

BASIC CONCEPTS OF EDMUND HUSSERL'S SOCIAL ONTOLOGY

By Stephen Strasser, Nimwegen

1. The Idea of a Transcendental Monad-Community

How does the Other exist for me in the sphere of Edmund Husserl's transcendental phenomenology? --To this question, various answers are possible. He exists for me as an animated body, whom I come to know as such by means of an analogizing apperception. He exists for me as an alter ego whose appearance and behavior I understand. He exists for me as another transcendental consciousness, whose intentions -- perhaps spatially projecting intentions -- I may co-accomplish. All these answers are correct, attaining significance along the path of Husserl's contribution to a social ontology.¹

It is well established that the initiator of the phenomenological movement had the intention of crowning his philosophy with an "encompassing general ontology." He developed his plan in a programmatic manner in the "Cartesian Meditations."

In it the regional ontology of "sociality of various levels and cultures" was to occupy an important place. It was to be ordered as a typical "ontological a priori."

If we ask once more in the spirit of the new social ontology: "How does the Other exist for me?", then the answer without doubt is: He exists for me as a member of an all embracing monad-community.

In this way we encounter Edmund Husserl's monadology. Until now the significance of this conceptual motif has been underestimated. It was regarded as a mere "maniere de parler," as a random image, something causally borrowed from Leibniz's historical model. It has been shown, however, as a result of the publication of Husserl's writings in three bulky volumes,

that our philosopher had repeatedly made use of monadological conceptual language beginning in 1908. However, Husserl's reference to "the ingenious apercu," which sounds playful at first, must not be misunderstood. If we read from the exact place, it says: "Thus phenomenology leads to the monadology anticipated by Leibniz in ingenious apercu;" with these words, Husserl concluded his lecture about "First Philosophy" in the year 1924.

The expressions "leads to" and "anticipated" must be seized first. They correspond

with Husserl's expression in the "Cartesian Meditation" in which he designates monadological insights as "results of our explication of experiences of Others."

Husserl understands his social ontology actually as "monadology." -- However what does this technical term mean for philosophical sense-investigation?

We ask first about which of Leibniz's basic concepts have evoked such a vigorous echo in Husserl. We must then immediately distinguish between two basic conceptual motifs, one which Husserl has enduringly made his own, and another which he has only occasionally used. Among concepts which constitute the scaffolding of the monad doctrine in general, the following are to be counted:

1. The concept of the simplicity and indivisibility of monadic substance;
2. the concept of individuality in the sense of singularity and non-repeatability. The monad individualizes itself from within, not from the ground of an external determination.
3. the concept of the immanent life of the monad, which can neither be awakened nor steered through external finite causes;
4. the concept of the absolute independence of each monad with respect to one another. Leibniz brings this to well known expression when he speaks of the windowlessness of the single monad;

Husserl refers repeatedly to this image;

5. the concept of the relatedness of all monads to one and the same universe in spite of variety of their specific types and their always individual perspectives;
6. the concept of a universal rational lawfulness to which the immanent lives of all monads harken. Leibniz speaks in familiar terms of a "harmonie preetablie" conceived by a Creator.

Why did Husserl sympathize so early with the Leibnizian position? A simple and plausible explanation suggests itself. In numerous investigations and lectures, the younger Husserl emerged as the sensitive and painstaking analyst of solitary conscious life. While he was occupied with the description of the a priori structure of that immanent life, he of course did not forget for a moment that conscious streams occur in the plural; and this occupies him from early on.

We now know that Husserl had discussed the just mentioned problem with Pfaender and Daubert already in the summer of 1905.

The question which proves to be fundamental from the beginning is that which concerns the "principium individuationis" of the single consciousness. How does it happen that I am the same throughout the transformation of "my" mental acts [Gefuehle]? What does the word "my" signify in this connection? "What is the foundation for this selfness," asks our philosopher. Contingent sensuous material can offer no explanation of this identity and unity. - In his investigation - as so often - Husserl proceeds from an analysis of the perceiving consciousness. "The appearances which I have from my standpoint (place of my physical body in space), I cannot have from another standpoint..." he states. The two systems of appearances are not compatible with one

another. How does it stand now with the appearances perceived by the Other? They are compatible if I "admit an unknown distinction;" they are related then like two [sets of appearances] which follow at various times from the perception of an identical object. The conclusion reads correspondingly: "This distinction is the distinction between individuals. Thus the continuity of space and time is not that which is fully individualizing. Rather it is individuality which individualizes." At least in later years - and probably already in 1908 - Husserl calls such individual consciousnesses "monads." We find the motive for that in the just cited text: every consciousness is singular, non-repeatable, individual; it is absolutely independent of every other consciousness; the conscious stream with its appearances is immanent to the individual consciousness - it is precisely for that reason that the distinction between it and another consciousness is an unknown distinction; therefore the intentional relation of many consciousnesses to an identical object is "compatible," that is, the concept of this relationship contains no contradiction. In the language of ontology, one can also characterize this contradictionlessness positively. With Leibniz, one can speak of a many sided "accomodement" of monads and of a "harmonie" of the monadic universe in general.

Why now is this starting point so remarkable? It follows from this that Husserl from the beginning sympathized with a pluralistic ontology. There are many conscious streams; for him that is established. On the other hand, he holds fast to the absolute character of the single consciousness. He proclaims: "The stream which is given to me, the direct and absolute law, this there [dies da]!"

Therefore each monad in its being must be completely independent from every other monad. "Your consciousness is for my consciousness absolutely external being [Aussensein] and mine is the same for you," he assures.

Since however a multiplicity of absolutely independent beings as such cannot be conceived, all the beings need one encompassing lawfulness. With Husserl it is the case that all monads necessarily constitute the same world. "This results in the world-nexus, it results in the following: there exists a world of things and, among them, of animal or human organisms...and to this world belong manifold conscious beings, flowing and judging, experiencing, also wishing and willing, etc. That is the objective world..."

In short, the harmony of single monads among one another and of the monad totality as a whole is of a constitutive kind. However variously the founding and the act intentionalities of single monads also may proceed, their total achievement is in each case the constitution of a world-for-all and in this sense of an objective world.

II. Constancies and Variants of Monadology

This is, so to speak, the philosophical scaffolding of Husserlian monadology. We will see however that his doctrine, in addition to constant, relatively enduring, always recurring thought motifs, exhibits numerous variants, so that it is not always easy to

demonstrate the unity between the first and the last of such variants. A first variant exhibits a certain connection with the position of psychophysical parallelism. "And the monad has no windows, the monads do not stand in reciprocal action, but they have a universal accord. It makes no sense to want to produce consciousness through physical factors. But changes in the appearance-groups `bodies' signify changes in the corresponding appearance-groups `themselves' in each consciousness."

This seems familiar. We think of post-Cartesian philosophers - perhaps of Geulincx, Malebranch, Spinoza - who were thought to have overcome the scandal of "influxus physicus" in their systems. We will also however remember Leibniz who formulated the following thesis: "...bodies [function] as though...indeed there were no souls: souls function as though there were no bodies; and both function as though they exerted an influence on one another."

On this point Husserl's position is related to Leibniz's conception, and he is very probably conscious of this.

The talk of "universal accord" certainly sounds as though it only concerned a formal axiom. Husserl however is soon intent on making the starting point of phenomenology plausible. He shows therefore the special role of the own-organism ("L" for short). "My L has a privileged mode of appearance, which no other transcendent object can have, and each L' has only in analogy with L, which [appearance of L'] can ideally can be thought of as converted into a privileged mode of appearance which is however unattainable in my sphere." The subject of L', which I appresent, further perceives the surrounding world in the form of modes of appearance which would also present themselves to me if my body were located there where L' dwells at the time. Husserl thereby comes to the following important conclusion: "Only where two subjects with respect to their genesis stand in the described "preestablished harmony," where each must constitute alien organisms in itself and where each can apprehend them and must apprehend them (...) as organisms of foreign subjects..., only there is the world of one subject at the same time the world of the other subject, and the inverse."

In place of this formal "accord" there now enters the doctrine of alien-perception, as it is known in the Fifth Cartesian Meditation. At the same time, progress in comparison with Leibniz is achieved: Husserl releases the conceptual motif of preestablished harmony from its theological-cosmological place and fills it with phenomenological content.

Husserl himself however will not be satisfied with this for long. In the Germany of his period, men like Natorp, Simmel, Dilthey, and their spiritual sons, and above all his great phenomenological adversary Scheller, philosophize. These thinkers speak of love and hate, of experience and expression, of family and state, of culture and religion. Their social philosophy appears to be more concrete, closer to life, attuned more to human beings and what is human. Husserl recognizes that here lies an enormous region of tasks for transcendental phenomenology. This [social philosophy] also has stimulated him in these tasks, as attested by the third division of Ideas II and the great manuscript "Communal Spirit."

In these treatments, Husserl is concerned with a phenomenology of social life close to actuality. - The question, which concerns us here at first, is that of how such a program

can be adjusted to a monadological ontology.

The starting point is the question which repeatedly concerns Husserl as to how the in-itself of nature can be intersubjectively experienced as an intentional identity. In order to be able to explain this, it is to be accepted that monads themselves ..." are directed to one another, 'are able to encounter one another spiritually..., insofar as what takes precedence in one, what it thinks, feels, etc. can be understood by the others by appresentative presentification." In all of this, Husserl is consistent with the consequences of the basic concepts of monadology, because such a "connection of independent essences ('substances')" does not cancel the independence of the connection. Leibniz, so believes our philosopher, has applied the strict Cartesian concept of substance to monads correctly.

- But does not - according to the same Cartesian concept - every mental knowing require the consent of the knower? And is this not also the case with respect to the knowledge of nature? If so, then how does it stand with the universal accord and the preestablished harmony? Does there not lie along this way an important Leibnizian concern: that which falls under the title of the previously considered lawfulness of singular monadic life.

Husserl is consistent insofar as he distances himself from the concept of a "divine Horlogier" who from an external position synchronizes the course of the various clocks. "Absolute actuality is thus not a multitude of monads merely adjusted to one another (like clocks which have been made by a divine clock maker and brought to the same motion), but a singular connection, an entirety of monads, each of which lives only its own life in an originary (perspective) fashion, but each is in a passively causal and actively performative nexus with every other, a unity of reciprocal affecting and being affected, in which a common product in the form of nature is present in all of them as something first in itself..

The "commercium" of monads, so Husserl realizes, proceeds as a consequence of an immanent lawfulness in such a way that it constitutes objective nature, human culture, personal community in a necessary way. A forgotten telos dwells within the collective efficacy of monads and their development, which is directed to the actualization of every purpose.

In these and similar texts by Husserl one hardly perceives the turning away from Leibniz. The difference, so it appears to one at first, is purely verbal. Leibniz speaks of a "liason" and an "accommodation" of all created things,

Husserl of a universal effective connection (Wirkungszusammenhang). Leibniz cognizes his monads' passivity and activity, the case is the same with Husserl; Leibniz stresses the harmony of the monadic universe, Husserl speaks of harmony and teleology. However one thereby overlooks the most important factor, namely that the harmony of which Leibniz conceives is imposed upon the monads by their Creator-God, while every telos of the monads - of the single monads as well as the complete monad totality - dwells within. It comes in itself and through itself to actualization - without any interference from outside.

There is still much to be said about the thought motif of teleology. To begin

with, we establish that Husserl sought to justify his monadology phenomenologically. The goal directed ideas function in a developmentally determining way, they are "apprehended" from a reflective point of view.

For that end, it requires no cosmological and theological speculation, but a phenomenological one which considers the genesis of the single consciousness and of the human collective consciousness.

III. Monadic and Intermonadic Time

A further phase in the development of the monad doctrine is marked by Husserl's endeavour to locate it in the perspective of his philosophy of temporality.

The decisive concept of this philosophy is well known: according to Husserl, time is not only the a priori form of immanent life. It is rather the streaming flowing consciousness itself. In this sense, Husserl had already risked the assertion in 1911: "This flow (the flow of experience) is something which we name in accordance with the constituted, but it is nothing temporally "objective." It is absolute subjectivity..."

Expressed differently, the nexus of my constituting life is the subjective stream of time, it coincides with the unity of the temporal horizon past, present, future. - However this must be understood in a transcendental phenomenological sense. On the basis of my original livingness, I know myself as transcendental subject and as origin of transcendental "cogitationes." Each "cogitationes" has not only its temporal position and temporal form in the flow; in it, in the course of my conscious life, all mundane objectivity which exists for me constitutes itself. The world indeed owes its objective validity for me to sense-conferring achievements, which occur in my living present. Moreover, in my immanent life, I am always turned backward as well as directed forward. On the one hand, I have what has just now occurred still in grasp; on the other hand, I already anticipate that which is impending, that which will be awakened from out of the stream. The manifold temporal forms of retention and protention, of recollection and anticipation, give Husserl occasion for numerous sensitive analyses. We will not go into this here since another question naturally intrudes: what does the transcendental view of time and of temporalization have to do with a monad doctrine? More, so will one have to say in a superficial mode of observation, is presumed.

To begin with, it is now possible that the concept of the simplicity and indivisibility of monads motivates Husserl further to surpass the substantialistic concepts of the rationalistic thinkers. That is to say, it leads him back to the simplicity and indivisibility of the filled living time of a soul. "The totality which the word monad should express corresponds to the fact that each such totality has its total form, that is to say, its total time in which all specific times, that is temporal positions and temporal durations as belonging to this monad (or the processes of its life) are arranged;" and Husserl adds: "In other words, the "living time," which is own-essential to a monadic

soul, can not be stuck together with the living time of other monads..."

- On this basis, it is also possible to understand, as it is said, that a monad "individualizes itself from within." Its individuality corresponds to the unity and non-repeatability of a living time, in which it constitutes its world and itself. Also, we can now find another and better motivation for the concept of "windowlessness:" "The individuality of the soul signifies in a certain sense irreconcilable separation, also an other-being and being outside of one another (in a logical, not spatial sense), which can never be brought to a continuous connection, a connection which would be the continuous inter-flowing of monadic own-times."

Such a super stream, which would place an always own-temporal entity in another such entity, would indeed suspend the being of the monad without further ado.

There is no "encompassing time," which would include the living times of single monads as parts within itself; we have just now understood that. How then is it possible to conceive of a multiplicity of monads? How is a plurality of conscious streams to be grasped? How can a transcendental monad community be given? -Husserl already has an answer to all these questions. Certainly one should understand correctly an important position with respect to this issue. In a negative respect, this consists in the fact that he abandons Leibnizian pluralism, namely, the speculative postulate that a multiplicity of conscious substances can be formed together through an external bond. Husserl's starting point is accordingly the solitary cogito and its cogitata, the single soul and its conscious contents, the transcendental monad and its transcendental own-being. Only if the phenomenologist can demonstrate an intention in and for the monad which is essentially directed to communalization, is he as a philosopher justified in unfolding a plurality from out of it. In his own words, Husserl says the following: "There are not first many souls so that the question is under which conditions they are "compatible" with one another in their existence; rather, the question is how can I be entirely certain of a soul and become engrossed in its own-being, and then conclude that it is merely "one" soul..."

Furthermore, Husserl insists on the actual and possible communalization of monads. It is accomplished, as we already know, by virtue of the transcendental achievement of empathy or of appresentation. What does this mean however in the context of a philosophy of temporality? Apparently it signifies a coincidence [Deckung] of single monadic times. Thanks to empathy, in my living present, the living present of the other manifests itself. We "know" in this way that we are perceptually directed to the same things; that we experience in common something joyful or sorrowful, are practically related to the actualization of a common purpose. In this way, the concept of the co-present can be phenomenologically justified, in which all modi of the "with" form comprise a "primal communalization, a communalization in which what are for me empathetically coexisting other lives co-live at the same time as I live in my (primordial, primally original) life..."

As follows from the above, the "correspondence" relates on the one hand to the absolute source point of my now, which streams in a primal impressional way, and on the other hand to that of the Other which is only empathetically announced. From here out,

however, it also extends to the temporal horizons. Thus in the context of a monadological observation, a communalized past and a communalized present can be spoken of meaningfully. When in this way phase for phase comes to coincidence according to form and structure, "a temporal simultaneity of supermonadic or intermonadic time of higher levels is constituted."

Clearly intermonadic time can not be conflated with the natural time of a nature that is already intersubjectively constituted. It is the time of a psychic we, a monadic community, in any event that of a monad totality. Nevertheless, a contradiction appears to occur here: has Husserl not emphasized that the living time of a monadic soul can in no way be understood as a piece of an encompassing time? And is intermonadic time not such an encompassing temporality? On closer examination, however, the apparent contradiction dissolves. Indeed Husserl in no way asserts that there is a universal time which can be conceived as existing on the basis of the living times of single monads. Once again: his starting point is the primal present of the monad which I am. It is the absolute in which temporalization occurs. However, since here in my living primal present another present manifests itself, I as phenomenologist am directed, indeed am required to speak of an intermonadic time of a higher level founded in my present. Husserl thus does not establish, intuiting from a standpointless standpoint, the presence of a plurality of courses of life; he does not order them externally into a unitary time. He proceeds rather on the basis of an experience: in my life another life manifests itself. On the basis of this experience, I must speak of one time which comprehends my life and that of the Other. Thus Husserl comes, along the phenomenological way, to emphasize single monadic and intermonadic time without diving them.

IV. The Way to the Co-Subject

The way to the co-subject - Husserl emphasizes this again and again - is far from simple: an analogizing apperception enables me to know the alien organism as such; along with the present organism, an alien conscious sensuousness appresents itself indirectly. In this way, empathy occurs; consciousness awakens, coexisting with an Other, living with him, fundamentally being able to co-accomplish his thoughts, valuing, setting up of purposes. To the question: "Who is my co-subject?" I can therefore answer in Husserl's sense: "Principally it is he who exists for me empathetically." From this it is evident that the basis of each subject-subject relationship is the analogizing apprehension of the alien body. From a static viewpoint, there are similarities of form and structure, from a dynamic viewpoint typical modes of behavior, which make it possible for me to accomplish every apperception. In this sense Husserl speaks of an "analogizing of an outer physical body with my corporeal organism, its articulation and its physical behavior..."

This relatively simple social-ontological theory is at first complicated by the fact

that there are limit cases in the region of the human. Already the newborn child presents Husserl with such a limit case,

the feeble minded, the sick, and the insane to a yet higher degree. The organicity and the behavior of such a subject is not capable of being empathized without further ado. - However, this is not all. Husserl is convinced that there are also animal co-subjects. They are also psychophysical unities which "have their own ways of grasping the same world.

Now how is empathy accomplished with animals? To begin with, one can assume with Husserl that the animal is the same as a human being, that it is "in a certain sense, a deformed human being from an organic point of view, individually changed, malformed, 'anomalous'."

But what is the case with the lower animals? Husserl himself proceeds from the example of a jelly-fish.

Where in this case is the similarity of form and structure? Which corporeal behavior here is the occasion of an analogizing apperception?

All of this causes Husserl to subject his theory of alien experience to an at least passing change. He now not only distinguishes "normal apperception" from the apperception of abnormal subjects;

he also formulates a new principle: "My organic body in 'inner experience,' in solipsistic experience, is thus the primal apperception and provides the necessary norm." This proposition is expanded by the following: "What I follow understandingly, insofar as I can empathize, that is precisely determined through the ideal transformation of the primal type Human Being."

- With this, three new elements enter the theory:

1. The experience of the own-body is not, without further qualification, a form of perceptual experience. It is not simple perception, but "primal apperception," and this is imbued with an implicit norm-consciousness.

2. Other subjects are not only analogously apperceived, but also "followed understandingly." Also a certain norm-consciousness hereby plays a role. Husserl speaks of a "sense-retro-reference to the corresponding normal apperception."

3. Understanding by following has its limits. Physical things are perhaps empirically established, but they stand under no norm, they are not "understood."

4. Can one conclude from all this that Husserl's theory of alien experience was, in a definite phase of development, nothing more than a theory of simple perceptual and apperceptual mechanisms? Can the question, who is the co-subject, no longer be answered on a purely intuitive basis? It would in any case be meaningful to set more precise investigations going in this direction.

V. Primordially as Drive-System

One of the relatively constant conceptual motifs which underpins Husserl's social ontology is related to the topic of "primordial nature" or the "sphere of ownness." - How does phenomenology come to speak of a "nature for me alone?" In numerous texts, Husserl developed this concept in a relatively simple way. "If I abstract from all empathy, if I think of it as canceled, so that the apperception which originally results in the human being present there as a member of my surrounding world, then I would have for a surrounding world only material things - and these as given in changing orientations - and I would have my body given as central member of this world."

Husserl calls the procedure of this cancellation "solipsistic abstraction."

However he also uses the expressions "deconstruction" [Abbau], "screening off" [Abblendung] and "solitary reduction."

Underlying his analyses related to this topic is his conviction that nature, along with the contents of psychophysical organicity, comprises the nuclear existence of any world-for-me. "However what this deconstruction now allows to come to the fore as presupposition of all spirituality is the fact that immediately physical nature is present "in" one's psychophysical body..." , he writes in this sense.

This view later succumbs to certain perturbations which we will consider here in order to bring a definite change to articulation. In a manuscript from the year 1933, we read to our astonishment the following sentence: "Primordially is a drive-system."

Here a completely new concern of Husserl's social ontology announces itself explicitly, and it is essential to grasp this concern along with him.

How does Husserl come to philosophize about drives, especially about the sexual drive? His motives are of course entirely different than those of evolutionary and naturalistic authors. What interests Husserl about sexual hunger is the fact that the drive has an alluring goal and that this goal is the Other. "In the drive itself lies the relatedness to the Other as Other," so that the drive "penetrates into the Other," remarks our philosopher.

This is still not all. In the drive also lies a relatedness to the correlative drive of the Other. This has essential consequences for the concept of "drive-fulfillment." Then of course it is not a private experience which occurs in one conscious stream independently from what occurs in the stream of the partner. "In the fundamental, primally modal fulfillment we do not have two separate fulfillments always occurring in one or the other primordially, but one unity which is produced by the reciprocity of fulfillments of both primordialities."

It is not the first time that the philosopher Husserl reflects upon drive-life. The

manuscript "Communal Spirit" already referred to, which was composed in 1921, begins with an observation concerning the instinctual subject.

In sexual satisfaction, he says there, both parties can be satisfied "not only by a satisfaction that exists inwardly in each for itself, but they can also strivingly exist for one another by means of a satisfaction that arises with one another and through one another and a satisfying activity... [they can] produce a unity of satisfying communality."

- In the context of a monadology, such concepts of course have a special meaning. Previously, Husserl had indeed characterized the essential possibility of the monad community at least formally: real [reelles] mutual exteriority, intentional interpenetration. In other words, Husserl had previously accepted the fact that conscious streams are strictly separate, but that but that they can be directed to something communal: to a surrounding world which is to be perceived, to a common purpose, to a matter which is to be approached or a danger which is to be avoided. In all of this, no conduit leads from one conscious stream to another. Each monad is - regarded in an old formal way - "unum in se, divisum ab alio."

This conceptual model, which is related to the Leibnizian concept of "simple substance," is now abandoned. It does not jibe with the experience of drives. What is intended in sexual life is indeed the satisfaction of the partner, who precisely thereby intends one's own satisfaction. The instinctual intentions lead accordingly to an "interpenetration of fulfillments," which overcomes the strict separation of monadic immanences. What thereby occurs must be characterized as a "becoming one with each other" and as a "blending" [Verschmelzen], not as a being-directed to a common third.

Now we can return to our starting point. It is clear that Husserl, at the beginning of the cited text,

introduces an entirely new concept of primordially. He is not concerned with a purely natural thing-world, and just as little with an ordinary perceptual world for me alone. When Husserl now speaks of primordially as a "drive-system," then he conceives thereby of an "original standing stream," which precedes the separate streams of single monads, but precedes them remarkably in such a way that it implies the being of single monads and their individual streams. In this way, the phenomenon of instinctual "blending" and "becoming one" was to be explained.

If however we proceed from one original "nunc stans," then from whence comes the multitude and the streaming? [die Vielheit und das Verstroemen]. Whence comes the awakening of individual egos? How is the process of "I-centering" to be understood? It is not completely clear how Husserl sought to master these ancient difficulties. He appears to assume that the primal intentionality of a pre-egoic life "strives in other streams, and eventually in other I-subjects."

Such a striving and desire to procreate is known as the sex drive. Thus Husserl comes thereby to conceive of that universal drive intentionality as the most original of all. From a philosophical point of view, this would moreover signify that the first word of monadology must be no longer "immanence" but "transcendence." Intentionality now indeed has "its transcendent goal." Further, Husserl emphasizes that monads are

communalized "through many-sided immediate and mediate transcendencies of drives."

Perhaps one can understand this in such a way that the immediate transcendency of the original stream is ultimately the ground for the "absolute simultaneity of all monads;" that, however, in the course of natural history and [human] history, the mediate transcendencies of individual monads appear as the drive to socialization and procreation.

It is certain that the primordially of which Husserl now speaks is "the radically pre-egoic."

In the context of this new view, the I of acts and habitualities is already the product of a development. It indeed temporalizes itself in such a way that it constitutes objectivities and thereby objectifies itself. It apperceives itself for example as a human being among human beings, as a member of a particular group, as the bearer of a social role. Also the drive does not remain an "unmodalized drive." Rationality and rational tradition awaken progressively from primal instincts.

The decisive concept which lies at the basis of many sketchy expositions is that of development. The monad totality develops itself in the form of levels: on the one hand, it evolves from preanimal and animal monads up to the human, on the other hand, from prechildish and childish consciousness to mature conscious life. Husserl does not hesitate in this context to use technical terms of evolutionary theory. He speaks above all of the "constancy of the `ontogenetic <and> phylogenetic development."

In his mind all developmental levels correspond to definite phases in the process of universal awakening of the ego to always higher degrees of livingness and consciousness. On each level, the surrounding world, and ultimately the world, are constituted with greater wakefulness and spiritual clarity. In other words, the drive-community of monads does not remain a drive-community; it develops in step-wise fashion into a community of rational individuals.

At this point, we must forestall an erroneous interpretation. It is true that expressions like "drive," "drive-community," "instinct" play a great role in depth psychology. It is also certain that termini technici like phylogenesis and ontogenesis are borrowed from the theory of descent. Must this be understood in such a way that Husserl, who in his Logical Investigations had struggled so energetically against naturalism, at the end of his life sought a rapprochement with his earlier opponents. Nothing would be more nonsensical than this assumption. An attentive analysis of the just cited text suffices to convince one that all natural scientific, biological, evolutionary concepts are employed by Husserl in a completely new-fashioned sense: he tacitly changes them into transcendental concepts. The problem with which Husserl struggles is indeed just as before the question concerning the essence of transcendental life. The discovery that it is inevitable to postulate a historical dimension of this life has a surprising enrichment of the phenomenological thematic as a consequence. It is certain that Husserl, even if he sets in motion "nature-historical" observations, is striving to project a transcendental life-philosophy. To postulate a natural scientific hypothesis as the explanation of all "world enigmas" lies completely distant from him.

VI. Beyond the Monad Community

On the other hand, it would be an error to underestimate the significance of this new view for Husserl's philosophy. It has as a consequence a fundamental change in his problematic. Our philosopher is himself conscious of this. Looking back, he briefly sketched the development of his doctrine where he *grosso modo* distinguished three phases. For the first, the doctrine of inner time consciousness is relevant, in whose context the stream of time and the temporal intentions were not apprehended as egoic. "Later," in a second phase, this impersonal stream was interpreted as "passivity." The I of transcendental achievements stands in contrast with it, in which the world is constituted. Now however - in September of 1933 - the foregoing at least becomes a decisive new standpoint: that of the development, the history, and the eventually to be reconstructed prehistory of the ego. "However is the I of acts and the act habitualities originating from it not itself in development? Can and must we not presuppose a universal drive intentionality which the original present as standing temporalization makes unitary...?", the decisive question now asks.

The novelty of the third way of looking at things can be taken in a simple manner. Husserl no longer speaks of the absoluteness of the single monadic conscious stream: the I-centering, the "self-temporalization," the "monadization as self-explication of the ego in a monadic multiplicity

are not the first, the fundamental. There is something more original than each monad, than the constitutive unities forming in a monadic time. Each single monad has thereby its temporal horizons, its time modalities, its past, present, future. As long as phenomenology limits itself to the investigation of these temporal modi, it has still not penetrated to the "ultimate transcendental." The most original of all is "the primordial, absolutely streaming life," emphasizes Husserl in an important manuscript entitled "A Night Talk," which stems from June 22, 1933.

He adds in characteristic fashion that not even stream and life...[can] be understood here in a serious sense."

Of course all representations of "activity which has its theme," of intentional directedness and adherence, but also of identification of acts by subsequent acts stand aloof from this concept of "life."

The "absolutely original pre-being [Vorsein] of the stream" indeed implies individual temporal streams and temporal modalities; it itself however is supra-individual, supra-personal, beyond activity, achievement, identification, and self-identification. It is "prior to all beings," says Husserl.

In this text, he also calls this most original of all living loci, the primordial ego.

He characterizes it as "the absolute ego" which must be regarded as the "non-temporal bearer of all temporalizations and times, all ontic unities, all values;" in its relationship to the existing monad, it is "in a second sense transcendental."

To be sure, this ego in quotation marks clings to a certain problematic. It reveals itself in connection with the concept of reduction.

We remember Husserl's doctrine of the reduction in its "Cartesian" version. - I, the phenomenologist, accomplish the epoche in relation to the being of the world that has actual validity for me. I discover in this way that my inner life in its ontic validity does not rest on this epoche: my pure I, my pure consciousness remains. In no way, however, does a final piece of the world thereby escape: for the I which I have won in this way is not the psyche of a human being. It is rather a transcendental ego thanks to which the world possesses its validity as an existing world. As such it is an absolute. As a result of this discovery, a sphere of transcendental experience opens to me, the phenomenologist. Thereby, when I explicate my conscious life, I start out from intentionality as the main characteristic of that life. My consciousness is always related to an actual or possible intentional object. Thanks to my transcendental achievements, a meaningful whole of objects-for-me are constituted: a world. Precisely because of this, the Cartesian cogito requires an expansion. For the phenomenologist, the basic principle, "Ego cogito cogitatum," is valid. On the basis of transcendental-phenomenological research, it can now be made intelligible how the world originates for me as cogitatum of my cogitationes.

This "classical" doctrine is now overthrown in the context of the just now indicated new conception which involves a shift in sense. The I as the accomplisher of acts, of intentional achievements, the I who identifies its single cogitationes and knows itself as their accomplisher proves itself for its part to be something of a descendent. It is, as stated, not yet the ultimate transcendental. Therefore, if we are to accomplish the reduction in still more radical form, it is necessary to break through to the "original ego." Of course, the word "I" is misleading in this connection. The "primal I" indeed accomplishes no intentional acts, its life can only be characterized as "original present."

It also has no other ego as transcendental partner; it is not the member of a monad-community. It is nothing other than the ego "which lies with its absolute 'life' prior to all beings; and because it itself is laid claim to, characterized, spoken of, indeed described as existing, it itself is indeed not the original ego..."

Remarkably, this original I "bears [in itself] the original ego in relation to which alteri exist."

The primal-temporal stream contains implicitly within itself all temporalizations and times, all mundane beings and worlds. It implies a multiplicity of existing monads. But nevertheless it does not exist in an actual way. It is nothing but a locus of life, from which today and yesterday, being identical and being other, being one and being many originate, but which in itself shows no trace of any division. - As soon as this is understood, the "ultimate overcoming of naivete" is achieved.

This is the theme of the "final reduction." It must direct the seeing glance of the phenomenologist to this original life. Furthermore, it is the purpose of transcendental analysis to bring all of the just indicated implications to insightful development. The latter is the task of a genetic phenomenology whose value next to the previously generally pursued static phenomenology Husserl once more recognizes.

If we reflect upon this profound course of thought, then two observations press themselves upon us. First it is significant that along this way Husserl again has endeavoured to exclude the person of the "divine Horlogier." In the context of the new position it is not necessary, indeed not possible, to return to the origin of the monad-totality and monadic time by means of an external intervention. In contrast with this stands the fact that Husserl, just as little as Leibniz, cannot help but enter the region of metaphysics. For this "original life," this "primal temporal stream," this not yet existing "prebeing" can in no way be beheld, perceived, experienced. So can a metaphysical thinker see himself compelled to introduce such concepts into philosophical discourse. Husserl had already in the "Cartesian Meditations" articulated the thesis "that the ultimate cognitions of being must be called metaphysical;"

It is completely conceivable that he continued his research in this direction.

Of course one can ask if his metaphysics is completely original. The "original stream" which makes all temporalization possible, without itself temporalizing, reminds one, to some extent, of the Aristotelian conceptual motif of the Unmoved Mover. Since Husserl harboured great admiration for the theology of the Stagirite, the possibility of an unconscious influence is not to be excluded. Furthermore, Husserl's endeavour to keep a distance from the pre-being of all multiplicity as well as all subject-object division bound up with intentionality reminds one of the profound metaphysics of Plotinus. We come in any case to the sphere of a philosophical thinking about the divine, a name that one also gives it, along which path one may also seek to approach it.

A restrictive remark is nevertheless necessary. There is not in Husserl a well-considered system, but only a metaphysical attempt. We are dealing with an ancestral thought which it is a difficult struggle to express in the form of a philosophical monologue. Moreover, we will have to recognize that Husserl had also undertaken other and various attempts to solve the problems of his social ontology on the basis of ultimate cognitions of being.

VII. Generativity of Monads

If the world exists only relative to consciousness, then consciousness is an absolute. As is well known, Husserl had already announced this thesis in 1913 in the first book of his "Ideas."

Somehow he had adhered to it throughout his entire life. The little word "somehow" contains in any event a certain limitation. In the execution of his thesis, Husserl of course encountered considerable difficulties. They forced him to modify the doctrine of "Ideas" in a far-reaching way.

A first difficulty consists in the fact that the concept of consciousness is applied to the total-subjectivity. Husserl did not doubt that there are higher animals that possess consciousness. But how do things stand with the lower animals? And with the plants and primitive organisms? Where is the limit to be drawn here? - If we limit ourselves to human consciousness, we encounter analogous difficulties. For Husserl it is characteristic of a consciousness that it constitutes objectivity, that which is objective, world. Can one assert that of a dreamless sleeper, an insane person, a newborn child? This is entirely uncertain. We have to find a principle solution to this problem in section IV's attempt to become acquainted with Husserl.

However the previous realization does not present the greatest difficulty, with which the philosopher has to deal, when he postulates the absoluteness-character of consciousness. Another aporia proves itself to be still more serious. The absolute is indeed, as we accept as self-evident, the unbecome; and to the same extent it is established for us that the absolute is unchangeable, imperishable, eternal. How does this now jibe with our experience of consciousness? Is consciousness not conceived of as being in continuous transformation? Does not the "stream of thought" [in English] rise up no and again? Does it not sometimes dry out? - Yet does it not at the same time have its rest? The authentic aporia lies in the fact that new conscious streams originate, while old conscious streams sink down and disappear. And this appears to stand in shrill contradiction to the thesis of the absoluteness of consciousness.

It is therefore thoroughly understandable that Husserl was disturbed early on, even though he did not speak of it in his published works. Already in a fragment which probably originates from the year 1908, we see the anxious question: "Consciousness originates. What does that mean? Consciousness vanishes again. What does that mean? And this text ends with the acknowledgement: "These are difficulties. How are they to be approached."

In September 1921, our philosopher encountered the same aporia: "Question: Can a subject begin? Can a subject end?"

These questions return in later manuscripts: "How is it with life and death? What is the 'entering into life,' 'being born?' Is that a modus of awakening? Are there modi of awakening?"

- Thus Husserl has no illusions about the significance of this problem. It is valid to point out, claims our philosopher, that generativity "is not a fact," that "a world and human being without birth and death are unthinkable;" Birth and death are rather, "constitutive processes for the making possible of world-constitution."

How does Husserl now seek to become master of these difficulties? One of his attempts at a solution clings to the most narrow of the metaphysical thought-processes which we have sketched in the previous section. We have seen there that Husserl in a certain phase of his development postulated an "original I" that does not exist in the authentic sense, that releases all beings, all essences, all values from out of itself. There was also talk of a primal-temporal stream, from which proceeds the temporalization of all concrete conscious streams; of an original locus of life in which yesterday and today are at home. Nothing prevents Husserl from accepting that the transcendental locus of life is also the

ground from which the singular subjective life awakens and to which it again strives after the completion of its development. The "absolute stream" would then serve as an explanation of the relativity and transitoriness of individual conscious streams. Husserl appears to have in mind something like the following thought which he formulated in the already-mentioned "night-talk:" in the original stream are implied "the pregiven world, my mundane past, my mundane childhood, of course the fellow humans and animals with their generative connections, with their birth, their childhood development, their maturation, their growing old and dying - psychophysically, thus biophysically and psychically: thus how can I let the original present...hesitate with a birth and end with a future death."

In the absolute stream everything is transcended, Husserl appears to want to say: living and dying, germination and withering, birth, development and death. The original I is the realm of the mother and at the same time the isle of death. Its nontemporality encompasses and binds together all biophysical and psychical experiences. The life of the body and soul lies enclosed in it. The word "appears" was of course used with a purpose. One can only say with certainty: if Husserl had thought something of the kind, then he - at least in passing - sought the solution of the crucial difficulties in the direction of a metaphysics to which certain pantheistic characteristics are not foreign.

An entirely different kind of solution was characterized earlier as monadological, nature-philosophical, and nature-historical. It represents a great planned synthesis in which Husserl unifies very heterogeneous elements. An interpretative analysis leads to the distinction of the following conceptual motifs:

1. Husserl takes over basically the Leibnizian thesis concerning the imperishability of monads. The way in which Leibniz motivates his position is well-known: according to him, although the intensity of monadic conscious life continually increases and diminishes, its substance cannot fall into dissolution. This would be incompatible with the concept of simple substance. Therefore there is no actual birth, no consummating death, but only development and growth on the one hand, involution and withering on the other hand. From this Leibniz draws the conclusion the monads which are gifted with little clear conscious life, perhaps the souls ("entelechies") of animals, also do not actually die. They only fall into a condition of prolonged unconsciousness, into a "long etourdissement."

In other words, they awaken or sleep, but they do not originate, and just as little do they completely perish.

2. Husserl does not take over these basic concepts in unchanged form. He connects them to a viewpoint which was foreign to Leibniz: that of historicity. As follows from what was previously realized, this word in Husserl signifies something different than in for example Dilthey or Heidegger. Husserl thinks thereby in the first place of the history of nature, which he believes must be understood in an evolutionary sense. The history of nature exhibits a development of single beings (ontogenesis), but also an origination of always new forms of life (phylogenesis). When Husserl now attributes historicity to the monad-totality, so this signifies in his mind the upward development of the monadic universe in the course of a history. In other words the

transformation of monads proceeds in such a way that always more intensive and higher forms of consciousness originate. Our philosopher repeatedly emphasizes that the development of teleology dwells within. Husserl's dynamic conception of teleology thus takes the place of the statically conceived "harmonie preetablie." More exactly stated, Husserl indeed retains the concept of harmony. But for him, harmony is not "preestablished;" it is rather a fruit of subjects' consciously known and affirmed "universal teleology."

The difference in the views of the two thinkers is unmistakable: While for Leibniz, nothing essentially new originates following the creative act of God, Husserl emphasizes that monads are again and again brought to a higher level of spiritual formation and that, "in this form...the totality of monads [comes] to self-consciousness by installments, first of all universally as the human community."

3. The optimism of the older evolutionists rests familiarly on a definite version of the doctrine of heredity. Husserl reinterprets this naturalistic hypothesis in a phenomenological and transcendental-phenomenological sense. In doing so, he employs the concept of sedimentation. What he understands thereby can be recognized: consciousness is not only like a stream of experiences. In the "bed" of this stream certain material which has been carried along is deposited. This means that monadic life exhibits an acquisitions which are not actually conscious, but which can be reclaimed from the stream, that is, can become conscious. Husserl now believes, if this material is to be capable of being reclaimed, that the experiences of the propagating organisms must be present as sediment in the hereditary material of every germ cell. "The entire process, which corresponds to phylogenetic development, is "sedimented" in each germ cell which comes to birth," he remarks.

The propagation of monads must therefore lead to an enrichment of experience and knowledge and finally to a more intensive and richer conscious life.

4. Phylogenetic development proceeds in familiar fashion in such a way that higher levels of organic life always presuppose the preliminary presence of lower levels. This biological insight will also be translated by Husserl into the language of a transcendental philosophy. When that which binds the monads to one another is the transcendental achievement in which and through which the world is constituted, then their total achievement possesses a certain structure, then it comes to stand essentially on the ground of a certain temporal articulation. To begin with the change of generations is to be calculated on this basis. It guarantees that "waking" and "mature" monads always exist already and are capable of carrying on the work of constituting subjectivity in new forms.

How does it stand however with the not fully waking, not completely mature monads? How must we conceive of the transcendental function of infants or subhuman monads? They are also called to make a meaningful contribution to that constitutive total achievement. Husserl compares the structure of the world-constitution which the monad-totality accomplishes with that which he has uncovered in the context of geological research. Here he had shown that the higher formations of act-intentionality

presuppose the passive syntheses of founding intentionality. Consciousness is "a stepwise formation of constitutive achievements in which always new objectivities, objectivities of always new types are constituted in always new steps or levels,..." our philosopher for his part has established.

Husserl applies this insight once again to the transcendental life of the monad-totality. In the life of the monad-community as well, steps and levels are apparent. Here also the constitution of an objective world is founded in a "preconstitution." Precisely for this reason, we can speak of a transcendental life also in connection with the not fully waking monad - the "pre-subjectivity" as Husserl occasionally calls it. That is to say, the pre-subjectivities secure the passive bedrock upon which the stage-like construction of the higher, and in an authentic sense, world-constituting achievements rest. "Pre-being, pre-world, pre-subjectivity as preconstituting pre-genesis. But all of this is ordered to our human world and all preconstitution itself belongs to the universal unity of world constitution." With these words, a fragment ends which Husserl himself titles as "an important observation about constitutive genesis."

5. We can now understand the spirit in which Husserl goes over to a new interpretation of the Leibnizian doctrine of the imperishability of monads. Linking up with our starting point, we can say: consciousness is and remains, in this phase of Husserl's philosophy as well, an absolute. However - and this is what is new - it no longer concerns the vulnerable and changeable consciousness of the single monad. The consciousness which alone possesses absoluteness is the total consciousness of the reciprocally communicating monads. - On the other hand, it is and remains also true that the being of the world is essentially related to the constitutive achievements of transcendental consciousness. We must however, in an analogous way, add: as ultimately constituting, the transcendental total achievement of the monad totality now has validity as it occurs along the path of communication and in the course of a history. Empathy in its social and historical dimension thereby proves to be important. Nothing prevents Husserl any longer from postulating a "transformation of monads."

It is indeed thoroughly conceivable that it is not always the case that the self-same monads in the self-same way, in the self-same typical style, on the self-same level contribute to the constitutive total achievement. On the basis of this recognition, Husserl is able to account for the phenomenon of generativity. Always new generations of monads indeed co-accomplish the transcendental construction of validity of the objective world. For that very reason, "birth," "death" and monad-transformation prove to be processes which are significant for making possible world-constitution.

Of course, "birth" and "death" must be placed within quotation marks. The total mode of observation is indeed only then consistent if the apparent death of the single monad is not equivalent to the end of its transcendental life. For if consciousness did not in some way constitute the world, then it would no longer be anything from a transcendental perspective; and if this could happen to the single monad, then the extinction of the total monad-community would be a conceivability. Therefore with Leibniz, Husserl postulates that the death that is meant here is actually a sinking into a deep sleep. Husserl adds however significantly that the sleeping monad also takes part in the transcendental life of the monad-community, but on a deeper level. Its darkened consciousness contributes to the passive preconstitution in which the higher constitutive

achievements of the waking monads are founded.

In this way the claim to absoluteness is preserved, but in a new form. Husserl thinks of a kind of immortality - not that of humanity but that of transcendental life - whose bearer it [humanity] is. "'Immortality' of the monad-totality in the mortality of single monads:"

this basic concept has concerned Husserl repeatedly. He endows it however occasionally with more intelligible form. We give the following long citation once more with a purpose: "And death? Monads cannot begin and cannot end. The transcendental monad-totality is identical with itself. The temporal-mundane process is transcendently a life-process of communicating monads, in which the self-same monads are founded as communicating in various ways. The whole process, to which phylogenetic development corresponds, is sedimented in each germ cell which comes to birth. Each is this nexus-functioning monad which has for its part its sedimentation as developmental acquisition. Each monad, for example a human one, which dies does not lose its acquisition, but it sinks into absolute sleep. It then also functions in some way in the monad-totality."

One sees from these words that, in Husserl's mind, the absoluteness character of the single consciousness is transferred to the transcendental monad-totality, which, despite the nature-historical and [human-] historical development, remains in absolute identity with itself.

VIII. Beyond Leibniz

With what right does Husserl go over to such daring assumptions? How can our phenomenology, conceived on the basis of methodological responsibility, engage in such a metaphysical adventure? Does he not proceed in his own way in just as speculative a manner as Leibniz? - The least that one must say here in response is that Husserl often thought about these methodological difficulties. He asks very explicitly about the ground of legitimacy upon which his monadological, nature-historical, and nature-philosophical ideas rest. And he admits with his usual honesty and candour: my method in this region is that of reconstruction.

In the important fragment from the beginning of the 1930s entitled "Monadology,"

Husserl introduces a new "distinguo:" he distinguishes here between patent and latent being. Under the first, he understands a being that is experienceable in its selfhood, that is constituted in an authentic sense, or whose typical possibility can be phenomenologically clarified in being constituted. - However, are we then finished? "Is the universe, the totality of possible experience - everything?" Are there not "pauses

in authentic being," Husserl asks. To these pauses belong the following: "the unconscious, the sedimented bedrock of consciousness, dreamless sleep, the birth-form of subjectivity or the problematic being of birth, of death and of that which is "after death."

How is the field of latent being to be approached? Husserl answers fundamentally: "This whole sphere of being is one of reconstruction - namely, a return to the latent from the patent."

It is natural to compare this reconstructive phenomenology with depth psychology, especially since Husserl for his part has viewed pure phenomenology as the eidetic sister science of the psychology of consciousness. Still we find in the text referred to an observation which clarifies the inclination to make such a comparison. Under the title of the latent we have not represented something hidden, something veiled, "something which can reveal itself, which has a being-in-itself which exists as something experienceable, and which exists as experienceable in special experiences," Husserl emphasizes.

The Freudian "libido" can perhaps bring itself to exhibition by means of a revealing process as a drive existing in itself; it exhibits definite characteristics and exists in definite - perhaps clinical - situations as the cause of special experiences. Husserl is not thinking of something similar. He sees in "latent" being only modified consciousness. As such it is capable of being disclosed and reconstructed on the basis of the primal modus of waking consciousness. Examples of this would perhaps be sedimented acquisitions or infantile psychic life. In all these cases it is a question only of intentional modifications.

Now what consequences does the turn to a reconstructive procedure have for the monad doctrine? In answering this question, we must bear in mind the fact that on the basis of his method Husserl hoped to be able to transgress the boundary between waking and sleeping consciousness (which we in everyday speech tend to call "unconscious"). Thereby he has opened a path to a view of the whole of the monadic universe. The question can at least be seriously considered - Husserl at first does not claim anything more - whether a "total observation of the wakeningly constituted world", and the "transcendental-subjective observation" proceeding from it can be dared, "the reconstructive return to subject beings of various levels with instinct-consciousness and instinctive communication, monadic communication in monadic reciprocity?"

Husserl does not speak about the legitimacy of such a procedure, but he adds a second question: "Do we thus come upon a Leibnizian reconstruction, but scientifically grounded by means of a systematic intentional phenomenology?"

This question also will not be explicitly answered. Nevertheless the meaning of this important observation is clear. Husserl apparently wants to say the following: We can only then come to a phenomenological interpretation of Leibnizian monadology if we set to work energetically on a transcendental total point of view. In this context all subjects of various levels will appear, while each single one proves to have a function in the history of transcendental consciousness and the parallel history of transcendental

world-constitution. - That both just cited questions are to be answered in a positive way follows from the fact that Husserl in fact attempts to sketch such a "total point of view."

How does our philosopher present the historicity of the monad-totality? He conceives of it as developmental history, which proceeds in three essentially different phases.

Evolution which, surprisingly, must be understood as a transcendental genesis, begins with merely "sleeping" monads, which live for themselves individually, instinctively communicating with one another, but still exhibiting no history. Only implicitly, only in their sedimented life, sleep the germs of a future development. On the next level, the beginning of monadic evolution becomes visible. Waking monads are capable of higher achievements, while these achievements are made possible by the founding sleeping monads. The third phase is characterized by the emergence of human monads. In them the monad totality comes "to rational self- and human-consciousness and to world-understanding."

In other words the phylogenetic transition from lower organisms to higher animals and from them to humanity can be clarified transcendentially as "humanization of nature," but also as the augmentation and elevation of consciousness.

From here our philosopher opens grand perspectives. "The monad-totality, a monadic all-unity is in the process of an augmentation in infinitum, and this process is necessarily a continuous one of the development of sleeping monads to patent monads."

In other words, the generation of patent monads have, in a rational manner, constituted the world; for this, however, preceding passively functioning latent monads are necessary. Therefore Husserl can say: "The whole totality is always participating as functioning." The latent sedimentation thereby guarantees, "despite necessarily occurring processes of decay," continuous ascension. In the mind of our philosopher, this constitution is the "constitution of an always higher humanity and supra-humanity, in which the totality becomes conscious of its own true being and constitutively assumes the form of a free self-[elevation] to reason, or the form of perfection."

Here there is a clear avowal of a not naturalistic or dialectical, but transcendently motivated belief in a teleology holding sway in world- and natural-history. Husserl is convinced that the opposition of irrational and not-yet-rational forces is not able conclusively to bar way to the dominance of reason. In the form of a rationally self-determining humanity, the self-developing monad-totality will attain a full spiritual maturity.

We cannot regard such expressions of our philosopher as solitary and accidental. In his already mentioned letter to Welch, Husserl expresses something completely similar: the problematic of phenomenology includes, at its highest level, "the problem of totality, of the transcendental possibility of an existing, openly infinite transcendental intersubjectivity in infinite connection," Husserl assures his friend; and all of this, together with the entire problem "of genuine humanity," can "be spoken of under the title of universal teleology."

However also in a published text - or rather one intended for publication - Husserl lays

down a credo. In his last work, "The Crisis of European Sciences..." Husserl announces in solemn fashion at the end of his treatment, that it has been reserved for transcendental phenomenology "to discover absolute intersubjectivity (objectified in the world as total-humanity), an intersubjectivity "in which reason exists in darkening, in illumination, in the movement of understanding clear as day in infinite progress."

Our investigation has reached a point where nature- and history-philosophy, epistemology and ethics, Husserl's social ontology and metaphysics converge in a way that is typical for him. The point upon which the otherwise so carefully distinguished partial regions of philosophical observation rest can be designated with the concept of teleology. According to Husserl goal-striving dwells within the single monad, but also within the conscious life of the monad-totality. It is effectively immanent in the ontogenetic, but also in the phylogenetic development. It comes to consciousness and to the consciousness of responsibility in the form of rational humanity. - However the belief of our philosopher in the final overcoming of all contradictions through this telos must not be confused with an easy optimism. Husserl had no cause for such optimism in the 1930s. Everyone knew what he meant when he spoke at this time of "processes of decline." Rather, the conviction concerning a teleology which dwells within sociality and the history of humanity must be regarded as a "philosophical faith." It is essential to grasp this if Husserl's whole path of thought is to be understood.

In conclusion one can say that astonishing material has been brought to light through the publication of Husserl's writings on subjectivity. They demonstrate that the presentations that are customarily made of our philosopher are inadequate. Husserl is neither a logicist nor an essentialist. He is neither exclusively the sensitive analyst of solitary conscious life, nor solely the careful describer of the formations of knowledge. Above all Husserl is not the nature-philosopher to whom the region of history is completely foreign; and just as little can he be characterized as the cold scholar who takes no intimate part in the social experiences of his time. All of these presentations rest on partial insights which are connected to parts of Husserl's work and stages along the path of his thinking. However they do not hit upon the essential concerns of the great philosopher. Whoever would convince oneself of the range of the Husserlian conceptual effort, must undergo the labor of working through the three volumes, and of bringing Husserl's "phenomenology of intersubjectivity" to presentation in its development.

