

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 are 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 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.'

### The 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 formerly authorized 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.

## The 8th letter, which Matt read for the group.

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 for 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 imminent 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 its 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 formulate a course of action that can, and seeks to, resolve the state of distress by debilitating fear that would otherwise lead to a doomed outcome? Maybe this is what 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 elucidates, 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 argues that through this refinement process of philosophy a true happiness can 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 cause 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.