in part may be correct but when applied to the whole may be wrong, through fear they stray further away from the possibility of a true Union. Both fail in truth because the former wants to understand nature in her entirety only with their own finite capacity of thought while the latter is failing through their inability to combine their thoughts into a union of the whole. Best put in Schillers own words, "Both must therefore miss the truth, the former because they attempt to imitate infinite nature with their limited capacity of thought; the latter, because they want to limit infinite nature according to their laws of thought. The first fear, to rob beauty of its freedom through a too-strict dissection; the others fear, to destroy the definiteness of its conception through a too-bold union".

To conclude, the former lack the insight to see that freedom is not lawlessness and the will to do what one wants/feels but rather to do what one feels is necessary for the betterment of mankind and the universe as a whole, not only their individual selves. The latter is lacking for they only want to see what they want to see and therefore exclude anything that doesn't fit into their thoughts/understanding. They fail to unite all of the parts whether they are in contradiction to one another or not for they are only seeking to form an idea of their liking and understanding rather than form a higher idea through reason. Their ego restricts them from a higher understanding of the universe because they don't care for the whole, only that they are "right" about this little fact. We must not exclude certain realities just so we can be right about one reality but rather we must include all realities to form the highest concept of truth/beauty even if that may mean you come to find a contradiction of realities.

Schiller finishes his letter by telling us that we are to avoid the problems by which the two characters stall themselves by beginning with accepting that before arriving at truth we must divide nature into parts but at the same time then elevate ourselves to an aesthetical unity by recombining those parts to the point that the two characters vanish and we are left with a perfect Union of the two into one, being that third character which we all aim to achieve.

Curt (2x)

19th letter

In describing the human mind, Schiller sets up a dichotomy of active and passive determination. Prior to having any thought, a state of unlimited potential exists he calls an empty infinity (not to be confused with infinite emptiness). The infinite is limited by having thoughts. We must have context from which to draw meaning from the infinite.

In our discussion I (Curtis) spoke of defining a garden plot that respected the foot traffic around the vicinity, by first placing stakes where the pathways were. This way we were able to create an exclusion zone ie, where we couldn't build. Then we simply built in all the

remaining space. Not quite what Schiller was saying, but interesting. On page 68 he writes: Before we define a place in space, there is no such thing as space for us; but without the existence of absolute space we would never ever be able define a place. He continues with stating it is also true with time; that we could never define a moment without the existence of eternal time. Then he adds more generally, that through the part, we have access to the whole and with the very existence of the whole, we have access to the part. Thus, we access to passivity through activity and conversely, access to activity through passivity.

Luke shared an interesting idea that our minds engaging in this activity can become aware of experience (hope I got that correct)

The next paragraph is where we all struggled with the autonomous faculty concept.

If, therefore it is said that the beautiful can be the pathway from feeling to thinking, this should not be taken to mean that the beautiful might bridge the gulf separating feeling from thought, passivity from activity; this gulf is infinite, and without the intervention of a new and autonomous faculty, the particular cannot in eternity be universal, the contingent cannot become necessary, the momentary cannot become permanent.

Yikes! Where to start?

Someone said this faculty was not a sense perception ie, it does not rely on sense certainty.

Schiller writes: The

[an] idea is the direct action of this absolute faculty;

While it has to be prompted to express itself by the senses, it is, in its expression, so little dependant upon sensibility that it manifests itself through its opposition to the [senses] same.

I guess we got that idea: an idea is prompted by our senses but is almost entirely independent from them.

There followed more discussion of the contrast between the sensuous and the academic.

Jon added some deeper understanding of space and time or more correctly spacetime being united by their shared quality of unlimited potential. That space allows time to occur and time unfolds in space.

Scott felt we very much capable of wielding this faculty and that humanity can lawfully come to know freedom though it.

I missed what followed, as my service failed.

I will add my own thoughts to the remaining portion of the 19th letter:

I definitely had my struggles with this 19th letter; our first session, really only provoked more questions. You all read that summary.

Then it was decided we take another shot at it, mostly because it didn't feel like we fully understood, but also because most of us hadn't done the reading do 20 or 21.

This time was different.

We read it again, and almost everyone experienced a deeper level of understanding. We restricted our comments to the work itself, rather than our own anecdotal ideas of what Schiller was saying. I feel that approach forced us to think and feel, as Schiller wanted us to.

It reminded me of the first letter where he writes:

“My presentation of beauty will often need to invoke feelings as well as principles; but the Heart which I address, does sense the great power of beauty, and acts upon it; relieving me of the most difficult part of my labor. “

This describes nicely what we all were feeling in our second reading and got us all to a deeper meaning. For me, it felt like he was strumming a rusty semi-out-of-tune chord within me. It wasn't painful, but it made me look deeper within. I will pull in some more of Schiller's words to summarize the rest.

Bottom of pg 71 he is talking about a mechanical necessity, external to us, that is mediated by our sense impressions. And within us, a necessity provokes our senses to open our personality to oppose them.

To conclude this statement he says

“ only someone who has self-consciousness can demand reason “

Though this process, it is possible to learn about and live our absolute existence.

Jonathan (20th and 21st letter)

20th letter

Freedom in man is there, once his two basic impulses have developed. And it won't be there when one of these impulses is absent, but will come back as soon as man is complete again. So, this is a very dynamic idea of freedom!

But, first comes the realization of the material impulse, than the rational one, because „sensation precedes consciousness“. Schiller attributes this reality to be key to understanding all history of mankind. Sounds to me like Lyn, saying that our worst enemy is sense-certainty, if Schiller means that the many struggles and errors of humanity so far come from this priority of the material impulse.

And, if we want to come from the domination of the material impulse, into the rational impulse, not domination, though, but to end the first determination and move to also develop our rational impulse, we have to stop being determined, „take a step back“. Schiller says that we pass through the aesthetic state, in this process.

Because, this „condition of real and active determinability has to be called the aesthetic“ (condition). Real meaning in and from the senses, active meaning coming from consciousness, and determinability means that it is yet to be determined.

21st letter

Now, the soul can be determined either because it is not yet determined or if it is not determined in a way that doesn't exclude anything. In the first case it lacks bounds because it lacks reality, but the second case is the aesthetic condition: it has no bounds because it unites all reality.

And because this is so powerful, Schiller calls „beauty our second creator“, hence it is through beauty that we're able to pass from one condition into another. Since Schiller is a true poet, he calls this that humanity is restored to him, each time he makes this pass.

On two side-notes: people who say and think that beauty isn't doing those wonderful things for us, they are partly right! Since it isn't beauty that makes them for us, but through beauty we can make them ourselves!

And, since the aesthetic state is not determined, „man is therefore a nullity“. And not many people can remain in this state for a long time. Schiller says, that only those who can, „supposing that they combine this capacity with a sense of reality, are destined for the whole, and for great roles.“

