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*Abstract*. Modernity is impregnated by rationality instead of natural reason, technical intelligence, and an ever more vociferous social communication. Seemingly, this interrelationship has absorbed and dissolved the traditional knitting stuff of society, known as its social tie. This image should be incorrect and insufficient. Since about thirty years, the Western world has seen the upcoming of a social mechanism strengthening and curtailing the person, or subject, to leave a portion of his conscient faculties to others, on one side, in order to be rewarded in the social field, on the other side. This is explained by means of recursion to (i) the proper explanation of the energy field, its polarity, (ii) the mechanism itself, (iii) a critical comparison with the Habermasian discourse theory, and (iv) finally and in the onset an investigation into the Chinese system, in particular the so-called Social Credit System and its circumscription.

[I]

This paper contains (a) a discussion of Habermas’ discourse theory,[[1]](#footnote-1) its transformation of the basic social relationship, and (b) both a discussion as well as a hypothesis concerning the social tie in modern societies including the Chinese. - »*If you leave a kohlrabi on the kitchen table it will stay firm and dry, but if you store it in the zero-zone compartment it will become soft and watery*«.[[2]](#footnote-2) If an adage, the decision lies in the middle. According to taste (assumed it can be expressed naturally, without any strengthening from external, the social impact), the one will take this, the other the alternating side. However, (i) the middle is a periculous concept and (ii) the molecule base or the moleculization of life up from its utmost infrastructure is flexible in itself, i.e., the epitome of a moveable fact, ± malleable in addition. [+] means, it cannot but ingress and be ingressed, [-] means, there are thresholds, even a marginal one, where altering and flexibility rests. Such a large scale exhibited, the first question concerning »the Chinese issue« will be: does the postmodern form of socialist rule include an adjustment (a real tradition, in German a *Fortschreibung*) of Marxism, in which case the core piece or very root is saved, or is it something else, an amalgam of capitalist rule together with well-established forms of administration and participation of folks (in Western terminology ›subjects‹), which balance more or less, however leave the opportunity for the few or even very few to become more than affluent (i.e., wealthy and rich, in consequence have the more or less full grip on production means)?[[3]](#footnote-3) Clearly, the question lies in the field of moleculization, the reciprocal annexing of opportunity to obtain some prosperity or profits from fundamental trading or market behavior by means of indefinite – non-rigid or dynamical – interconnectivity. It is shared by anyone who must one against the other, the reverse included, complete the common field, hence more or less among both, steadily at least and in some portion convertible. (So far, the limit opportunities, actually on the extremes as elsewhere, are not alterable or fixed). Otherwise, and taken theoretically in first instance, the question should not have the middle option. If the socialist rule (or rule by one-party administration) is a real and true tradition of Marxist conceptions it should possess a clear notion of negation and negativity encompassing any private endeavor to stretch out the axis of opportunities to its own, and expressly own, advantage. If, instead of, it has left the infrastructure for other, and perhaps opposing, influences, it will offer appearances in accordance with the introducing adage (or adage-like sentence). Hence one might be compelled considering that the issue will alter and sometimes leave the compartment impression, and at other times without, i.e., firm and stable.[[4]](#footnote-4) The middle works or there seems to be a (logical) axis allowing the alternation (and something in-between).

This, in turn, might be called wisdom. It does permit the alternation between opponents which otherwise must exclude themselves, i.e., exhibit the rule of contradiction.[[5]](#footnote-5) The oldest traditions of the Eastern mind, Confucianism, Taoism, and Buddhism, even if already aware of what a contradiction is (p.e., within syllogisms or the syllogistic compartment),[[6]](#footnote-6) do allow a mindset or intellectual manners which lift themselves above, at least against, the rule of contradiction (as if indifferent, out of operation, or irrelevant).[[7]](#footnote-7) However, Marxism or dialectics cannot be settled with this mindset, at least not per se or right away. Clearly, the dialectic rule (if it is) has softened (or soaked from the bottom) the alternation requiring ›a¬a = false (and not only untrue)‹, hence promulgating a steadily operative middle, or axis. But opponents ruled by this middle often are termed contradictive (sc. a false or misleading application).[[8]](#footnote-8) Furthermore, dialectics in the realm of Marxist interpretation do not rely upon the utmost power of »synthesis« (if the representative or key of the classing middle) but stay with alternation, or polarity. The latent (innerly or genetic code-like) bourgeois attitude of looking for affirmation, as if a constant of mental conclusion or principal requirement, must be set off. Hence the united rule of the single class (or proletarian rule) has even more to be settled with intersection (or salient coincidence) to be understood as »synthesis« (in the dialectic mode) or as realization of polarity (in the other sense): in the second case, virtually, there is no (real) *Ruhestellung* (complete fulfillingness, position of final settlement, etc.). The appearance of the modern Chinese state and society will not provide an easy answer. Concerning two recent studies, one of a Chinese professor,[[9]](#footnote-9) the other from Rand (a corporation in affiliation with the Pentagon ministry),[[10]](#footnote-10) the overarching notion implies reconciliation: on one side, the (Chinese) wisdom seems still on board or active.[[11]](#footnote-11) The investment of the state or the backing of private ownership by ± local cells of the communist party sustain a large scale of market share, thereby nourishing party leaders and private people as well.[[12]](#footnote-12) As it seems, mingled or at least sublatent oligarchic accretion is not totally excluded, even if the government seeks to implement barriers. On the other side, Li Xiaodong, the professor, is gathering the glories of the recent history of Chinese economic restructuring in order to trumpet the taking over of the first place within the chain of world economies in the near future. Here, negativity seems to break through. Relying upon concepts like “the European” versus “the Chinese Miracle”, he purports, at least cannot avoid the assumption, that the maintenance of the Western rule sticking to the so-called human rights, to unrestricted market competition, and to the *oriented* (or monocausal) capital axis, the center of which is anywhere within the capitalist class, will necessarily lead to decline.[[13]](#footnote-13) The prospect of this pamphlet-like paper, as if authentic interpretation, will implicitly be maintained in the following, even if the need of more detailed information and (non-knitted) argumentation seems obstant. In addition, neutrality and indifference, the *zero* (›0‹) or ›±‹ position against *a* (›a‹) versus *not a* (›¬a‹), are possibly, virtually, or really responsible for the state of the main subject because they are real options as soon as the axis cannot be restricted to the sole complementarity of *a* versus *non a* (in the sense of contradiction). The molecularization of the standard, then, is what the adage invoked, even more what the Chinese issue nowadays is putting on the table. If it is profiting from the amalgam,[[14]](#footnote-14) pragmatics[[15]](#footnote-15) (or some form of felt or non-felt traditional wisdom)[[16]](#footnote-16) has the upper-hand, and negativity or negation does not need to be cited from the 1848 Manifesto or any other Marxist source (a habit Xiaodong still follows).[[17]](#footnote-17) Seemingly, he is persuaded that the cited insight of Marx:

“One nation can and should learn from others. And even when a society has got upon the right track for the discovery of the natural laws of its movement—and it is the ultimate aim of this work, to lay bare the economic law of motion of modern society—it can neither clear by bold leaps, nor remove by legal enactments, the obstacles offered by the successive phases of its normal development. But it can shorten and lessen the birth-pangs.“[[18]](#footnote-18)

In the Chinese context will never lead to cleavages known by the Western society, as soon as capitalist measures are adopted in large scale. Fears of similar prospects, however, are more than relevant in the CCP self-conscience (or monitoring the success of society) so that purity of the doctrine or coupling affirmation with one against negativity of the other party seems obsolete.[[19]](#footnote-19)

If, in addition, expert appreciations or evaluations of the Chinese system are correct, terming it in the context of inclusive financing and the new Social Credit System as an “increasingly socioeconomic neoliberal system”,[[20]](#footnote-20) the introducing alternative seems even more obsolete. Instead of, the fundamental field is achieved dividing its participants into the Eastern and Western claim, whereby the factors of promulgating, serving, and ruling the masses are clearly different. Under this (first) premise, negation has not to be dealt with in context of dialectics (as it meanwhile appears, a civic or properly bourgeois mode of thinking itself), but in that realm which since ever has been the master of, i.e., reality *versus* thinking (*Vorstellung*). Illusion, ideological disrupture and alienation, (standard) falsity, posture (disguise and/or pretense), even the normal playground of role-playing – societal, political, executive, or official role against the (very) private, subjective, collective stratum or class realm – will have to be easily included or, with some theoretical help, derived. Indeed, the philosopher, in particular an exponent of the rationalist fraction, will exhibit his objection that negation cannot be validated within this relation, it should imply a restriction to thinking, ultimately the categorical impact. Sentences (or propositions) bear the burden of negation, there is no anchor to be settled with reality. The economist, sociologist, and politician will answer that, concerning negation, he has learned the main twists, intersections, and repulsions from experience, hence the counterpart. This, besides, will reply anyone too, who has become acquaint with the introducing phenomenon. The opposition between ›weak‹ versus ›hard‹ (or stable, solid), even ›wet‹ or ›dry‹, and ›(cryo-)cold‹ or ›(ultra-)hot‹ is somewhere, but crucially, in the matter, or *in materia*. Looking for the ›poor‹ versus the ›rich‹ (or the ›marginal‹ versus ›non-marginal‹, ›enfranchised‹ versus ›disenfranchised‹[[21]](#footnote-21)), the ›affluent/prosperous‹ versus the ›subject of small means‹ this situation should not alter – and the premise can be concluded in the second place, where the notion of field should receive its interpretation. The ›*a* ¬*a*‹ alternation, everywhere it complies with a full-scale middle or in-between region, is equivalent to the antonymy or real polarity (complementarity within an active stretch of plus- versus minus-pole, it might be pluralistic or at once in multiplied situation).[[22]](#footnote-22) And not heretics, instead of some sort of heredity is achieved because, without making first borrowings with modern physics or chemistry, (i) the alternation is better written ›± *a*‹ versus ›± *b*‹ (if, in particular, ›−*a*‹ has got its own term), (ii) the identification of indifference can be better localized (if in direction to neutrality or otherwise within the interim region, hence deserving more analysis, and the symbol ›±‹ for indifference must be something else than, first instance, ›±‹ as the proper signification of an antonymous or polar axis), (iii) neutrality, the more or less over-arching partner of (the principle of) contradiction, can be delegated to its own realm without the presumption it should (always) possess the conclusive, finalist or most distinctive rule, (iv) the primordial distractor of the rational calculus, the hiatus, lapse, precarity or gap as instance of the [-] continuum (homogeneity or the [+] continuum non-fulfilled), can be resolved on the ground of the immediate encounter of + and −, i.e., their instances (values) do not commute, fuse or otherwise aggregate on one side against the simultaneous, steadily coincident other side.[[23]](#footnote-23) These are instances, to make it short, where one saw, has seen, sees (and properly will see) the weak (or weakest) use public violence (against police or military forces, and instances of societal establishment), otherwise a whole community or nation, perhaps the whole mankind use a persistent – immediate and coincident, as a matter-of-fact non-latent – gap between public and private life in order to introduce a census (not simply a censorship) reading, and consequently sorting out, any person against her societal affiliation.

[2]

This said, the modern world or globalization is located (once more) within a common *field*. The introduction at this place is following two tasks, already overwritten in the headline. First, as the main part the so-called »social tie« will be explained, how it behaves in modern society, and which political burden it has to bear. Second, the question will be met to investigate into the Chinese present and ask if the Chinese society has experienced the beginnings of the modern form of the tie, its mechanism, in the nineties in order to unfold its own form and principle. Even if the question has to be affirmed, the proof is not so easy. Indicative are several articles which will be exhibited, otherwise the main task will be to provide the insights of the field, how it constitutes and how it operates. The cardinal hypothesis should be that the whole Western world including the US and the entire European region have developed a well-understood and concomitant form of social tie mechanism, operative and more or less effective, i.e., ‘proficient’ to replace and penetrate the full-scale social and political hierarchy from the bottom, the mentioned infrastructure, up to the highest executive positions. Scil., this should have consequences. In order to understand it, one must give up some well-known and steadily confirmed tenets, or sidings, of Western philosophy, in particular the fundamentals of individualism (these fundamentals are overriding those which are responsible for interpretation of human rights within the liberalism context). According to this opinion, the subject is identical to itself because it exists within an ultimately self-enclosed sphere. There is no-one capable of ingressing (permeating or penetrating) into the (± ultimate) personal sphere of another one. Therefore, allegedly, anyone has his own (proper and personal) thoughts, feelings, impressions, vernacular or cerebral impulses, stimulations, will(s) and intention(s) responsible for his actions. Correspondingly, the energy everyone is dependent from is only material, *materia ipsa*, or the neurophysiological (physico-chemical) stratum forever different to the impact of »individual« senses, thinking, representation (*Vorstellung*). In other words, the inner life is absolutely (*in ultimum*) personal, »subjective« in the proper sense, and the external versus the internal realm encompasses a full hiatus, i.e., the division of a two-fold, binary sphere, even if coincident or, as per interpretation, evolving simultaneously: otherwise, there is no other consciousness, no other being to evaluate and to state. Accordingly, a human being needs his or her senses in order to perceive the figure of a kin and must use his communicative means to express ones will, thoughts, sensations. (The inner life of an animal, if domesticated or not, is totally excluded from direct, non-emphatic senseful perception). The origins of this doctrine, apparently the bedrock of mankind, reach back into its first beginnings, the main current of evolution leading into the history of the so-called ›homo sapiens‹. In any case, the antiquity is already witnessing or promulgating the burden of the division (hiatus) without profound questioning into the correctness. Religion will not be touched here, because (innermost or absolutely, by first instance) secular doctrines will not be resolved by *sacra* or religious beliefs.

Contrary to this still prevailing opinion, the first deduction from non-individualism forming the very basis of (i) subjectivity, (ii) the political community, and (iii) the intercourse or real energetical traffic as constituent of any mental, »nonmaterial« or proper representation and communication is a peculiar cross-relation.[[24]](#footnote-24) It should have been the wild ancestor, not the domesticated one (farmer, breeder, first guardian or soldier) who has laid the fundamentals of mankind: the constituencies of a so-called rational animal who is – pursuant to a special slyness, false simulation or disguise – incapable of sensing and immediately having insight into the thoughts of another being. (To make objections short, there are beings, perhaps mutants, who really are not capable, but the vast majority, the main current of generations does not belong to. In addition, superiority, social hierarchy, the historical ranks up to »aristocracy« and »kingdom« should have been in the core and not only nutshell, i.e., within the realm of highest tension, dependent from the ever more inborn faculty to handle and manage the ± enclosed condition: struggle, appertaining strife, and conflict conceal the very program of mankind). Following this main claim, the energy field becomes the crucial part of explanation. It would not help to immediately rely on physics, even if, per example, a model analysis of entropy in the acoustical domain should provide good insights into how the energy behaves analogously within the cerebral condition.[[25]](#footnote-25) Each subject or individual, as it is ‘only’ part of a constant dynamic field, maintains and receives coincidently a portion of energy shared, in the end, by the whole living mankind.[[26]](#footnote-26) Therefore, no one can cut off himself into an absolute, fully shadowed island, where no one, whether familiar, acquaint or not, should not be able to be aware of his perceptions, thoughts, even personal history, his stimuli and spontaneous mindset. To put it otherwise, the subject – or individual – is not the very center of a permanently moving orbital sphere, which, taken together in sum and/or product with any other (living and coincident) center alike, i.e., underlying the same condition, makes up the common and (allegedly) well-known (well-knit) world. This, as the outward externalization of his real condition, is only the result of abstraction – and the very force of ± scientific neutralization having guided the rationality of mankind since the antiquities – of conduct, convention and mutual, eventually simultaneously agreed upon mindset, interpretation, i.e., in this restricted sense, understanding. Instead of, the neutral (neutrality-intended) systematics of individualism – in particular within the region of rationality or rational individualism – have to be abandoned to settle the correct understanding with the conditions and properties of the field. In consequence, the real, existing energy field, lending everyone his thoughts, feelings, situational findings, and any nexus (connection or *Anschluss*) he might create and sustain to another one, must take over the systematics from the utmost fundamental infrastructure up to the most peculiar, seemingly personal (or idiosyncratic) ideas or representations (of humans): the logical chaining is not, as immediately obvious, typological, even less gender-kind-like, but corresponding to the disclosure, exploitation, analysis of the field. In *recte* (or perpendicular) position, the first one to resolve, resp. the very conclusive resolution. As will be seen, this does not exclude, that proper nodes (cores or centers) do possess subordinating power, but in first instance it will have to be explored how the real constituencies behave, cores against peripheries, ± subject(s) against groups and non-groups, assemblies, sheared or not and providing a current, against others on firm, consolidated, non-accidental grounds, finally even nations against other policies (politeia), nations (or Colossae-toruses) themselves. The ›subject‹, then, is seen necessarily from a peculiar perspective, no longer under the sole condition of outward externalization, equivalent to the individual, but immediately evolving from perceiving the energy field, every being coincidently included (subjected) and procreated (the emerging factor): the very symbol of this coincidence is the ± factor, already used and inserted into the following schemata. To make the claim once more, the subject is no longer divided into his or her psychic life, innerlyness or simple inner sense (according to Kant) *versus* his outward existence as figure, bodily extension, and source of physical communication (gestures included) but evolving in the region in-between. Consequently, there must be neurological, or non-acoustical, non-sensory (or retina-bound) communication, even if, as per condition, not non-physical (quite to the contrary: so far not explored or asserted. A human, even a mutant, can perceive (a) as-if-bodily regular movements within this exhibited energy field, (b) non-acoustical, absolutely distinctive speech,[[27]](#footnote-27) as already mentioned, and (c) perceive consciousness as a source of energy everywhere and profoundly. If he or she does melt it too, and in which degree, is an issue of secondary order).

(1) ›∃*x*∀*y* ±[Φ*x*]±[Ψ*y*] − (ΦΨ*xy*/±Γ*z*)‹

This first schema should mean, there is a subject, an *x*, appertaining to a function Φ, at least his or her consciousness, forming a product with all other subjects *y*, appertaining to a function Ψ, at least their consciousness,[[28]](#footnote-28) from which a peculiar proportion, or relation, is subtracted, i.e., the immediate product of the last ones versus a function Γ, appertaining to (non-quantified) *z*, and put into or coupled with indifference. If taken for reality, the schema is rough (or still imprecise) because (i) the ∃*x* may be a sole subject up to a couple of or even the center of a fascicle; (ii) the ∀*y* is vague against the implication or not of the *z* (explanation follows); (iii) in the difference (or subtraction) term the immediate product needs explanation about the meaning of ± versus its implementation with Γ*z.* Nevertheless, perhaps one will have grasped what (1) means: the opposition or alternation of a singular versus collective function (taken in its widest sense as finally encompassing the whole consciousness) exhibited against the steady rest of energetical loss versus that portion of consciousness (or functionality) not included within the first product. I.e., the last term is lent from entropy theory, it means that peculiar amount of energy which must diffuse within the process of communication, intercourse or encounter, and which necessarily leads to a lowering of the energy state communicated or transgressed. (Within the physical calculus it is responsible for the understanding of the heights). As premised, the situation is more complicated: the ± symbolizes direct opposition, therefore at any instance either Φ*x* is plus and Ψ*y* minus, or the reverse. In addition, the product is correct, however, it needs implication of the productive negation. As available in computation,[[29]](#footnote-29) the sign ≅ should mean equivalence (or equivalence class), but now it must bear also the constitutive negation melt into (or regularly fused with) the relational symbol. (Presumably, there is no need of clarification, it is full-scale antonymous or polar negation, already mentioned above in connection with, p.e., ›non-material‹ vs. ›immaterial‹).[[30]](#footnote-30) Further, as the energy field permits anyone to behave not only with his true function, acoustical speech and physico-chemical body, but also with a double or a peculiar personal representative, something like an energetically bound dummy (in German something like the *Attrappe* or *Doppelgänger*),[[31]](#footnote-31) the ≅ relations deserve a multiplication according to the unfolding of the social role: normal or standard behavior with bodily representations and acoustical speech, identity according to the civic or state-controlled conditions, or non-standard with the energetical dummy, its peculiar role and manners (allowing broad disguise of one’s person including the conditions of character). The next step of schematization will therefore be

(2) ›∃∃>∃∀ (±){[(|| Φ ≅ Ψ ||)(|| Η ≅ Ι ||)]*i* ≅ [(|| Κ ≅ Λ ||)(|| Μ ≅ Ν||)]c} − ((*ic*)-1n/±Γ )‹

Presumably, this formula will need explanation. So far, ∃,∀ have been complemented by using the sum symbol; accordingly, ∃means there is some, at least one single *x* (now properly as the »normal« non-dummy or non-marionette of himself, both within the scalar ± energetic representative), whereby the symbol , the single one can be counted up into a fascicle of 2 or more, however less or different from ∃> which must mean more than 1. Both symbols, as easily to grasp, cover the range between the standard ∃ versus ∀. Then means the normal or standard token (givenness) of the bodily (conventionally outward or external) individual, his counterpart in the energy field, i.e., the dummy (or energetic representative, the actor or simulator, as one will. Scil., the energy field is spinning or encompassing on both sides, i.e., it is not equivalent with the dummy or double side. Of course, as the component, the *attrappe* or energetical double-goer, might fuse or be coincident with the ‘real’ acting, normally speaking , its pending fascicle, there are intermediate values to expect, however the constitutive difference should be 1 against 0). The formula then must signify the basic situation of necessary conscious behavior: the focal (or polar) condition is obligatory, i.e., there is no real expression of consciousness, any coupled function, which could evade the energetical condition. Hence, everywhere and always the single mind encounters a counter-fascicle, at least within the dummy or simulator region, but it seems necessary to write a product of his peculiar interplay of the versus region (performance) versus the same product evolving from the plural fascicle. Both products are indexed by *i* versus *c* (for individual versus collective). (As one sees, the difference is, against the still neutralistic thinking of sociologists like Durkheim, at once written in polar terms).[[32]](#footnote-32) Then the complex symbol || ≅ ||, as mentioned, does not mean simple equivalence (or equivalence class) but the alternation and interplay of the polar antipodes. It should mean real life, and accordingly negation is involved, its peculiar expression should be the ± alternance. Both antipodes re- or interact within an ultimate, non-defeasible opposition. The || signifies the complete sphere, not simply the peripheric meaning which could be grasped by a simple stroke. Then the symbol || Φ() ≅ Ψ() ||, brackets included (and normally omitted), means a real polaric interplay even if the function Φ versus Ψ conceptually, as per notional content, do not involve a polar opposition. The formula captures the energetic situation. In any case, real complexity should allow that the functions of the versus region are not identical, in the formula they are rowed up to express the upper tension. However, the digital accomplishment, counting per 0 versus 1, should be taken up and integrated because it seems more than correct to put the main alternative, or basic schism, this way. Even more, it should allow the intercourse or quantum insertion, i.e., the real person is not fully bodily as his energetical dummy is not completely 0-like (merging with outward or sensually available energy). What follows (under §4), will be the question how the mentioned mechanism, the census versus reward ‘tie’, having thoroughly reconstituted the societies of the Western world (and perhaps by far a wider range within the living mankind), can be inserted into (2). As one sees, the periphery (or spherical) expression is coupled with brackets in order to express the specific product. The whole interplay from both sides, as mentioned, must be confronted (once more) with the subtraction of (i) the energy loss always active versus (ii) the overall indifference of the encompassing consciousness as the concomitant or coincident whole. It should include the versus -difference (of energetical region), however it should be sufficient to use once more the traditional ∀ symbol to capture its reality. Then (*ic*)-1n at least expresses the product of the entire spheric encounter (or interplay) taken as a fraction with the possibility to accrue by grades. ± is written as a factor in advance, thereby it is included within the expression of the spheres, as necessary.

[3]

The question for the »social tie«, its fundamentals in modern society, may not pass some remarks about Habermas. According to his theoretical standpoint, methodological thinking, and intentions in connection with the pragmatically conceived discourse theory, the object is naïve.[[33]](#footnote-33) Social relationship is dependent from the historical input, the state of industrial evolution, the pressure it imposes upon the member of the society, and possible layers of non-available communication following from distortions of power stratification(s) which do not allow to address their covered levers. The social class is obliged to report the power field(s) to get rewarded and to have participation in the public and state affairs, so far not a novelty, and equally not the consequent appeal to emancipation or a steady mixture of a critical and emancipatory nominal value. The very clue of this approach with normative affinity lies in the discourse which, according to H., has quasi transcendental impact because it must absorb the entire spectrum of the lifeworld, political, and societal engagement of the subject.[[34]](#footnote-34) Otherwise, he knows that the subject (from the standpoint of legality) is really the subject (in the older, traditional sense, i.e., the *Untertan* vs. *Obertan*), but his normative endeavor obliges him to think of the subject mainly on the other (+) side as the actor within civic society, the bearer and impulse-giver of the public, the conscientious partner and maintainer of the discourse process which should be responsible for the best efforts and optimal results. Still a democracy in the old (or classical) sense, where administration and power distribution depend from the civilian input without implications of societal origin or class (experience), and largely under the holistic condition (or even precarity) because the real circuits, milieu mindsets and behaviors, double role expansion of incumbents and of the average citizen, the so-called *Normalbürger*, are overshadowed both by his preference for the reflexive mode and intentionally driven high abstraction, otherwise by the obligatory adoption, even absorption of linguistic behavior and the cleavage, which this deeply entrenched convention conveys. Civilians do alter their societal role, one as the official, the other as the mummy, mock-up (*attrappe* within the encompassing energy field) or non-void (instead of the void) marionette,[[35]](#footnote-35) and this fact should influence the fundamentals of this theory. The development of this cleavage or double expansion of the social input has reached such an »electric« degree that sometimes it is not easy to decide what reality depends on, or how the standard must be confirmed (versus transitus or normalization). As societal developments extend by far beyond one generation – in the logic of Port-Royal one can already find a profound critique and rebuke of the then ruling nobility, quite equivalent to forecasting the final events of the next century – similar events are not excluded to balance these oscillations and steady shifting sustained, as it seems, with more or less ± popular pleasure input by reason of the clearance within the oscillation. (Even incumbents seem to like and promote it heavily). Be that as it may be (still rather not to notice by observing the media), according to H., the best results aforementioned have to be grasped in a post-metaphysical, non-objectivistic manner. Presumably, he overweighs by far the good-willing person [basically ± subject] against the so-called »strategic« one, hiding his true intentions and, as hypothesized here, capable of perceiving (‘reading’) and simulating the thoughts and intentions of his contemporaries, even his partners within the discourse. Under this premise, the difference becomes obligatory.

“A system concept appropriate for social science (and not only tailored to the production of strategies and organizations, i.e., the expansion of steering capacities) can therefore not be adopted from the general system theory [in particular according to Luhmann];[[36]](#footnote-36) it must be developed in connection with a theory of colloquial communication, which does even more take into account the relationship of intersubjectivity and the relation between the identity of the I and the group.”[[37]](#footnote-37) What this system really has to take account of, primarily in the straight (*recte*) and not reflexive mode, is the modern, fully accomplished energy field, i.e., the very condition of societal nexus implying any effort and capability of thinking, sensing, perceiving. Pursuant to this (alter-)premise, the subject is not capable of cutting of his consciousness from any other, and he must allow, and endure, to be permanently perceived from others (hence also intersected, repulsed, segre- or integrated, submerged and/or stipulated as (i) a trial, (ii) effort or (iii) compulsory act of being dominated: just before any communicative act is expressed, at least on the margin or limit). Then the traditional hiatus or spread in-between becomes crucial. Several sentences later H. writes: “From the conceptual strategy of transcendental philosophy […] is following the proper constraint to think the social world as a *constitutum* in the same manner as the world of the common objects of possible experience.” If this does represent a constraint, it must include the constraints of being ± able to unfold one’s energy with or without the impact of others, foremost the cerebral one. In consequence, transcendentality should follow the logics of this implication, especially if the addressed so-called identities are underlying focal impact and if they eventually merge, intersect, or coincide with or without following pure affirmation or pure negation (negativity). Accordingly, a spectrum should express real intersubjectivity, values between 0 and 1, and the focal impact will allow to interpret curved (in fact steadily looped) domination of one or the other side: coinciding everywhere they, the others and the (± focal) subject, must, and is provided an interpretation within this spectrum, scil., the values can spread at the same time in different directions or incumbent orientations. “Thus, subjects in large are dedicated to objective relationships, where socialized individuals encounter and act in communicative manner. The projective engenderment of subjects of higher degree is seeing back on a long tradition. Marx too did not always make obvious that the attributes coordinated with the social classes (like class consciousness, class interest, class action) do not simply mean translations from the level of individual consciousness to a collective [one]. Rather they are titles for something which can produce itself only intersubjectively within consultations or cooperation of individuals living together.”[[38]](#footnote-38) As becomes clear here (and elsewhere), H. reproduces the (traditional) hiatus. The constraint rests with the limit of the single consciousness having contact to others and being able to notice them only by communicative acts, i.e., speech, gestures or alike. Instead of, class, or group, consciousness should mean the spontaneous awareness of a collectively bound and sustained consciousness integrated by the common (existential, non-abolishable or permanently present) energy field (hence also perceived by others not necessarily belonging to group *x* or *y*, identity *z*1 or *z*2, or commonality *α* versus *β*), and being not dependent from the creation of a subject in large which should (only) represent it. Indeed, under this premise also solidarity or labor division, the forerunners in sociology of the theoretical issue,[[39]](#footnote-39) will not be sufficient to reach the communicative traffic and real circuits capturing both the consciousness and the class member (worker, employee vs. chief executive or manager, vs. lawyer, clerk, incumbent, …) within their effort to fulfill the executive exercises of being ± responsible, ± veridical, ± illusion-bound, ± discriminating (or ± solidary in the proper sense), ± prepared to use societal violence solely or in connection with others to enhance their standing within the societal hierarchy).

Another issue is the projective engenderment (or generation) of ideas, representations, thoughts, or icons. H. is still following the notional reduction from a necessarily (at least) two-level to a one-level base according to which the projecting result has not to be reckoned up with the producing ground, and the reverse,[[40]](#footnote-40) i.e., class consciousness, if it means the representative (mental) idea to reflect upon and actually spread over a peculiar population, can very well be measured, perceived and noticed from inside: not only a person involved, a so-called ›participant‹, but also the ›observer‹ maintaining contact with the obligatory energy field as existential base is not only capable of, but must thoroughly examine his situation, location and mindset in relation to any other node integrated in the same field and presumably expressing the ± same or similar interest. Accordingly, stratified consciousness does polarize, as well known, and the stratification is not dependent from logical subordination alone, or in first instance. Subjects do organize their consciousness; accordingly, they (i) sense, (ii) perceive, (iii) receive, and (iv) reflect (think of) the resulting conglomerations leaving the explanation for the already mentioned ± intersubjectivity: the centrification is not only placed with ± affection (especially in connection with the working class) but also, as well known, even if a lasting theoretical issue, ± solidarity and/or ± cohesion: the field condition obliges to conceive of any node, be it by single person, group or community, within the steady coincidence of the plus versus minus side, i.e., the real (polar) loop,[[41]](#footnote-41) so that solidarity is not the simple, foremost and unrestricted affirmative gender of societal relationship or ‘life’ (as with Durkheim; Bourdieu, in the essence, is still within the reflexive mode, accordingly he sets and propounds polar relationships as basic but does not compulsorily show how they evolve from one field into the other, in particular, how any situation must include the involvement of several opposites).[[42]](#footnote-42) Following this premise, the main effort of this article should be introduced and hopefully explained, the modern (contemporary) expansion of the circle, presumably the true charged (energy) circuit and substitute of the social tie. As above, it means a mechanism, coupled with coercion (more or less first rank constraint), and pressing the individual to have some portion of his or her consciousness melt into the common one, steered in the same manner by other ones (dummies – energetic doubles – and official roles within the observable hierarchy). The rendering is rewarded by social position, »opportunity« and/or relationship (especially or intentionally the distribution of sex [in the Western sphere; it remembers, no question, the *Ablasswesen* of the catholic church in 16th century]), so that the mechanism has a census and reward side in advance or permanently coupled, providing, even more in connection with the concept of charge, a model case of permanent ± coincidence or affirmative versus negative fraction. Of course, the ‘thing’ is perfidious but over several (more than three) decades it has received wide acceptance and the deep-reaching soaking of societies, in particular the Western ones, presumably the Eastern too. H. as a theoretician of the nineties up to the twenty-first century should be aware of, even if one cannot find a single testimony. Presumably, his dummy (and the official professor) was (more or less) heavily engaged with the steering function. Be that as it may be, “in first instance communicative reason is different from practical reason by the fact that it will not be ascribed to the single actor or a state-society macro-subject any longer. Instead of, it is the linguistic medium through which interactions network and [the different] lifestyles structure themselves.”[[43]](#footnote-43)

Well-known, the clue of the Habermasian conclusion lies in this linguistic (“communicative”) rationality. It has absorbed – and leaves no place – for the traditional, esp. Aristotelean social tie, even if language, the linguistic faculty was already the classical index of it. By theoretical claim, the new, proclaimed and linguistically driven rationality is endowed with quasi transcendental conditions. Whoever uses natural language to make himself understood and seeks the understanding of an addressee, is forced to settle himself with a performative role and certain presuppositions. Among other things, “he must assume that the [actors] involved follow their illocutionary goals without preservation, bind their agreement to the intersubjective acknowledgment of claims of validity, and are prepared to adopt liabilities out of relevant consequences of interaction, resulting [themselves] from a consensus. [Then it should follow:] What in this manner is implemented into the validity base of normal speech, informs also the lifestyles reproduced by communicative acting”.[[44]](#footnote-44) Even if correct or substantial (not to deny in first instance because the denial would imply deficiencies affecting the spectrum of rationality), those lifestyles (*Lebensformen*) are not simply empty or void of properties, orientations, tensions: substantial charges (it is allowed to think of them in the true energetic mode). In consequence, abbreviating the mentioned consensus, the overall goal of Habermasian philosophy, into a census, is not a bare sample of wit. Presumably, from the beginning of the notion, the ›tie‹ implied that specific break between affiliation versus non-affiliation not needing the official mark. Accordingly, Aristotle thought of the citizen of the polis (male, not necessarily affluent, not criminal, speaking the mother language of the region including the idiom, of course settled, not migrating or squatter, and prepared to take over an official role under both tidings, i.e., circumstances of peace versus wartime). With his family, wife and child(ren) subordinated, he lived the latent census, counting instantaneously up and down the very members of the community against the slaves, migrants, aliens, and metics. Under this premise, the community *does* have a common consciousness, but it is dependent from (theoretically) inserting and (practically) knowing the properties of the real energy field. Inhabitants of the city communicate instantaneously, anyone who is capable of (mutants only involved by permission and special information, afterwards however very well), and illocutionary acts, where H. normally settles the “binding force” of language, are only the outward, or official, side of this intercourse of information and overall exchange. History put aside, the faculty, or potency, was at any time prepared to take over a social mechanism to organize society entirely or only in proportion. The famous labor division, which baffled Durkheim and evoked his response at the end of the century against the communist (or socialist) analysis of industrial society of Marx, should no less imply the complementary condition of ubiquitous inwardness, as did the polarization of the capitalist, his organizing the markets, financial circuits, and urban centers, against the working class, its resentment, awaking solidarity and search for internal organization and common voice.

Even H. knows that the so-called lifeworld (a term he adopts from phenomenology) is heavily pre-charged with orientations, history, social claims and ± malfunctioning alternating interest, idealist fractions. Therefore, he cannot believe that the partially idealistically, partially transcendentally drafted discourse requiring participants, which are prepared to render the observer party against the actual, sincerely involved person, is settling with a properly free sub(ter)- or under-level, anywhere at once absorbing and/or fusing the terms and states of the peculiar discourse.[[45]](#footnote-45) However, instead of thinking of it as the opposite, a receptacle with inert properties not willing to receive the outcome of the discourse, in addition not as part of an opposition which might take the other, i.e., the discourse, as sub(ter)- or the under-term, he implies it as a security function: “The high dissent risk steadily nourished afresh by experiences, i.e. surprising contingencies, would render social integration by means of the use of language oriented towards understanding totally unlikely, if communicative acting were not imbedded in lifeworld contexts providing rear cover through a massive background consensus. Actually, any explicit accomplishment of understanding is moving in the horizon of common non-problematic convictions; at the same time, they feed on these resources of the all along familiar (*immer schon Vertrauten*). The continuous vexation through experience and contradiction, contingency and critique are refracted in the everyday practice by a broad, imperturbable rock of consented models of interpretation, allegiances, and accomplishments, towering up from the depth.”[[46]](#footnote-46) H., as it seems, takes up an older thought (or even theorem) of metaphysics, the *enveloppement* of Leibniz. Any perception a subject possesses is encountering a mass of already passed ones fused into the whole of consciousness a non-physical soul does maintain and is conscious of. The post-metaphysical position, however, requires a later resourcing, therefore only the Husserlian phenomenology lies in the sustained historem of Habermas. Shifting from the subjective to the collective perspective, the *enveloppement* has become the social one, maintained by a whole society. In consequence, he thinks of the “background knowledge” within the lifeworld, the pre-predicative and pre-categorical foundation of sense of the everyday practice and world experience. “While acting in a communicative mode the lifeworld is capturing us in the mode of unmediated certainness, out of which we live and speak without distance.”[[47]](#footnote-47)

Shifting into the we-speech, something H. as others normally does not reflect, seems indexical. At least, there is no contradiction to address the lifeworld at once as the energy field implying any consciousness in the complete (non-conventional, -positivist or -analytical) sense mentioned above. Then, however, it must bear a by far more compulsory meaning, the familiar we-mode included as immediate index, not necessitating any creative, even not intuitive reflection. If the background knowledge within this lifeworld must be shared (the bearer or base is distinctively not the individual), is “all-penetrating” and characterized by an “at once latent and unnoticeable present”, then it should bear the most important questions of the post-metaphysical era: (i) is the human knowledge, and common consciousness, still impregnated by substantial thinking, or the genetic code, does it not imply a difference between the categorical versus non-categorical; (ii) the genetic code, does it have an impact on consciousness capabilities versus/against their conventional manners and social witnessing of, i.e., social behavior complies with a primordial cleavage between inner and outer communication, the first one disavowed or even immediately denied; (iii) communicative acting, when it takes place within the energy field, i.e., information is also transferred and exchanged by the shared (underlying and distinctively not communicated) brain frequency, is it everywhere compatible with truth finding and searching for consensus, or does the potency of acting and communicating within the energy field also imply the possibility of (a) delusion and posture (according to H. strategic behavior), (b) knitting the tie, i.e., make social relationship dependent from requirements only understandable and manageable within the field condition, expressly not within the official role and matrix, which must follow and absorb the result; (iv) reflecting the dichotomy and the complete field of theoretical opposition, does it anywhere, presumably also within the conflict of dissensus versus consensus, offer the possibility of the hiatus, a real, presumably also efficient gap in-between; (v) lending out the reflexive mode of Habermasian thinking and speech, which by means of the universally interpreted communicative rationality filters and eventually absorbs any break, cleavage, mis- or disproportion, and disagreement (misunderstanding) between the social layers or classes as (allegedly) non-obstant, does it never encounter peculiar limits, depending from power and the primordial will of domination in-between, i.e., reciprocally, so that not only upper classes and executives neglect communicative potencies, but also lower layers of the full-scale society exhibit peculiar binding forms of their energy and communicative skills in order to have the aggregate weight pulled up against the other side(s).

Who does not devise it, should be told – the fourth question is most important because it impacts all the others. Several authors have already pronounced the polar base or possible situation within society which would show reluctance against the good-will solution, constantly forming the affirmative horizon of H.s thinking. The scope of the argument also reaches to the theory of justice of Rawls as soon as the parties are interpreted within the polar condition (Th. Nagel). Accordingly, neutrality as the last outcome of reasoning – H. is heavily inclined to (like Rawls by overt intention) – versus polarity are getting into a non-reconcilable opposition (in first instance not-equivalent to contradiction). The hiatus or gap (and not only precarity according to Nagel as the last divide after reckoning up any party decision and interpretation under the premise to find a common understanding), the ± famous jump (or saltus) is the axiomatic situation responsible for the opposition aforementioned. First, the census break of affiliation versus non-affiliation, virtually equivalent to the (so-called) social tie, should be a candidate. The second lies in the steady implicit opposition between the classes, i.e., modern society renders only by interpretative construction a real, veridical continuum, economics included (expressly Th. Piketty). (In short, the axiomatic base should be introduced to have the proper lens free for insertion and interpretation. Any opposition between at least two terms which form each the opposite extreme to the other, if (i) they can be aggregated with itself and tensed (or augmented), are capable to approximate the sphere and aggregate region of the other side, but eventually not to merge or definitely fuse, if (ii) fusion is the main logical force within the base, making it impossible to leave the whole sphere for one against the other term. Accordingly, as one sees at once, the negation equivalent to the relationship in-between is everywhere within the span, quasi curved or instantaneously looped (describing a loop), and not only in situations of possible coincidence, responsible for the hiatus, gap, or saltus. It might be lesser or larger, even implicit, or nearly not noticeable. Accordingly, this negation, not coincident with contrariety, simple complementarity or any other form including the full orthogonal contradiction, is aggregatable itself or a waiting momentum of such traditional vitium which seems punctual or neglectable in the beginning and horizontal in the end. The axiom can finally be inserted into any real antonym, p.e., the relation injust versus just, large versus small (in the very sense), hence also, if properly needed, consensus versus dissent. Of course, the polar base or interpretation of negation rests with non-contradictory terms, i.e., the continuum has a real opposite, the (−) continuum, existing and propulsing main physical theory since the quantum theory, relativity according to »zeitartig« versus »raumartig«, etc.).[[48]](#footnote-48)

The rest of the difference to H. announced above should be granted the answer to the other questions. If the lifeworld, any lifestyle or proper *Lebensform* included, is the actual background, base or undercut of each properly evolved rational discourse, it should bear negation, in addition real negation, and not simply and everywhere merge into indifference (what H. seems to be inclined to or proposes, whereby indifference is, per essence, non-equivalent to neutrality). The price is very different, no question, because the interpretation of right and law, partiality, the input of social class, formation, origin (…) cannot be rendered a completely homogeneous base, where everything, in the end, seems convertible into one another, and the main value conscription rests on commutation (this is, unpretended, nevertheless the common interpretation of democracy in connection with the principle of equality). If, then, the interpretation of society does actually not allow to use everywhere the same coordinate system – instead of, the H. theory does still assume this premise – values of one emitted are not simply to commute into another one, possibly with far distance from the (now fully established) inner and (standard or normal) outer side. Contradiction, as the main or exacting principle of rationalism, must accord a real counterpart, it depends on any form of polarity, and the difference, certainly with axiomatic impact, does involve the categorical question. Hegel was after Kant, who initially felt the need to insert into quality the proper forms of negation,[[49]](#footnote-49) however missing the clear concept of polarity even within the antinomies or the renamed region of dialectics, the main philosopher in pursuit, who misunderstood polarity with overall dialectics. He even was prepared to put fusion as per function on the main platform, plateau or level, and to make any progress in thinking dependent of. Hence, he melted proper negation into the difference between direct antithesis and, awkward, assumed synthesis (impossibly identical as it should, otherwise not should). Polar negation is not equivalent to dialectical negation, it comes however near to want Kant termed such in his dialectics (in connection with conditional versus non- or unconditional) (A504/B532).[[50]](#footnote-50) Nevertheless, or above all, the negation should in any form, the polar one with axiomatic status included, have a formal or mental understanding, not totally dependent from empirical token. Accordingly, and once more, the categorical impact.

When this is attested, the discourse cannot be grasped, drafted, and unfolded from a plan which does not involve even a single, non-commutable or non-mergeable, in this sense refutable negation, or break. How the field of common human conceptions, notional matrices, and representations actually involve the categorical issue, i.e., the common lens, is by far overarching this paper, but it should be clear at once that negation is deeply, under every orientation, involved, lends the first concepts of dichotomy in numerous places (without necessarily falling under contradiction or contrariety), and is, by understanding, responsible for sensing real breaks or saltus in reality. (Scil., the sensing against the understanding is convertible in itself, i.e., it represents a long stage of genetically confirmed learning by evolution and cyclic experience involved.[[51]](#footnote-51) The categorical issue is, in turn, dependent from this same convertibility. In consequence, and lending Kant the foreword, the classical dichotomy between intuition and concept or thinking by categories is impossible, example of a false cut, if this means that “by taking away any thinking (through categories) from an empirical recognition, not a single recognition of anything will remain; because by intuition nothing is thought, and that this affection of sensuality is in myself, does not amount to a relationship of such representation to anyone object.” (A253/B309) This should be obsolete (squarely false) as soon as sensitivity and sensation do, and must, possess determinative power upon the mind, the notional capacities of brain and reason – accordingly, sensing, or sensual experience does have recognitional power and value, sometimes absolutely (or distinctively) distinctive, because the determined mind is dependent upon. The obsoleteness of this classical cut within the rational tradition will result even more, when the energy field is introduced, and any representation does not depend on the subjective impulse alone (the focal “affection of sensuality in myself”), instead of being shared, instantaneously reviewed, intersected, informed and even impulsed by others, in particular – but not necessarily – the members of the linguistic community, the ± interested mankind not excluded). Taking, in opposition to H., these conditions together, the negation within the discourse and sensing versus understanding not evolving anywhere a clear cut, the so-called social tie is the proper instrument of a (±) census, which, in addition, has afforded the secondary, electric mechanism in modern society (mentioned above). Anyone who is willing to lend a portion of his consciousness against being more or less immediately rewarded (by executive position upwards, being employed elsewhere, or – normally – by sexing, or popular reputation, the delivery of shares, properties, bonuses or alike), must feel a peculiar hiatus against anyone, purely not willing or only less willing. The saltus in-between is well sensed, even anticipated and, against H., also implicitly communicated. This, however, is done on, and by reason of, the concomitant inner side of the energy field which is lacking totally in his philosophy (and those of others so far).

With this paragraph also questions (iii) and (ii) have been initially answered. If the lifeworld according to the discourse theory, its interpretation by H., is the common sound board it must be also the largest catch basin of the common energy, irrespective of having been used for thinking, working, communicating (sexing, …). Instead of pure indifference, the common, necessary (i.e., unavoidable) merging of ± values experienced, posted and claimed, it is the representative of the counterpart to any acting, the haven of inertia. In consequence, the lifeworld seems to have once more a basic polar condition, because the middle or interim region cannot simply be delegated to (normal) oblivion or non-awareness (unless by help of mutilated or stipulated concepts). Acting, thinking, ± determinative sensing is realized within a positive impulse region that must shift to the counterpart, a minus region of non-awareness and crucial melting (thus a main part of normal life, bound to entropy or the steady dissipation and melting of energy). When this consideration, simply enough (or even axiomatic-like) pronounced, an advantage which should grand its immediate acceptance, is confronted with some critical (and apological) effort of H. against his own discourse theory, (ii) and (iii) can be followed to make the canonical difference. This thought reads in the following way, it is responsible for introducing the function of law in modern societies. First, the problem has to be attested that contemporary lifeworld(s) which are differentiated, in itself pluralized and debunked (from sacral authorities) encounter a growing discrepancy of dissent risk by reason of lacking strong institutions and the vanished horizon of religion as obligatory orientation within social activity.[[52]](#footnote-52) Second, the scenario is aggravated by the fact that the need of integration is hopelessly overcharged, when an increasing sum of strategic interactions, indispensable for modern economic societies, is set free, which can only be bound by the “mechanism of understanding”, so far subjected. In the case of conflict, the parties involved must decide between the termination of communication versus strategic acting. Third, under this premise the escape lies in finding the normative regulation of strategic interactions, which, according to H., the actors agree themselves upon.[[53]](#footnote-53) Fourth, this discrepancy is delegated to the base of law. Actually, it is coupled with a “paradoxical nature”.[[54]](#footnote-54) Even more, it is coupled with a “polarization” involving the region of acting, where the orientation towards success (i.e. strategic) versus understanding (or agreement) must spread (differ endlessly[?]), accordingly a “*perceptible* incompatibility of factizity versus validity.”[[55]](#footnote-55) Now if the polarization (“complete alternative”) is true, the assertion should be misleading (if not false), that “the norms, which qualify for a socially integrative effect, i.e., for a binding regulation of strategic interactions of any [party] involved, comply with two contradictory conditions, which from the view of the actors cannot be fulfilled simultaneously.”[[56]](#footnote-56) On one, the minus side, the norms have to insert limitations, which definitely compel the strategic actor to comply with, hence to restrict his or her intentions and adopt the limits. Otherwise, and obviously the plus counterpart, they must unfold a “socially integrative power” connected with obligations, which, on the whole and according to H., is only possible on grounds of intersubjectively agreed validity claims. Now the balance comes up, which reads that “this sort of norms should effect *simultaneous* compliance by reason of actual constraint and legitimate validity.”[[57]](#footnote-57) If, however, ± simultaneity is coupled (or caused by) polarity (as cited in the next sentence “polarization”), then the counterparts, the condition of one against the other, are not coupled with contradiction. Accordingly, to leave the discussion (or reckoning up a bulk of emancipated theory against the need to comply in any instance with sentences belonging to), the mentioned »mechanism of understanding« has a special counterpart. It is the already mentioned census/reward mechanism which later on will be focused by means of (2), providing the symbolic explanation.

First, the polarization should render the possibility of the hiatus (or real spread), i.e., evidence of the (-) continuum. No question, legal thinking and practice, presumably from the beginning, was intended to not suppress the cleavage (which should be impossible), but to regulate or stipulate it in advance, hence to neutralize, immunize or simply glue it (because society, the social intercourse, is by far more driven by conflict and disharmony when open cleavages, the smaller or lesser abyss, precipice or chasm between parties, in addition by being rowed and aggravated through approximate parties, are sensible and active). Accordingly, the legal – or political – sphere is not the proper (immediate) sphere of discourse, discussion and/or parliamentary effort, the effort of the civic society, because the domination of the (-) subject takes place in advance against any lending him (+) or emancipatory power in order to pronounce his views, wills, affections and perspectives, be it in public or not (the (-) public still to be defined and explained, but congruent with what has been pronounced so far, the existence of the energy field as the base of common consciousness and the overall communication within, including simultaneous review, observation, and simulation by others. It should not be confused with what in German is called the *Sein*, *esse* versus *ens*, by reason of the connection to modern physics). If the fact (or truth) subscribes to statehood, it has not given up its ruling in any democracy, the (-) subject is still its predominant stability module, the brink of those columns, which have to bear the state buildings and their roofs, in comparison with any effort of the same (or other) subject to voice his opinions, take the party of this or that civic motion, or subscribe to an organization with nongovernmental impact. Political theory, however, was not striven for under this point of view. The misunderstanding of non-compliance, complementarity (on last exclusion), and incompatibility with contradiction (instead of polarity) rests with both the rational and the dialectical tradition and is responsible for the overarching search for neutrality leaving reality, the concrete experience and its need of exact prose or other symbolic signification, aside against ever more abstract, self-encircling concepts.[[58]](#footnote-58)

H., in other contexts, does reflect that lifeworld(s) do also include the technical sphere. Instead of the liberal circles which believe in the controlling power of societies over any technological development and in-depth changing of their structures, he is residing more with the conservative field.[[59]](#footnote-59) It should be inserted that these structures, in particular the infrastructures, are wet ones, deeply soaked and permeated, as soon as the energy field fulfills the first premise and anyone is allowed to act on himself by means of his dummy or *attrappe*,[[60]](#footnote-60) their focally melt nodes or aggregations, bunches, resulting from the natural energetic representative and coupled with any faculty of communication so far mentioned and exhibited. H. takes the critical side because he is convinced that rationality has given up (or even immediately lost) a special historical portion of its overall validity, the main process of absorption was the 19th century leading into the post-metaphysical era (as well known). What should interest in this connection is the concept of overarching disposal belonging to the circuit (“dynamical interconnection”) of science, technics, industry, military, and administration nowadays tied together “above the heads of the acting subjects”.[[61]](#footnote-61) To follow the proper philosophical task (against the bulk of neighboring sciences), this subject should be cleared unambiguously. At once, it can be identified with the (-) subject already mentioned, but then the executive power has shifted into the core of a (hypothesized) circuit. In addition, it must be clear, why it is not simply a circle, otherwise, how the cycle has to be integrated. Presumably, empirical research would show that when a circle, a stable periphery of factual power, is shifting into a circuit the power also shows a shifting from a mono- to a dual or multi-centre. Then, and this must be booked, the infrastructure or the constitutional base was polar, at least with cardinal propensity.[[62]](#footnote-62) (Scil., when the energy base is attested it must include the antipodes of plus versus minus flow, in consequence a natural, even necessary, inclusion of the circuit, irrespective of being mediated or not, i.e., with ± technological appearance). The cycle, on the other side (and to stay shortly), is the instrument of (ordinated) control and common behavior, of following the balance sheet as well as the normal and proper legislature. As per evidence, it is compatible with both the circle and the circuit, however a cycle getting under the impact of a polarized circuit should show a special flexibility too, i.e., the outcomes become focal, slope-conform or, another alternative, providing evidence of a perpendicular situation, the corresponding executive within tidings or an affiliate loop – polarity makes concepts prosper (the loop can, but isn’t obliged to show a peculiar perpendicular between popularity versus seriousness).[[63]](#footnote-63) Now H. is not silent or abstaining from the task to explain how he thinks that the gap between the mentioned overarching power of the circuit, as it seems an instance of paradox primordialism (*Naturwüchsigkeit*),[[64]](#footnote-64) can be fulfilled. His solution, following the exhibited dichotomy, must show and reside with the path, and intellectual means, to achieve a so-called “coherent total conscience”, otherwise “a society [that can be grasped] as the interrelationship of acting among speaking humans which have to integrate the social intercourse into the interrelationship of conscious communication and thereby must form themselves into a [single] total subject capable of acting.”[[65]](#footnote-65)

Evidently, H. cannot explain how this state can be firmly and distinctively achieved and structured because his methodology is underlying the same result. He must acclaim (or simply claim) as to how the better, the prospective result should be cognizable because the pragmatical, sometimes hermeneutical, otherwise underlying circular approach cannot fulfill the effective difference between forming steps towards, versus knowing or achieving a new stage. (Claiming the emancipatory endeavor or solution, even if valuable, is perhaps not even scientific at the end).[[66]](#footnote-66) In other words, his philosophy, as pragmatical claim, is bound to the threshold, but not to the status which must follow. Accordingly, it does not wonder that never he is willing to describe, or even constitutively imply the faculties of human conscience (brain) any further and obligating. (His main mindset, completely absorbing the so-called linguistic turn, is disdainful against the – history of – conscience philosophy).[[67]](#footnote-67) The price is his abstractionism which must leave reality apart from his pronounced, described and drafted communicative means, i.e., where reality has been absorbed by human skills, behavior, manners, and contrivances long before a human or social being has started to make a gesture or usage of his language faculties. ‘We’ include, these faculties are plural not by reason of using a secondary implied, the linguistic one, but because the same subject(s) are capable of communicating within the normally granted energy base, its brain frequency, by reason of simply simulating, perceiving and providing the impulse(s) of their thoughts, wills, and sensations one against the other; in addition, to appropriately fuse the same energy in bulks of pairs, groups, and smaller masses up to the common nation – of course not on the same level of clearness, awareness and subjective availability, but at least non-abolishable and constitutively – so that the conventional understanding must lead into the proper divide. It has already been termed and defined as the proper (*recte*) energy field,[[68]](#footnote-68) belonging virtually to the human race, in addition any living being that possesses the faculty of perception (in the older sense). This fact, however, should profoundly influence, even impart, and bias the outcome of any discourse. To finish, a sentence like

(a) “In the role of the global citizen the individual melts with the human at all – being at once I as the single and the general one;”[[69]](#footnote-69)

should – within the aforementioned background – include that this proper melting is correct, however the function of fusion is real, existential, obvious and sensible, not only the ideal or mental one (within peculiar representations, notions, or propositions). (It was called appropriate because it makes human behavior evolve on the full scale between sly- or deviousness, he often is very fond of, against his stipulated sincereness or virtue). Even more, fusion belongs to constitutive energy, its first or primordial properties (which can be easily observed, otherwise researched by scrutinized effort, equivalent to the counter-input of rationalism since centuries which seems only content when disambiguation and distinctive, analytical clear-cut terms have been achieved. This observation should include, there is an alternative of analysis which concentrates on the fusing characteristics, how they evolve and behave). In derivation, this doubly – ± mentally (ideally) vs. ± really – charged melting power deserves the complete explanation as to how (i) the subject is also capable of splitting his civilian role into the dummy representative, using the fusing power within, and otherwise (ii) constitute peculiar nodes or bulks, the well-known heaps or bunches, (though now quasi semi-internally,[[70]](#footnote-70) within the stretch of the energy stream across several subjects, at least the living generation of mankind as already mentioned, neither simply externally by »*caput*« or body, nor, scil., internally in the sense of psychic representation, the other full antipode of the spectrum). It follows that the subject as “general one” will not be coincident with the “total subject” postulated before unless this condition is recognized in advance. In addition, the “coherent total conscience” if it does possess an index of existence, of factual maintenance and sustain (instead of being transferred in the notional or semi-idealistic sphere) lies in the energy field, its condition and veridical interpretation. From this follows immediately that the ideal, abstract, or externally proposed Euclidian space has been properly overcome by modern physics. Energy lies in the curvature, there is correct nodal binding of time into the spatial dimensions.[[71]](#footnote-71) However, the question was how (apart from political manipulation) the coherent total conscience can be achieved and implemented within the common social issues, their eventual spreading among the classes and different interest. Instead of looking, still in the classical manner, for argumentation exhibiting the public and political sphere as proper, normative external field against any making up one’s mind and pronouncing an opinion, searching for partners, etc., the classical procedure, obligatory the basic externalization, seems obsolete as soon as the real manners and faculties, proficiencies are within the horizon – not only questions (ii) and (iii) above are answered, the genetic code does have an impact on conscience capabilities against their conventional manners and social witnessing of, and communicative acting, when it takes place within the energy field, does not only imply the possibility of delusion and posture, but also, and prominently, of knitting the social tie. This primary goal was aimed at and it will be left for the part after, using (2) as the basis for symbolization.

(b) “The world as the epitome of possible facts is only constituted by a community of interpretation whose participants come to an understanding within an intersubjectively shared lifeworld about something in the world;”[[72]](#footnote-72)

should retain a false binding, even a hidden circular understanding because something that does exist in the world is presumably, and even on the limit, well known and properly constituted before any attempt has been undertaken to express it or put it into the correct words. I.e., the dependence of the existing thing, if it must be imparted to the difference between conscience and the real world, must not be absorbed by its linguistic faculty, hence be dependent from the proper and immediately contingent expression (or proposition). This is spelled out against the so-called linguistic turn, it leaves philosophy and any scientific endeavor within the task to find, at least to attest truth beyond any attempt of mere symbolization, language included. Otherwise, it should be clear that this critique (or axiomatic stance) is not equivalent to a metaphysical return because nobody should believe that ›*things in itself*‹ (or ›truths‹, but the issue is squarely different) are instantaneously known by humans. Nevertheless, the categorical claim has to be grasped and resolved at once within the real energy field, where any representation has no chance to come unless being perceived, criticized, eventually understood by others, i.e., encompassing simulation of brain performances – any manners of ± guiding, ± orienting, ± promulgating one’s consciousness, highly generalizing, abstracting, reflecting included – takes place within the social context, the urban place, the nation up to the common (living) mankind. Against its entrenchment, ›*Communicative Rationality*‹ seems profoundly absorbed leaving a cleft against its official role and interpretation by discourse (giving the answer to (v) in abbreviation).

[4] Symbolization of the tie

If it is correct that (i) the modern subject, after the overall progress of the industrialized society, can be grasped as the existence of intersection within a matrix of social obligations (“Schnittpunktexistenz”); further: “Only the multiplication, the gaining of independence, and the accelerated turnover of detached models of behavior have provided the ‘roles’ a quasi-material existence against the persons which [have to] externalize therein and, within that same externalization becoming awareness, evolve their claim for being recognized (lit. innerlyness or *Innerlichkeit*) – as the history of civilian consciousness shows, at least in the 19th century.”[[73]](#footnote-73)

(ii) the dimension of obviousness, so-called visibility, or cognizability (in German “Überschaubarkeit”) of social relationships alters between plus and minus; nevertheless, instances of straightforwardness become concrete with the following sentence: “Even if the town counts as a city, it is still cognizable in such a manner that the ends of the threads which have to form a network can be tied well together – also those between the young founder scene and the classically processing middle class.”[[74]](#footnote-74)

Then both the material status of the roles as well as the spectrum of the network has to be questioned. The thesis was that (a) the roles, (b) the cognizance (or seizability) of the so-called network, its peculiar nodes and ties, are not monoform, representation-like by means of unique common externalization, but in itself spread as instances of a necessary spectrum. Anyone who takes on a social role, is compelled to unfold it within two cardinal spheres, the second one the spectrum of the energy field and the special approximation (or ± distance) members are used to exhibit and to retain. (It is, to avoid any misunderstanding, not bodily, not properly Euclidian, because it is realized within and by the energy of normal, any existing consciousness, irrespective of belonging to a mutant or not. As per convention and, as it must appear, tradition they, anyone, can communicate even without taking notice one of the other. The so-called third party or, now, the inward observer is everywhere in the middle or determining the stretch in-between, the proper interval). Then the seizability (or cognizance) of the network – as representative of the older social tie – is not bound to proper external means, i.e., knowing the determinate instances of becoming acquaint (as per body and acoustical voice), using technological means to confirm and deepen the relationship, i.e., making it a real potency (by self-multiplication), but correlative to the internal horizon, too. (The term horizon, which has become more or less well-used since Kant, should also represent instances of this sort, i.e., implying or simply meaning the internal one as involved. An author who writes about terms and arguments resulting from his or the perspective of another one, may always include that the peculiar potency implies in the end any other, hence if this potency is coupled with the representation of a mental horizon, it must override the subjective one and include other consciousness. To put it in other terms, the interconnectivity of consciousness is bound by the current (alive) energy field making it possible to have spontaneously the representations of other consciousness within the spectrum of the own ones, or not to be compelled to imagine any perspective and representations of another one solely by externalization, proper representation in the sense of absolving other consciousness definitely or distinctively within the realm of class abstraction and separation against the own one).[[75]](#footnote-75) Then the proper connection with other, and any, consciousness is not following (a cardinal misunderstanding) intentional fusing because the merging is already done by the natural condition (the energy field). Fusion, nodal ± approximation, is free to be realized in addition, as will be seen. (Here the ›proxy‹ is coming up as confirming and consolidating the *Doppelgänger* or energetical representative, any -agent against the objective person belonging to, but the legal status in the Western democracies is by far not developed to such extent to provide the term proxy this distinctive meaning). Conditions belonging to theoretical philosophy so far confirmed, the task was to follow the symbolization already exhibited and to implement what the social tie will become when it has been resolved from mere externalization.

“The scared world and misplaced mankind against itself reveal [according to Schelling] its curse and stigma within the proper domination of the external over the internal, the lower over the upper, anger over love, the power of the dark reason over integrity.”[[76]](#footnote-76) The introductory, somewhat *pittoresque* sentence provides Habermas the opportunity to transfer the misbalance – as pre-judgment – into historical materialism and the domination of the basis over the *Überbau*. Concerning the first two inputs of the balance, which must interest most, it should be not so easy to set the domination of one sphere against the other. In the meantime, over the decades after its introduction in the nineties, social life and communication in its completely expanded habits give the impression that the internal one depending on the energy field and its changing (combatant) currents has gained the upper hand, at least seems equivalent to the traditional external one. To understand it one has to come clear with the elements. Remembering (2), functions belonging to the outer or official role were written as - versus -relation, where means the internal role exhibited in the proper energy field. (Scil., the outward role does belong to it also, however, as already mentioned, it is covered by convention and traditional means of communication and self-representation). Accordingly, the ›social tie‹ has to be distributed. In

(2) › ∃∃>∃∀ (±){[(|| Φ ≅ Ψ ||)(|| Η ≅ Ι ||)]*i* ≅ [(|| Κ ≅ Λ ||)(|| Μ ≅ Ν ||)]c} − ((*ic*)-1n/±Γ ) ‹

was claimed and expressed that the interconnection of ||, ≅, and once more || contains (a) the expression of an active periphery, (b) of an active negation fused or coupled irresolvably with the point of reversal in-between (polar negation does not need to be expressed by any linguistic form corresponding with ›not‹ or alike). Then it must be allowed that the distribution of the function, one against the other, unfolds or exhibits under peculiar circumstances the hiatus.[[77]](#footnote-77) The distribution of the tie, however, now not only needs the implementation within the spectrum, but also the mechanism. The claim was, it is a steady census versus reward mechanism, something like a false social currency, i.e., anyone who is willing to undergo its requirement (render a larger or lesser portion of his consciousness into the nodal one guided by others, for the moment left open who this is, and the confirmational one aggregated by anyone assimilated) will be rewarded and benefit from some »payment«, i.e., remuneration or compensation (at least by sex, non-coincident with normal friendship, betrothing or marital approximation which, of course, is not excluded, hence a sort of ± intentional disguising the proper nexus). Then principally the mechanism which is an interrelated ± function, i.e., the insertion of one side needs the implementation of the other too, or, taken exactly, rendering (one’s consciousness: [and] being fully integrated, have the opportunity to play a social role, fuse, and having fused one’s energy with the communal one) means a sort of negation (at least privation, however not in the traditional sense) versus proper affirmation, the complementary term (and being tacitly rewarded in any sense, by position, sexing, boni, shares, etc., being elected) must take place with the normal or simple function in (2). Leaving quantification for the moment aside and considering that ›Φ‹ versus ›Η‹ now should express the situation of the mechanism, the ± diversion included, the insertion of the corresponding ± function must also reflect the influence of the complementary or polar term within the counting periphery: one or the other within the sphere of this functional term is included by the mechanism of the other side.

If (i) is exhibiting his or her outer (official) role with Φ and (ii) his or her (logically) coincident counterpart ,[[78]](#footnote-78) of course neither necessarily nor steadily, in this sense continuously exhibited, is dominated by the function H through the census mechanism, its representative , then

(3) › Φ ⊃ Η ‹

means that *x* () is implying (conditioning) a H-function dominated by *y* (in both affiliations, and ). It should be stressed that in both instances, dominator versus dominatee, the 0-affiliate of one’s person, if one will her energetic proxy, is executing the mechanism, hence more relevant. It should also be stressed that (logical) sum versus product have clear understanding, the simple coordination for the last well-entrenched (in principle, the distinctiveness is such that the product includes the merging of, where the sum leaves its constituents distinct). (Then Η must symbolize a real product, a personal – active – intersection included, the very issue of the mechanism. In addition, concerning quantification and complying with (2), *y* is normally above the single or 1-person, whereas *x* can only override, systematically starting with). Before reckoning up the variants according to the peripheric behavior, the 0-domain (or level) coming up with the indifference in the last minus term, should be cleared. Actually, there are two zeros – a real polarization – because the melting level (or threshold), where communicating with the double-goer or not is stopping, i.e., calm (and/or silent), and residing with the or level (it is, to remember, not only done by acoustical speech and bodily gestures, the everyday mimic): double-going (using one’s energetic representative, or splitting one’s energy, the Leibnitian *vis*, into a bodily and non-bodily sphere) allows to have its own melting sphere (otherwise energy should lose its primordial property) different from the conventional physico-acoustical body sphere and from the eventual product (which should override the sum in which distinctiveness is predominant): the term ›∀ − ((*ic*)-1n/±Γ )‹ signifies the ultimate diffusive background, in which both the (*ic*)-1n as well as the are differentiable. Then the first signifies the degree of perceptible energy loss (within a pair, group, larger auditorium, mass of people), the second alternative a circumscription in which calmness by bodily representation overrides the counter- or contrapart fulfilled by calm double-goer representatives still within the present energy field. Both zero states should have their symbolic expression.

(4) › [−] ((*ic*)-1n/+Γ ) = 0 ≥ ±Γ ‹

signifies a situation, where *z* melting into the energy horizon is realized by where this horizon is fulfilled by the + pole within the function Γ. (The horizon can be reached also from the minus pole within a foregoing or relevant discourse symbolized in abbreviation by (2)). Analogously,

(5) › [−] ((*ic*)-1n/+Γ ) = 0 ≥ ±Γ ‹

signifies a situation, where this horizon, realized by *z* as per , is melting before or above the ultimate ±Γ background.

In the following, formulas describing different situations concerning the census/reward mechanism are written. Afterwards this section will close with a short interpretation – the social tie was, and still is, the input and issue.

If (i) () () means the normal, standard, polarized as per perpendicular, personalization (the variables taking individuals as per convention) and (ii) the real product (it *does* contain a section) is realized by a function Φ*δx*0*y*0, where *δ* means this proper product (or the energetic perpendicular), then

(6) › ∃Φ*δx*0*y*0 ‹

essentially means (3) or the basic element of the mechanism: *x*, fulfilling the function Φ by his -component (or energetic double-goer, »proxy« or »dummy«), is dominated by *y* and his or her up to their same energetic component (or representative, i.e., double-goer) within the same function.[[79]](#footnote-79) So far, this domination is latent (or as per interpretation), and the periphery needs expression, in addition to the coupled reward function. This should be (more or less) the normal (social) situation, however, the mechanism takes it as the necessity or standard input. Accordingly, socialization (being integrated into society up to the full-scale of opportunities) is getting into a non-free, circular situation – there is a sub-infrastructure, highly commutative, i.e., inclusive concerning the official societal roles, even communicated within the discourse, be it public or not, and necessarily directly, in first instance, not depending from legalistic endeavor, law-making or executing, hence a criterial factor concerning the notion of sub-infrastructure, thus forming a real clearance or leeway (*Freiraum* or ‘free-space’ in German). It should be added at once, that the sub- is not really classifying, i.e., the relation is commutative, and the sub-level may under circumstances become dominating – a normal situation within polarity. However, the alternatives and complementary terms of the mechanism have to be denoted. If

(7) ∃Φ*δx*0*y*0 ⊃ Κ*δx*1Λ*δy*1

should signify the reward situation, the function Φ must mean that *x*, in the energetic perpendicular, is rendering on behalf of his -component at least a portion of his consciousness, dominated by *y*. Then Κ means a function the -component fulfills within a logical product with the function Λ coupled with , both officially or manifestly real in the so-called physical world. (Φ might be ‘the secretary’, Κ his or her doing something in pastime, Λ the doing of an executive or other job, normally of higher order than Φ. In addition, the *δx*1 in Κ*δx*1 should mean that is reigning the perpendicular, the product () (), whereas in Φ*δx*0*y*0 it is reigned by the product of , *y* () the dominator against the dominatee *x* (), or role versus role (the same for Λ*δy*1).

Now the conditional has to be purged. If ›Κ*δx*1Λ*δy*1‹ could be fulfilled without the pre-term, the mechanism could fail, in particular as soon as Φ*δx*0*y*0 is given without coupling the last term, Κ*δx*1Λ*δy*1. This, however, is not what the situation really takes (or comprises). Generally, neither *y* nor *x* do have the opportunity to fulfill Κ versus Λ against Φ, if Φ once has been accommodated or agreed upon. Therefore, the neutralistic (or neutral-like) understanding coupled with the conditional has to be transformed into real polarity: the terms on the left and the right are really interactive (something that since Kant has been recognized with antagonism or gravitational behavior in nature, i.e., Newton’s interpretation of the universe), hence there has to be recognized a peculiar periphery, where the interrelationship exhibits. To rewrite (7),

(8) ∃Φ*δx*0*y*0 ≅ Κ*δx*1Λ*δy*1 ||

must mean that the functional ‘context’ is properly bound (however in addition to, and overriding the quantificational relationship). Then the privational context – *x* does render a portion of his controlled or guidance-demanding consciousness to *y* by doing Φ – is (mutually) constitutive or non-omissible against the product of ΚΛ. ( is performing, has been granted, is benefitting from the function K against/versus performing the secretary/assistant/engineer against/with the team leader *y*, any persons of the team included as , by doing Φ, and, in addition, *y* as is performing Λ in intersection with K (and indirectly Φ). In any case, within the official performing of the secretary/assistant/engineer Φ must mean the rendering of one’s consciousness as per domination, however the portion pro rata may differ – there is mutual ‘payment’ included, the very concept or root of civility or, if needed, bourgeois culture; otherwise the rendering (under K) might be one of the most famous behaviors of humans, their *zoon*, political or zoological history, i.e., evolutionary outcome. Concerning the scheme, some ambiguity is resting, of course. First, in the dominator versus dominatee context of Φ should be more than 1, however the who is not quantified, is necessarily included (by *δ*). If there are other included, and speaking of a team must include it, their peculiar function as besides Λ as providing the senior function of at least has not been designated. against is focal, both need to be included by δ-designation, where the complete field condition is supplied.

Some final remarks should follow (a) the interpretation of the social tie, (b) the mixing of the perpendicular written *δ*, (c) the issue of identity, if and how it exists or not, concerning the personal core, the traditional subject (or I-function, as soon as regarded metaphysically, not linguistically). If (8) signifies the core of the modern (contemporaneous) social tie, it lies within a proper and non-ending circuit. As soon as society including the persons of the government, the persons elected, have accommodated the core in one or the other outer fashion – it seems to comply with a democracy no less than with an autocracy or more autocratic regime – the tie becomes coercion, a sort of constraint. The notion is well known since Durkheim, however now it must mean a constraint on a (possibly far) higher degree because the (still physical, or even more physical as per energetic condition *and* the burden of the accruing aggregate of population or mankind) inward realm is totally integrated or permanently coincident – and dominated. Or, to spell it otherwise, because the inward realm, which the western sphere, (as) regulated per democracy, is fond of calling free or the epitome of freedom and the background or hotbed of liberty, is bound into complete or ‘totalistic’ spherical behaviors, where the domination may alter or commute. Accordingly, the domination needs full reference to ± because the ‘dummy’ or -level may overrun the (conventional and most popular) counter- or contra-part. Then, concerning the *z*-part in (2), the corresponding ∀-quantor should become (more or less) integral in the periphery, thereby fulfilling the constraint and lending its real and essential meaning. (No-one can escape or:) Anyone feels, knows, and fulfills the circuit, so far most of them (»the many«) seem more or less happy, hilarious, joyous, satisfied (not denigrated, discriminated), i.e., accepting the constraint, once having rendered, experienced and serially accommodated the +, virtually ± fruits. Who denies, even more strictly denies, must bear a sort of social testimony, something like a ban, ostracism or being excluded, (which already Aristoteles was aware of as an instrument of social conclusion and levelling up the medium): in any case, neutrality is out of the sphere, not only the fashion, the notional base is opposition, negativity in the core accommodating essential polarity (and not dialectics).

Then (b) is bound to (c), the issue of identity. Of course, the constraint, or tie, grants the possibility to have a function Φ*δx*1*y*0, where *x* within an official role is intentionally fusing with the-component. This is expressly not written with (8), however it lies in the very sense of the mechanism to leave the perpendicular and constantly fuse one’s consciousness, hence forming a fascicle or bunch (eventually some sort of bucket or »cloud«). Correspondingly, the self or identity becomes an issue. As soon as a person is willing to split his role, and the very root of his energetic identity, into the alternative both coupled with social activity the fused part of his or her person is not identical. Even more, he might be willing to leave the core or very center of his personality into the mechanism, executives or *responsables* included. Accordingly, the »dummy« or part is melting and commuting (this means the steady reversal of a bound ± series) into the core annulling any prescriptions and/or philosophic recipes tradition was fond of to develop. Be that as it may be, presumably the core of subjectivism, if it has to spell the most abstract, methodically achieved and rectified pure I or center of consciousness, the (self-)thinking and (self-)sensing being, has never existed, taken the energetic condition by theoretical constraint or in first instance. The issue must be left even if it is highly descriptive of the common world. So far, the benefits of symbolization should be exploited to address the situations of mixture and possible commutations (situations of presumable expectation and/or the virtual loss of identity).

[5]

Instead of, the final question will follow the social issue as a Chinese one, p.e., the social credit system. The situation is complicated because the answer, whether China has accommodated the mechanism, depends on textual proof or evidence, at first hand. Taking a glance (and not simply glaring) at Chinese executives, the affirmative answer makes sense concerning the melted result of the facial exhibit – there should be lots of other people have their nodal input or energetical evidence concerning the -level. (If the -level executive is governing or dominating the relation throughout, may be left open. (8) is not an expression of ‘normal’ classification, as will follow. In addition, the melting is by far not a phenomenon restricted to the Asian political and/or social sphere, it can be learned from the Western one in advance). To make a further step, the Chinese society is looking back on centuries of social integration. Even if correct, the sentence is not distinctive because it is true for the Western side too. *Do ut* [coactu] *des*. Vel: *Do* [coactu] *ut des*. The roman ‘wisdom’ spelling the root of moral behavior (or *Sittlichkeit* in the Hegelian sense) has been enriched with an adverb. Its existence expounds the burden of the mechanism which, in essence, is still the *Tausch* (exchange or bargain) the Marxist theory identified totally with labor. It is the good the working class is able to possess and introduce into the economical market. On this background, the mechanism – against the wisdom or truism, as one will – is neither the simple analogy nor the immediate result, but a precarity. A subtlety in addition because the coercion is able to shift the binding (even if this was active all the time), then forming a sort of circuiting measure (or clock), when interpreted and required in mechanical manner – the coercion everyone is willing to accept is not leaving the social relationship (and not only the commonplace) overrunning any distance in order to become the latent census-reward system (or mechanism). This is mainly Western experience, but the question is whether it has a Chinese reflex, virtually ± (i.e., active and passive).

Public opinion, on the other side, when projected onto the mechanism and interpreted within its realms, has altered profoundly its meaning. Concerning the Chinese interpretation which will follow in short terms, public opinion is intentionally dominated by the ruling party. Otherwise, it does exist, not only in the exploding (and sometimes explosive) social media, but also academia (›communicative rationality‹ is, as it seems and as an example, a well-received concept of intellectual contribution to the self-understanding and interpretation of the Chinese society).[[80]](#footnote-80) Yet what has to be derived from the history of public opinion is the difference between the +versus −subject. In a lot of literature, the difference is instantaneously melting, even if it should be recognized first in order to recognize the condition of the mechanism too.[[81]](#footnote-81) Distinctively, the opposition becomes obvious in sociological textbooks about a century ago.[[82]](#footnote-82) To reference, the interpretation of public opinion is identified with ethical needs against individualist interest (and possible overdrawing of the public good). Then, well-known from Durkheimian writings at the same time, the opinion and its (collective) subject is located on the higher level instantaneously and steadily subordinating the individual.[[83]](#footnote-83) A peculiar cross-relation results because the (real or true) [−]subject required by law (and never to abolish) is played off against the alternate [+]subject abstracting and cherishing the social ideal (or common good). Scilicet, this is also the input of the discourse theory attempting to make the legal subject coincide with the actor within the discourse.

Abstracting from the theory and history of public opinion the real opposition (and not only difference or interrelationship) of the ± subject (it belongs to a logical loop, a common sphere divided by direct opposition, not to dialectics or contradiction), it should be inserted into the core of the mechanism: even if several issues, the Chinese so-called social credit system,[[84]](#footnote-84) the strengthened rationale of the CCP concerning civic society,[[85]](#footnote-85) the clashing of the cultures, i.e., mutual reflexion of the other side and possible decay versus superiority,[[86]](#footnote-86) do not allow to extract unambiguously the transformation of the society by means of the taker versus giver role, the real execution is not negated. Given the insertion of public opinion against the state, afterwards (or coincident with) the ± relation concerning the proper realization of the subject, the derivation means its distribution within the mechanism (the more or less obligatory census/reward ‘tie’ within social relationship). If anyone must comply with (in the West, and presumably in the Eastern world, that is China), the subject is allowed to act as the giver (in this sense the ›subjector‹ or ›subject-giver‹) versus the taker (the ›subjectee‹ or ›subject-taker‹, ›dominator‹ versus ›dominatee‹ above). Accordingly, the ›subjector‹ has a binding function capable of attracting and merging within a large(r) fascicle, anyone belonging to constantly subordinated. It cannot be excluded that the members of the ruling communist party know this opportunity very well, hence enforce their official state function by means of the latent mechanism. So far, this is not different to the West (for the last decades or legislatures), however the system differs crucially.

If the hypothesis is correct, a sort of implicit nepotism is active at the core of contemporary social and economic life. The distribution is such that anyone can reckon upon the ›subjectee‹ or ›subject-taker‹ especially by its -level representative, i.e., the personal dummy or subject within the energy field. To sharpen, the relation ± subject is by far not coincident with (or equivalent to) the distribution of the census/reward system because the opposition (and not only difference) was, and is, always active within tradition and contemporary theory (or social and state-bound reality). However, abolishing the strict outwardness or externalization of the interplay, hence introducing the real subject through its energetic performance including its representative, this level is extraordinarily prepared to take on a proper meaning of the [−] subject. (In addition, to only repeat, it will not fail to be the person or individual being obliged to steadily observe the common laws). Accordingly, one does not know if the somewhat decried corruption (system) having fueled the upshot of the Chinese economy during the last decades must be interpreted within this framework.[[87]](#footnote-87) Even more, within the system the corruption must not be seen this way – it seems normal or the proper feed of a mechanism complying with social ubiquitous exchange of benefit against obligation. Even the large shadow banking system can be integrated into so that the social credit system is not coming up on political (or cultural) claims but as an instrument or machine to get control of the flowing regional capital, the shadowed one. So far, it is operative within the testing phase and it seems not to stir up the Chinese public or citizen (even if heavily mistrusted by Western commentators). If the shadowed capital cannot be dried up entirely it, at least, might be regulated by the SCS because it renders, at least, oversight over repaid loans.

Most likely, the neatest connection is given with the concept of *guanxi* (interpersonal relation), where the study of the Chinese system and if it implies the energetic person () should follow. “Trust in human connection is the very essence of civility, which in turn is the absolutely critical foundation for any well-functioning political society and polity.”[[88]](#footnote-88) Accordingly, corruption and bribery have to be located here with customs at large within society, providing a special form of Chinese »subjectivity«, where ›subjectors‹ reign over flocks or fascicles of ›subjectees‹ (as in the West, and both on the official and the private side). “For example, personal relations or *guanxi* make it possible to navigate bureaucracy and business. *Guanxi* is often consolidated by gift giving (including bribery) and other behaviours, ranging from excessive banqueting to visiting hostess clubs.”[[89]](#footnote-89) This is similar to the West, even if (apart from sex without hostessing, as mentioned) the consolidation works more exclusively on the supplement of social hierarchy, i.e., position offer and occupation. In addition, the outward reality has to be complemented by the inward one. “In a system of rule by men, not by laws, successful governance requires skill in reading character, building and maintaining personal relationships, and meticulously performing one’s expected roles.”[[90]](#footnote-90) This system is explained as already including *guanxi* in the time before 1989, where in the West the census/reward mechanism became alive. That, however, the Chinese system does not involve the awe of the majesty of the law or of a system of moral codes (perhaps somewhat less true, insofar Confuzian genetics are relevant), or “high-level officials are constrained by the power of others, that is to say, by the play of politics,”[[91]](#footnote-91) demonstrates a special sort of wisdom, probably (still) the mandarin one,[[92]](#footnote-92) as soon as the inward region of the (political, ruling and/or governed) person, in one stroke, has to be consolidated with the outward region. And both are observed, experienced, and eventually communicated at once, hence making power coincide.

1. There is ample reception of Habermas in China since the 80ties until the new century, connected, sometimes knitted and knotted to his main concepts – public sphere, communicative rationality, the discourse including its ethics and criterial affordances, the validity of human rights (as it seems, it makes the juncture, where Western rationality and primordiality is felt or suspected) – so that Chinese intellectuals seem well aware of the situation concerning Post-Marxism and capitalist globalization (see Gloria Davies. “Habermas in China: Theory as Catalyst”. In: The China Journal 57/1 (2007), 61-85). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. “Relations between the United States and China remained chilly for a couple of decades, but they began to thaw following President Richard M. Nixon’s visit to the PRC in 1972. Significantly, this rapprochement was made possible because Mao Zedong and other senior PRC leaders had reevaluated China’s security environment in the early 1970s and determined that the Soviet Union, not the United States, posed the greatest threat to China. Relations between the PRC and the United States remained generally positive for the remainder of the Cold War, and ties expanded significantly, especially after the establishment of full diplomatic relations in 1979.” (Rand Study 2020, 7, see fn 10). The »adage« has not been derived from this text, although its essence belongs to the phenomenon of moleculization, as will follow. Concerning the tie, its social spread and/or break in connection with the political happenings of 1989, the German unification included, the study leaves no mention. “Beijing’s

perception of a soft power threat from the United States is more difficult to comprehend; after all, the U.S. political system in recent years appears to be dysfunctional or in crisis.” (9) What this exactly means, is left open, it should be linked to the hypothesis following (concerning the social tie mechanism). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Concerning literature, and some portion of self-understanding, the question – or issue – seems answered. To use a representative formula, the Chinese path after Mao (with Deng Xiaoping) can be settled with “away from planned economy in Stalinist terms towards a market economy with Chinese features” (Georg Erber. “China: Land der unbegrenzten Möglichkeiten?”. In: Leviathan 42/1 (2014), 29-66. (China: Country of endless opportunities; Gerber is a scientist at the German IWF, see fn 11). Political theory has accommodated a sort of unique power balancing by the Communist Party which has rendered at least about some half of the communal wealth to the private sector (see below, Pye 1995). One should note, it does observe how accruing prosperity is expressed and socially manifesting. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Concerning recent Western-Eastern political spiraling, where China is reflected on the autocratic step-circle, CCP mastering the society seems to become doubly colder (inwards and outwards) however the capitalist spreading must not be grasped in the same way. At least to mention it, the critical Rand study, mainly concerned with security (army) issues, is attesting “the incredibly successful economic reforms implemented in China over the course of many decades.” (Rand Study 2020, 8). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Correspondingly the appreciation of the opening of China after Mao, Erber, 45, cited in fn 11). [One should be rather familiar with the Chinese thinking of Yin and Yang to be able to appreciate this apparent Salto Mortale with the post-Maoist era]. This is something like a tenor often to read, also among intellectuals (see Davies 2007). [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. See article contradiction (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy). [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Even if one cannot extract the item by, p.e., the comparison of Confucianism with human rights (its moral issue) it should include no objection to say that Eastern mind, at least the historical, possesses other skills to deal with opposition (see May Sim. “Confucian Values and Human Rights.” In. The Review of Metaphysics vol. 67/1 (2013), 3-27. She argues for an intersection residing with affirmative proportionality). [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Two examples are given in the Habermas section below. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Li Xiaodong. “The Power of Thinking – The Origins of China’s Re-rise.” In: Philosophy Study, vol. 11/3 (2021), 149-165. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Andrew Scrobell et al. (eds.). *China’s Grand Strategy. Trends, Trajectories, and Long-Term Competition*. Published by the Rand Corporation; Santa Monica, Calif. 2020. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. Even a more biased interpretation, relying upon the main hypothesis that the Leninist tradition of CP must include the problem to hold up the revolutionary tradition as the very legitimation of the one-party-rule, concedes some consolidation and successful implementation of Western-learned or achieved capitalist society, commerce, trade and development, coupled with the assumption that the alternation of the global balance between the nations, US and China in advance, will not necessarily imply the decline of the Western states (James A. Lewis. “Racing the Paper Dragon”. In: *China’s Uneven High-Tech Drive. Implications for the United States*. Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS), 2020, ch.4). Erber, to stay with mainly Western interpretation, uses the formulation: “At the minimum, one should be familiar with the Chinese thinking of Yin versus Yang to be able to appreciate this apparently ideological Salto Mortale of the post-Maoist era. In any case, this alliance of convenience with the class enemy was a surprising step which made China abstain from a similar fate like that of the Soviet Union” (2014, 45; the cooperation with Western enterprises including the transfer of crucial industrial know-how is meant). [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. Rand study, also Pye 1995 and other observers, authors on the main subject. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. The newly nationalist impulse seems concordant with his main endeavor: “Xi Jinping’s ‘China Dream’ outlines the promise of China’s (renewed) rise as a wealthy and strong world power and appeals to nationalist sentiment.” (Kristin Shi-Kupfer et. al. “Social Fabric”. In: Chinese futures. Horizon 2025. European Union Institute for Security Studies (EUISS) (2017), 19-25, 23. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. Certainly not relying upon distinctivity, this is concomitant with the evaluation of “market economy with Chinese features”, the latter including the Communist Party as a hegemon over any economic activity (Gerber 2014, as before). The recent Rand Study is conclusive in the same segment, i.e., it does not thoroughly investigate into the Marxist-Leninist or philosophical endeavor (sometimes firming under the title of “soft power”), however, it delivers concrete numbers and percentuals about the intersection of private ownerships backed by statehood leaving suggestions about the distribution of affluency ≤ wealth in modern China (47f, 50, 54). [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. Gerber 2014, 45. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. Obviously, this has also been intended since the rule of Xi Jinping as the leader of the CP, connected with slogans like ‘harmonious world’. The legalist tradition is also concerned in connection with the introduction and interpretation of the Social Credit System (see below). “But maintaining cordial and cooperative relations with the United States is a top PRC priority. This may seem strange or even contradictory to observers, but it is quite logical to most Chinese.” (Rand Study 2020, 8) Sentences like these provide another instance (similar 38). [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. Following the sinologist Kai Vogelsang, the texts of Marx and others have been promulgated in China through translations from Japanese sources between 1919-21, the Manifesto included (Kai Vogelsang. *China, Japan und die Macht der Sprache*. Stuttgart 2020; see FAZ from 19.5.2021). [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. Xiaodong 2021, 152. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. “Chinese leaders grasped an uneasy truth: Success in building China’s CNP required Beijing to sustain and expand its engagement with the outside world, thereby increasing the vulnerability of the CCP-PLA-PRC system to the hard and soft power forces of globalization. But closing off China and adopting a policy of autarky was simply not an option if Beijing wanted to invigorate its economy and improve the quality of China’s S&T sectors. By the turn of the century, Beijing’s unofficial mantra had become ‘thinking locally demands acting globally’.” (Rand Study 2020, 17). During writing this article, the spiral of mutual abstention has arisen but in the essence the sentence should be true, p.e., in connection with the Chinese attempt to enter the global (Western) automotive markets. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. Nicholas Loubere. “China’s Internet Finance Boom and Tyrannies of Inclusion.” In: *China Perspectives* No. 4/ 112 (2017), 9-18. The adoption of neo- and post-liberalism is expressly confirmed by Chinese studies. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. Shi-Kupfer 2017, 23. [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
22. To become familiar with this thesis, S.W., “The Theory of the Antonyms.” Contribution for the [9th Annual International Conference on Philosophy, 27-31 May 2014, Athens, Greece](http://www.atiner.gr/philosophy.htm). In: *An Anthology of Philosophical Studies*, vol.9, ch.14, 147-157; otherwise (in German) *Sozialbewusstsein*. *Ursprung, Exegese und die Beziehung zum theoretischen Bewusstsein*. Berlin-New York 2015. *Ichbewusstsein – Gruppenbewusstsein. Die Energiebasis und ihre logischen Folgen*. Berlin-New York 2019. [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
23. See below, using symbolic expression for the interpretation of the social tie (as a census ~ reward mechanism). [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
24. As an example how notions behave, non-material is not necessarily equivalent to immaterial, even if in practice nearly everywhere, scientific speech included, the common mind is following coincidence (or indifference). As non-true must not be the same as false, the span or spectrum in-between becomes crucial. It demonstrates (and follows) another base of negation (meltable or fusing into a notional core). [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
25. A. Le Bol. “Entropy in sound and vibration: towards a new paradigm.” In: Proceedings of the Royal Society A., vol 473 (Jan. 2017), (online <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspa.2016.0602>). [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
26. Preannouncements or analogies, as one will, of this assertion in the becoming sociology of the nineteenth century will be shortly cited below. [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
27. That means: phonemes and phones as non-acoustical, but analogously well understood. [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
28. On the limit, the coincidence would make the difference only symbolic. [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
29. John C. Martin. *Introduction to Language and the Theory of Computation*. Singapore: McGraw-Hill, 128ff. [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
30. To clarify, the normal or standard rational understanding results from proper abstraction and, not at least, intentional neutralization. [↑](#footnote-ref-30)
31. By reason of conventional abstraction, it is not easy to find the correct term. In the Logic of Port-Royal the authors reflect for a short moment the possibility of an outward normal figure devoid of reason and the faculty of thinking etc. (Antoine Arnauld, Pierre Nicole. *La Logique ou l’art de penser*. Notes et preface de Charles Jourdain. Paris: Gallimard 1992, P.1, ch.X, 72; see also fn 34). Accordingly, they speak of “des statues automates” as did later Condillac. At least the doubling is crucial, but then the inward, expressly not external (and figural) *Doppelgänger* should not lose its faculties. [↑](#footnote-ref-31)
32. We think of polar terms in a formal, non-linguistic way, which is more complex, entails focality, commutative reason (or alternation) and is committed to represent in any instance the relationship to the peripheries. Basic antonymy is understood in relation to the constitutive notional axis implying the possibility of the hiatus. It should follow, polarity means a proper orthogonal or systematic alternation to common neutral(istic) – or ‘rational’ thinking on the basis of contradiction (in main instance) (see, p.e., Paricio, Francisco Hernández. “Négation Et Polarité : Les Métaphores De La Quantité.” *Langages*, no. 162, 2006, 73–89, esp. 77f). The orthogonal difference becomes evident as soon as the classical categories are interpreted on the base of polaric quantification (from §3 onward). [↑](#footnote-ref-32)
33. Certainly not a single reference, p.e. Jürgen Habermas. *Theorie und Praxis*. Frankfurt/Main 1978, 9th edition 2014, 24. Even more, he is prepared to set ‘naïve’ and ‘intentio recta’ into one thing (p.e. 32). – The following definition might be true of the historical Chinese society, though it must conflict (a) with the Western, originally Aristotelean, which did not center around the family in order to introduce the tie (instead of the male citizen of the polis), b) with the modern more or less capitalist society: “[…] the Confucian view of humaneness (*ren*, the highest virtue of extending love for family members in a graduated manner to the larger community) consists in combining learning and speculation with a focus on the practical […].” (Sim 2013, 10, 12ff: the paternalistic source derived from Confucius as the so-called “continuity such that the state is just the family writ large.”) The critical translation into the modern world (after the experience of relativism too) put apart, a sentence like the following receives an affirmative echo as soon as the real mutual observation and perception of the populace is introduced: “In such a state, the *junzi’s* [exemplary person, esp. the erudited] exemplary accordance with *li* [manners according to the rite or “ritual propriety”] has an almost magical effect on the rest of the population so that they too are inspired to behave virtuously, not only to do the right things, but to do them while having the right demeanor, countenance, attitude, motive, and emotion.” Obviously, the individual in the antiquity (as in the Western sphere) cannot be settled with the modern, enclosed (analytical) subject. Then the real condition needs a renewed investigation, as done here, introducing the energy field in order to understand mutual perception and observation (it must not lead to virtual behavior, to put it in advance, and the magical, on the margin a least, should receive its profane answer). Concerning the comparison of Confucianism with the human rights model, it seems questionable whether the intellectual elite (or *junzi*) is allowed *neutrally* (within any political situation) to pronounce his opinion, act, and think, as he or she should be according to the principal understanding of the modern fundamental rights (“capable of exercising the first generation civil and political rights of free association, thought, and action.”[15]) – A sociological interpretation of the social tie, not exploited here, can be learned from Harrison C. White, Scott A. Boorman, Ronald L. Breiger. “Social Structure from Multiple Networks. I. Block Models of Roles and Positions.” In: American Journal of Sociology vol. 81/4 (1976), 730-80. It does not investigate into the philosophical, or fundamental issue instead of defining it with special social behaviors (“a concrete social structure”) in connection with “role and position” (“we take as given the incidence of each of several distinct types of ties across all pairs in a population” (731). The positivist base becomes obvious with opposing (the logical symmetry of) absent versus present ties so that ubiquitous perception is excluded. [↑](#footnote-ref-33)
34. The Chinese, somewhat ambiguous reception of Habermas can be learned from Davies 2007 (fn 1). [↑](#footnote-ref-34)
35. The expression does not stem from Plato (nomoi 644d), but from a critique of Bergson versus Einstein in relation to time: Pierre-Alexandre Fradet. “La durée bergsonienne et le temps d’Einstein: conciliation et insubordination.“ In: Symposium 16/1, (2012), 52-85, 61. He thinks of living persons beyond the referential system, that is underlying the calculus and must deprive them of their élan vital. Of course, as the marionette within the energy field is not sensing pain or joy in the same manner as the corresponding material body, it could also be termed semi-void. It cannot be fully elaborated in this place. [↑](#footnote-ref-35)
36. See also the introduction into Jürgen Habermas. *Geltung und Faktizität*. Frankfurt/Main 1998, 5th edition 2014, 15f. [↑](#footnote-ref-36)
37. Habermas 1978/2014, 20. [↑](#footnote-ref-37)
38. Habermas 1978/2014, 20. [↑](#footnote-ref-38)
39. To think in first instance of Auguste Comte and Emile Durkheim, p.e. Hermann-Josef Große Kracht. *Solidarität und Solidarismus*. Darin Kap. 2: Solidarité sociale in der französischen Soziologie. Bielefeld: transcript 2017, 73ff. [↑](#footnote-ref-39)
40. Presumably, the roots of this notional reduction are aligned with the main argument against religion of Ludwig Feuerbach, which became the standard meaning of projection in the mental region (apart from space theory and geometry, where the other, and true meaning of projection has been redeveloped even far more in advance of the 18th century). [↑](#footnote-ref-40)
41. To make the concepts more familiar, the loop, even if not expressed in such manner, is already well-known from temporal – cyclic – experience. It should be the (Western) rational and obligatory predicative thinking that is responsible for abstaining from the cyclic interpretation as outcome of the real loop. Time will bear a real negation or siding with constitutive negativity. [↑](#footnote-ref-41)
42. To observe by German reception, p.e. Hans-Peter Müller. *Pierre Bourdieu. Eine systematische Einführung*. Frankfurt/Main: Suhrkamp 2014. [↑](#footnote-ref-42)
43. Habermas 1998/2014, 17. In Original “Lebenswelten” (lifeworlds), a notion that has made its way into Chinese intellectual discourse since the eighties (see Davies 2007). [↑](#footnote-ref-43)
44. Habermas 1998/2014, 18. [↑](#footnote-ref-44)
45. According to Frege, the subter should mean the most concrete rest, implying individuals or (here) focal versus peripheral points. [↑](#footnote-ref-45)
46. Habermas 1998/2014, 38. [↑](#footnote-ref-46)
47. Habermas 1998/2014, 38. This meaning of the lifeworld seems also valid in its Chinese reception, p.e. Davies 2007, 74ff, in some portion also resonating with the interpretation of the public sphere Cao, 70). [↑](#footnote-ref-47)
48. See Albert Einstein. *Die Grundlage der Allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie*. In: Annalen der Physik, Band 49/7 (1916), §4, 778 (Def. in connection with Minkowski). [↑](#footnote-ref-48)
49. In comparison with, p.e., the Logic of Port-Royal or Leibniz. [↑](#footnote-ref-49)
50. Here analytical versus dialectical opposition comes up, the last one epitomized by the relation ›Either the world is infinite, or finite (non-infinite)‹. K. explains this dialectical opposition by the reflection that there might be another property or point of view, in turn possibly false as both others, hence in opposition to contradiction. This opposition stands still in the region of contrariety, however, thinking of the expressive confrontation of thesis versus antithesis, also dialectical, the approximation to polarity becomes distinct because now both terms are true, at least justified. The “principle: that realities (as mere affirmations) do never conflict with each other, is a totally true sentence about the relationship of the concept; but it does not mean the least, neither in view of nature, nor everywhere in view of some thing in itself (about which we do not have any concept).” (A273/B329) The reason is that “the real conflict does everywhere happen, where A – B = 0, i.e., where one reality with another, connected to one subject, repudiates the effect of the other, […]”. This shows that K. did not reflect the proper possibility of both the logical as well as real axis between, at least, two realities (properties, relationships, foci, peripheries with implicit centers, …), implying true negation and spinning one against the other instantaneously. Accordingly, there can be no simple 1 versus 0 alternative, but the full spectrum in-between. [↑](#footnote-ref-50)
51. The following citation from an article about H.s concept of post-metaphysics may provide an example of convertibility in connection with classical philosophy and its interpretation: “’The kinds and genders,’ according to which the Platonic philosophy orders the phenomena of the appearing world, ‘follow the ideal order of the things themselves. Scil., the Platonic idea is neither pure notion nor pure image, but the [very] typical, formative extracted [lit. *herausgehoben*, later“must have been read off”] from the intuitive manifold.’” Immediately the conversion: “’The ideas imagined into the material carry the promise of all-unity because they run up to the apex of the notional pyramid ordered as hierarchy and hint upon internally: the idea of the good.’” (Matthias Lutz-Bachmann. “Postmetaphysisches Denken? Überlegungen zum Metaphysikbegriff der Metaphysikkritik.” In: *Zeitschrift Für Philosophische Forschung*, vol. 56, no. 3, 2002, 414–425. The internal citation: Jürgen Habermas. *Nachmetaphysisches Denken. Philosophische Aufsätze*. Frankfurt/Main 1988, 37f.). If one will, the root of circularity within traditional thinking has herewith been stamped. H. takes the opportunity to strain the bow even more, but the resulting “paradox” appears abstractive as soon as determination, determinative power, enters the faculty relation. This was the Kantian clue (intuition is determined by the mind) obviously requiring its counterpart, determination of the mind by sensation, the very empirical input. Accordingly, idealism should suffer or the purity of the *Verstandesbegriffe* cannot survive. [↑](#footnote-ref-51)
52. The thought can be found on 43f in Habermas 1998/2014. [↑](#footnote-ref-52)
53. Normative regulation H. thinks in connection with morality, i.e., normativity is taking the branch of moral practice (or reason according to the last horizon possibly awaiting); p.e., to cite the same dichotomy: “As soon as nature is objectivized by means of experimental science, one has to give up the hope to find the certainness about normative laws simultaneously from the recognition of causal laws.” (Habermas 1978/2014, 312). The dichotomy is directly derived from “loix du monde physique” vs. “du monde moral” (d’Holbach) in the prehistory of positivism. [↑](#footnote-ref-53)
54. Habermas 1998/2014, 44. [↑](#footnote-ref-54)
55. Habermas 1998/2014, 45. [↑](#footnote-ref-55)
56. Habermas 1998/2014, 44. [↑](#footnote-ref-56)
57. Emphasis according to Habermas 1998/2014, 44. [↑](#footnote-ref-57)
58. To remain short, the dialectical instance is given by H.s interpretation of the Vico cycle (see also below). He postulates the contradiction of the subject as originator and real subject of the history, proving a dialectical difference. However, (+) and (-) subject should form a polar instance which under no circumstances can be reduced to one or the other side (against the Hegelian claim). Even Marx, after reversing the relation, was still on this path, and that at least history has not resided with him, attested by H., provides this sort of objectivized evidence. (To put it to terms: “The historical subjects are so to speak burst into noumenal and phenomenal aspects; they are the authors of their history and nevertheless have not constituted themselves as its subject – causally determined natural kind and morally free individuals in one instance. Now if mankind itself brings about the unity of this contradiction[!] within the path of its history, then the contraction extending into the [proper] approach of recognition of philosophy of history must be understood as belonging to history, nay, as its proper momentum.” This is clear Hegelian language, but the proper contradiction is only conserved with “Because mankind is the subject of history and nevertheless is not as such one, […]” (Both citations Habermas 1987/2014, 274 + 275 n.cit.). As another negation is waiting, contradiction should be error-leading (or dialectics are overcome). [↑](#footnote-ref-58)
59. P.e. Contributions 8 and 9 in Habermas 1978/2014, esp. 9, 338ff. [↑](#footnote-ref-59)
60. Another possibility, the siren. Then Homer was already aware of, and the myth takes the same path as does the Vesper, i.e., the mythic or sacral content becomes secular as soon as the condition is invested. Scil., normal language has still not reached the vernacular signification of possibilities well-entrenched and communicated in latent manners. [↑](#footnote-ref-60)
61. Habermas 1978/2014, 343. The concept “circuit” does exist but is not prominently used by H. Further, the circuit process (“Kreislaufprozess”), when used, is bound by dialectical thought (p.e. 1978/2014, 241f): Characteristically, the steadily changeable feasibility of technological means, when showing success, regresses on the socially managed primordialism of nature – technology is integrated into daily life prompting its natural input to interchange. Otherwise, traditionally understood subject and object are shifting into intersection, the one side not fully clear-cut against the other. This, seemingly, necessitates the dialectical approach, implying a significant surplus (“Überschuss”) of reflection against the positivist method of sociology. [↑](#footnote-ref-61)
62. The propensity is also well-known the theoretical base of accumulation versus societal satisfaction of needs. Accordingly, the consideration about the development of the productive forces must be accommodated, which are not only able to satisfy the necessary and superfluent needs, but actually do. If, under these circumstances, “the accumulation can be interrupted and brought back from the spiral of expanded [potential accumulation] into the circuit of simple reproduction,” the simple circuit is not necessarily or by itself polar-free (resolving at once the “antagonism”, being neutralized per se or immunized. The spiral does not require ± against ¬± in front of the circuit). In turn, the issue falls back on questioning if any real encompassing satisfaction, balancing the power of accumulation, might exist (see Habermas 1978/2014, 262f) – the historical answer is going conform with the polar base, saying no. Even if political institutions including the government have gained more and more influence on the economical circuit, the normal or legislative ‘public’ budget included, they nevertheless leave a large leeway for capital accumulation, at least in the Western division. And China or Russia seems prepared to accept similar societal developments. [↑](#footnote-ref-62)
63. The loop is, of course, dichotomous because he can be neutral (p.e. in computation, Martin 1991, 131f) versus polar. [↑](#footnote-ref-63)
64. As before, the paradox results from the fact that technological change in evolution started with the attempt to overcome the pressure of nature, to translate it into the instrumental sphere, leading to a situation, where this steady change has gotten self-impact (reflexivity). [↑](#footnote-ref-64)
65. Habermas 1978/2014, 309. [↑](#footnote-ref-65)
66. One instance in the same context, 1978/2014, 354. [↑](#footnote-ref-66)
67. See p.e. Lutz-Bachmann 2002, 416. [↑](#footnote-ref-67)
68. The term ›recte‹ should imply a peculiar caveat or remind – the base as the basic energy field cannot be reached by simple reflection. Accordingly, thinking is divided once more (among other things, well-known to natural sciences) and leading to a proper reflection about the base, if constituted polar or not. [↑](#footnote-ref-68)
69. Habermas 1998/2014, 15. [↑](#footnote-ref-69)
70. The term semi-internal seems more appropriate than semi-external, which should not be false because there is a real shearing or axing; however, the conventional understanding of conscient behavior and development makes the intercourse in-between, basing on the existing energy field, appear to be of a more internal sort. (It is normally hidden, not objectively communicated and morally often inclined to deviant or low-graded behavior, manners, and attitudes, p.e., the dummy insolent). [↑](#footnote-ref-70)
71. A recent appreciation concentrating on Einstein: John H. Sweeney. “Einstein’s Dreams.” Review of Metaphysics vol. 67/4 (2014), 811-34. [↑](#footnote-ref-71)
72. Habermas 1998/2014, 29. [↑](#footnote-ref-72)
73. Habermas 1978/2014, 238f. [↑](#footnote-ref-73)
74. Taken from FAZ 31/7/2021 ([www.faz.net/aktuell/wirtschaft/digitec/start-up-staffbase-aus-chemnitz-bald-ist-es-eine-milliarde-wert-17450995-p3.html](http://www.faz.net/aktuell/wirtschaft/digitec/start-up-staffbase-aus-chemnitz-bald-ist-es-eine-milliarde-wert-17450995-p3.html)), slightly altered. [↑](#footnote-ref-74)
75. The formulation is signaling the intentions of analytical philosophy (and positivism), but it is also valid with characterizations like the following, exhibiting a commonplace of modernity: “Vielleicht wird heute politisches Recht gerade deshalb gefordert, weil wir weniger denn je in einer politischen Gemeinschaft, sondern vielmehr in einer neuen Gesellschaft pluralistisch, individualistisch, singlistisch leben” (Arno Baruzzi. *Rechtsphilosophie der Gegenwart*. Darmstadt (WBG) 2006, 28). It should be completed – the political community, if it does loosen its inner connex more and more, so that the singularization of the individual becomes obstant, apparently the predominant and obligatory character, is virtually, and eventually, held together by the energy field, which by itself is neither political nor social and therefore must be politized and socialized; accordingly, singularization seems only the outer side made possible by the coincident inner or internal one (never simply psychic or innerly). It is not pluralistic in the same sense, also not singularizing but at once requiring a proper answer to the already given fusion by the person, and implying nodal existence, where everyone has to implement his profits, advantages, prospects. Accordingly, the question of a “silent majority” against an “active citizenry” should receive its correct answer (Yu Keping. *Democracy is a Good Thing: Essays on Politics, Society, and Culture in Contemporary China*. Washington, DC: Brookings 2009. Review by Sabine Grund, in: Internationales Asienforum vol. 41/3-4 (2010), 370-1). [↑](#footnote-ref-75)
76. Habermas 1978/2014, 264. [↑](#footnote-ref-76)
77. Perhaps unnecessary, it should be stressed against the restriction of linguistic understanding of polarity seeking the exploitation of the hiatus to be blocked by the generic process of symbolization (p.e., Paricio 2006 often residing with Horn 1989 and later, so that the hiatus has no regular place, is even not mentioned); concerning contextual and conversational input, the expression might be freed, but it does not count systematically. In addition, the hiatus might be realized by a break lying fully in or in the periphery of. [↑](#footnote-ref-77)
78. The pronominal difference is implicit in the following, using only the male form. [↑](#footnote-ref-78)
79. If needed, the domination within the term Φ*δx*0*y*0 should be explained by Φ*δx*0 → Φ*δy*0 (so that given Φ*δx*0 but not Φ*δy*0 would be false); however, the neutral fixing has to be abandoned in favor of the polar (peripherical) one, as will be seen. In any case, it is not the quantificational term who reigns the domination. [↑](#footnote-ref-79)
80. At least in the nineties, see Davies 2007. [↑](#footnote-ref-80)
81. If needed, the distinction can be derived from empirical and theoretical research on the concept of legitimacy in political theory (see M. Stephen Weatherford. “Mapping the Ties that bind: Legitimacy, Representation, and Alienation.” In: The Western Political Quarterly vol.44/2 (1991), 251-76). Then the focus (or functional “perspective”) correlated with the conventional – and empirical – indexes of measurement (by means of survey and statistical approach) is operative on the [–] side, whereas the other one correlated with (the fundamental “perspective” of) the public’s opinions about legitimacy and efficiency of institutions and incumbents works on the [+] side. In first instance, the logical basis should be polarity even if “complementarity” (especially against alienation versus representation) cannot be denied. This becomes obvious with profiling the conventional indexes even traditionally by means of alienation. In any case, the existence of the (apparent) “continuum” between the “micro versus macro level” should be questioned (252: the “micro pole of the continuum” versus the “macro pole”), most likely responsible for the cardinal “dilemma”. [↑](#footnote-ref-81)
82. Eldon Eisenach. *The Lost Premise of Progressivism*. Ch.3: *The Nation & Public Opinion*. Kansas University Press 2021, 74-103, first section. [↑](#footnote-ref-82)
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