

**UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DE SANTA CATARINA
CENTRO DE FILOSOFIA E CIÊNCIAS HUMANAS
PROGRAMA DE PÓS-GRADUAÇÃO EM FILOSOFIA
DOUTORADO EM FILOSOFIA**

WILLIAM HENRY FURNESS ALTMAN

**THE PROBLEM OF TIME
IN HEGEL'S PHILOSOPHY OF HISTORY**

**Florianópolis
2010**

William Henry Furness Altman

The problem of time
in Hegel's philosophy of history

Trabalho apresentado como requisito parcial para a obtenção do título de doutorado em Filosofia, sob a orientação do Profa. Dra. Maria De Lourdes Alves Borges.

Florianópolis
2010

Catálogo na fonte pela Biblioteca Universitária
da
Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina

A468p Altman, William Henry Furness
The Problem of time in Hegel's philosophy of history
[tese] / William Henry Furness Altman ; orientadora, Maria
de Lourdes Alves Borges. - Florianópolis, SC, 2010.
259 p.

Tese (doutorado) - Universidade Federal de Santa
Catarina, Centro de Filosofia e Ciências Humanas. Programa
de Pós-Graduação em Filosofia.

Inclui referências

1. Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich, 1770-1831.
2. Filosofia. 3. História - Filosofia. I. Borges, Maria de Lourdes Alves. II. Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina. Programa de Pós-Graduação em Filosofia. III. Título.

CDU 1

Para Zoraide.

RESUMO: O objetivo deste trabalho é mostrar porque o problema do tempo é o calcanhar de Aquiles no sistema Hegeliano. A filosofia da história em Hegel dá margem a crítica rigorosa porque estruturas lógicas atemporais devem ser aplicadas a um processo que se desenvolve no tempo. Mas não se pode pensar em Hegel aplicando a dialética à história; esta noção pressupõe a existência de nossa consciência histórica pos-Hegeliana. Para nós, tempo é aquilo no qual os eventos ocorrem, um processo infinito estendendo-se para o futuro. Para Hegel, “tempo” emerge somente quando a Idéia Absoluta externaliza-se na filosofia da natureza e nosso “futuro” é meramente um “mau infinito”. Uma investigação arqueológica da compreensão do tempo em Hegel enfatiza que ele foi herdeiro de uma longa tradição filosófica que era absolutamente hostil à mudança, fenômenos temporais e tempo. Nós somos tão profundamente influenciados pelas implicações do pensamento do próprio Hegel que é agora difícil para nós entendermos que ele mesmo não tinha consciência dessas implicações. A hostilidade de Hegel para com o tempo revela-se em sua filosofia da história porque seu próprio sistema é, e somente pode ser, o término da história da filosofia. Mas o escândalo do “fim da história” depende inteiramente de um prévio e muito menos visível escândalo: a falha de Hegel em perceber o que tornou possível para ele conceituar um processo cronológico como a história foi a temporalidade já implícita na dialética Hegeliana em si.

Palavras-chave: Hegel, filosofia da história, tempo, dialética, *das Moment*, Hegelianismo de esquerda, Hegelianismo de direita, “o fim da história.”

ABSTRACT: The aim of this work is to show why the problem of time is the Achilles heel of the Hegelian System. Hegel's philosophy of history is the correct point of entry for a rigorous critique because timeless logical structures must here be applied to a process that unfolds in time. But it is wrong to think of Hegel applying the dialectic to history; this notion presupposes the existence of our own post-Hegelian historical consciousness. For us, time is that within which events occur, an endless process extending into the future. For Hegel, "time" emerges only when the Absolute Idea externalizes itself in the philosophy of nature and our "future" is merely his "bad infinite." An archeological investigation of Hegel's understanding of time emphasizes that he was heir to a long philosophical and tradition that was resolutely hostile to change, temporal phenomena, and time. We have been so deeply influenced by the temporal implications of Hegel's own thought that it is now difficult for us to grasp that he was unconscious of these implications himself. Paradoxically, Hegel's hostility to time is revealed in his philosophy of history because his own System is and can only be the culmination of the history of philosophy. But the scandal of "the end of history" depends entirely on a prior and far less visible scandal: Hegel's failure to realize that what made it possible for him to conceptualize a chronological process like history was the temporality implicit in the dialectic itself.

Key Words: Hegel, philosophy of history, time, dialectic, *das Moment*, Left Hegelianism, Right Hegelianism, "the end of history."

Abbreviations

E	<i>Enzyklopädie der philosophischen Wissenschaften</i>
GWFH	Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel
HW	<i>Werke in zwanzig Bänden</i> , Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1970.
LHP	<i>Lectures on the History of Philosophy</i>
PhG	<i>Phänomenologie des Geistes</i>
PhN	PETRY, M.J., <i>Hegel's Philosophy of Nature</i> , Volume 1, London: Allen and Unwin, 1970.
SZ/BT	HEIDEGGER, Martin, <i>Sein und Zeit / Being and Time</i> .
WdL	<i>Science of Logic</i>

Table of Contents

Preface	xiii-xviii
Introduction	1

Part I: A Philosophical Archeology

Introduction	15
--------------	----

Section 1. Logical Completeness in the Hegelian Dialectic

Introduction	18
Chapter 1. The Hegelian Dialectic as Logical Completeness	19
Chapter 2. The Hegelian Dialectic in Action	41

Section 2. Chronology and Logic

Introduction	56
Chapter 3. The Logical and Chronological Parallel	62
Chapter 4. Logical and Chronological Completeness	85

Section 3. Hegel's Philosophy of History

Introduction	108
Chapter 5. The Emergence of History in the <i>Philosophy of Right</i>	109
Chapter 6. The <i>Umkehrung</i> of <i>Freiheit</i>	127
Chapter 7. Hegel's Philosophy of History	149

Part II. A Philosophical Scandal

Introduction	166
--------------	-----

Section 1. The Scandal of Time

Introduction	167
--------------	-----

Chapter 8. Beginning with the End	170
-----------------------------------	-----

Chapter 9. The Hegelian Moment	172
--------------------------------	-----

Section 2. The Scandal of Right Hegelianism

Introduction	195
--------------	-----

Chapter 10. Hegel on the Americas	199
-----------------------------------	-----

Chapter 11. The Rebirth of Right Hegelianism	206
--	-----

Section 3. The Scandal of Left Hegelianism

Introduction	214
--------------	-----

Chapter 12. Self-Deception in Hegel	215
-------------------------------------	-----

Chapter 13. Hegel's Platonic Projection	225
---	-----

Chapter 14. The Return of the Repressed	242
---	-----

Bibliography	243
--------------	-----

Preface

If it were not relevant to the problem of time in Hegel, even a brief *Entstehungsgeschichte* of this dissertation would probably be justly regarded as superfluous and perhaps might even seem like fiction. It truly is a remarkable tale: a philosophical *Märchen* whose heroine is my treasured wife Zoraide. She brought me, along with this thesis, back to life. My gratitude to UFSC likewise knows no measure; never in my entire life have I been extended the opportunity to live out a fairy-tale. The first night I spent in Florianópolis, I knew that philosophy was alive on this island thanks to Alexandre Lima, a student of Luis-Filipe Ribeiro. The amiable Sarah Albieri was the first professor who extended her hand in welcome to us and then came the fateful meeting with Marco Antonio Franciotti, now a dear friend, who introduced me to Maria Borges and set the whole process in motion. My course with Luiz Hebeche was an enlivening “provocation” and a pure delight. Thanks to Décio Krause, a brilliant educator in his own right, I had the great privilege of learning from the legendary Newton de Costa. Although I did not formally study with either Celso Braida or Cláudia Drucker, both have given generously of their time and insights; Maicon Engler, a most promising student, has provided delightful company as well as invaluable assistance. To Alessandro Pinzani I owe a special debt of gratitude as a teacher, a member of my Qualification Committee, and as a friend. His kindness, insight, and support are deeply appreciated. Everyone who has met the second member of my Committee knows that Delamar Dutra is both a gentleman and a scholar; never have I been treated with more kindness, warmth, and respect. And Maria Borges has been quite simply the ideal Supervisor: wise, *simpático*,¹ and perfectly direct. So many heroes! And behind them all, the wise and beautiful woman who brought me to Floripa and shared with me the open-minded and big-hearted country she calls home.

This dissertation was born at Wesleyan University in wintry Connecticut, home of *History and Theory* and thus the ideal place to discover the philosophy of history. At the University of Toronto, it became “The Shape of History: A Platonic Critique of the Speculative Philosophy of History.” Although he wasn’t mentioned in that title, this early version was already a critique of Hegel: since nothing can be better without the

¹ It was, for example, extremely fortuitous that our first conversations took place during the writing of BORGES, Maria de Lourdes Alves Borges, *War and Perpetual Peace: Hegel, Kant, and Contemporary Wars*, *ethic@*, v. 5 n. 1, p. 81-90, 2006. See also BORGES, Maria de Lourdes, *A Atualidade de Hegel*, Florianópolis: Editora da UFSC, 2009.

good (such was my youthful “thesis”) his “shape of history” couldn’t, despite appearances, be progressive. Although it did little for me in the profession, this thesis proved a wonderful basis for living my life and I never saw my failure to receive the doctorate as a symptom of decline. But when, many decades later, Brasil opened its arms to me, the long forgotten thesis sprang again to life, reappearing first as “The Rejection of Ethical Idealism in Hegel’s Philosophy of History.” Maria Borges showed a keen eye for what was alive in this version and the result is what follows. But before letting the dissertation speak for itself, I want to make a few remarks about its future: it already has had enough of a past that it is easy to see where it is headed.

Extrapolating, then, from recent developments, it is easy to see that this thesis is moving from ethics to metaphysics and from the philosophy of history to the philosophy of religion. To begin with the first, it is turning into “The Problem of Time in Hegel.” Like my original interest in the ethical presuppositions of his philosophy of history, my concern with Hegel’s philosophy of history has revealed itself to be little more than the means for bringing “the problem of time” to the forefront. In attempting to show that this problem is the Achilles heel of his thought, Hegel’s use of the word *das Moment* proves to be of decisive importance. The first appearance of this word in the characteristically Hegelian sense occurs in the last paragraph of *Glaube und Wissen* (1802)² and this passage will be

² HEGEL, G.W.F.H. [hereafter “GWFH”], *Werke in zwanzig Bänden*, Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1970 (hereafter “HW”), volume 2, p. 431-2: “Der reine Begriff aber oder die Unendlichkeit als der Abgrund des Nichts, worin alles Sein versinkt, muß den unendlichen Schmerz, der vorher nur in der Bildung geschichtlich und als das Gefühl war, worauf die Religion der neuen Zeit beruht - das Gefühl: Gott selbst ist tot (dasjenige, was gleichsam nur empirisch ausgesprochen war mit Pascals Ausdrücken: “la nature est telle qu’elle marque partout un Dien perdu et dans l’homme et hors de l’homme” 224)—, rein als Moment, aber auch nicht als mehr denn als Moment der höchsten Idee bezeichnen und so dem, was etwa auch entweder moralische Vorschrift einer Aufopferung des empirischen Wesens oder der Begriff formeller Abstraktion war, eine philosophische Existenz geben und also der Philosophie die Idee der absoluten Freiheit und damit das absolute Leiden oder den spekulativen Karfreitag, der sonst historisch war, und ihn selbst in der ganzen Wahrheit und Härte seiner Gottlosigkeit wiederherstellen, aus welcher Härte allein—weil das Heitere, Ungründlichere und Einzelne der dogmatischen Philosophien sowie der Naturreligionen verschwinden muß - die höchste Totalität in ihrem ganzen Ernst und aus ihrem tiefsten Grunde, zugleich allumfassend und in die heiterste Freiheit ihrer Gestalt auferstehen kann und muß.” Hereafter, citations of this edition will be of the form: “HW 2.431-2.” For the “first appearance” claim, see BORSCHÉ, Tilman, “Moment” in *Historisches Wörterbuch der Philosophie*, edited by Joachim Ritter and Karlfried Gründer, Basel / Stuttgart: Schwabe & Co, 1984, volume 6, p. 100-108 at p. 105.

briefly discussed in Chapter 9. There I will argue that the mere fact that there actually was a precise chronological moment when Hegel himself introduced the word “*das Moment*” is highly significant. But what will not be found in Chapter 9 is an adequate discussion of the theological origins of this *momentous* transformation. The need for such a project is indicated by Hegel’s reference to both a historical and speculative “Good Friday”³ or rather to the transition between the one and the other in the same sentence in which the new meaning of *das Moment* first appears.⁴

Ironically, Franz Rosenzweig may provide the best commentary on this transition; the irony, to be sure, resides only in the fact that Rosenzweig was Jewish since his credentials as a Hegel scholar are impeccable.⁵ After quoting a couplet from Angelus Silesius,⁶ Rosenzweig describes the temporal implications of Christian life:

Nicht als Augenblick also wird der Augenblick dem Christen zum Vertreter der Ewigkeit, sondern als Mittelpunkt der christlichen Weltzeit; und dies Weltzeit besteht, da sie nicht vergeht sondern steht aus lauter solchen “Mittelpunkten”; jedes Ereignis steht mitten zwischen Anfang und Ende des ewigen Wegs und ist durch diese Mitstellung im zeitlichen Zwischenreich der Ewigkeit selber ewig.⁷

Rosenzweig is explaining what might be called “the antinomy of Christian time”: each *Augenblick* in the life of a Christian is at one and the same time (*zugleich*) both momentary and eternal, both *zeitlich* and *zeitlos*. As a

³ *Karfreitag* at HW 2.431; cf. FACKENHEIM, Emil L. *The Religious Dimension in Hegel’s Thought*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1967, p. 143: “...the life, death, and resurrection of Christ has initiated a process which seeks completeness once it is explicitly initiated. And it will not have reached completeness until an infinite, transcendent heaven has descended to a finite, transfigured earth.” See also p. 149. HALPER, Edward, *The Logic of Hegel’s Philosophy of Nature* in HOULGATE, Stephen (ed.), *Hegel and the Philosophy of Nature*, p. 29-49, Albany: State University of New York Press, 1998, at p. 35 revealingly mistakes the resurrection for “the second coming;” the resolution cannot be in the future.

⁴ AHLERS, Rolf, Hegel’s theological Atheism, *Heythrop Journal* v. 25, p. 158-177, 1984.

⁵ ROSENZWEIG, Franz, *Hegel und der Staat*, München / Berlin: R. Oldenbourg, 1920.

⁶ ROSENZWEIG, Franz, *Der Stern der Erlösung* in *Der Mensch und sein Werk; Gesammelte Schriften* II, Haag: Martinus Nijhoff, 1976, p. 377: “Das Wort des Cherubinschen Wandersmanns “Wär’ Christus tausendmal in Bethlehem geboren / und ists nicht auch in dir, so bist du doch verloren” ist dem Christen nur in der kühnen Präganz des Ausdrucks, nicht im Gedanken paradox.” Cf. the couplet from Martin LUTHER cited by GWFH that follows.

⁷ ROSENZWEIG, *Der Stern der Erlösung*, p. 377.

radical critic of German Idealism,⁸ Rosenzweig himself did not require the merely historical Good Friday to be *zugleich* the eternal fact of God's passing over into His speculative entombment in the World in accordance with Hegel's Philosophy of Nature. Rosenzweig can keep God, Man, and World in permanent temporal play precisely because they are eternally and intrinsically distinct. Rosenzweig's Christian, an individual believer,⁹ thus lives *in an eternal moment made possible by a strictly temporal event* and the *Augenblick* of worldly time thus becomes eternal through divine redemption. It was easy for Rosenzweig to imagine living this chronological antinomy precisely because, as a pious Jew, he was already experiencing himself as having passed over, by means of the eternal Torah, the flood of time.¹⁰

I would like to suggest that Hegel invented his own characteristic sense of the word *das Moment* to capture what Rosenzweig would later call "*der Mittelpunkt der christlichen Weltzeit*" or rather to capture its *antithesis*.¹¹ In the "Systemfragment von 1800,"¹² Hegel is grappling with a rather more spatial form of the paradox Rosenzweig would later explain: how can one worship the unseen God in the temple's empty space.¹³ He indicates his solution by referring back (*wie oben*) to an earlier passage:

⁸ PÖGGELER, Otto, "Between Enlightenment and Romanticism: Rosenzweig and Hegel" in MENDES-FLOHR, Paul (ed.), *The Philosophy of Franz Rosenzweig*, Hanover: Brandeis University Press, 1988, p. 107-123.

⁹ Cf. the importance of *die Gemeinde* in GWFH's "Lectures on the Philosophy of Religion" (hereafter "VPR") at HW 17.305-19.

¹⁰ ROSENZWEIG, *Der Stern der Erlösung*, p. 376: "Diesem Leben entzog Gott den Juden, indem es die Brücke seines Gesetzes himmelhoch über den Strom der Zeit wölbte, unter deren Bogen sie nun in alle Ewigkeit machtlos dahinrauscht."

¹¹ BAUM, Manfred. Zur Vorgeschichte des Hegelschen Unendlichkeitsbegriff. *Hegel-Studien* v. 11, p. 89-124, 1976, p. 109: "Die Religion schöner Menschlichkeit ist die Religion der Menschwerdung des unendlichen Gottes, der nicht bloß räumlichen Gestaltung, sondern auch *Verzeitlichung* des Ewigen als Mensch."

¹² HW 1.418-427.

¹³ HW 1.422-3. "... ein[en] objektiven Mittelpunkt; allen Völkern war er die Morgengegend des Tempels und für die Verehrer eines unsichtbaren Gottes nur dies Gestaltlose des bestimmten Raums, nur ein Platz. Aber dies bloß Entgegengesetzte, rein Objektive, bloß Räumliche muß nicht notwendig in dieser Unvollständigkeit der völligen Objektivität bleiben, es kann selbst, d. h. als für sich bestehend, durch die Gestalt zur eigenen Subjektivität zurückkehren. Göttliches Gefühl, das Unendliche vom Endlichen gefühlt, wird erst dadurch vervollständigt, daß Reflexion hinzukommt, über ihm verweilt; ein Verhältnis derselben zum Gefühl ist aber nur ein Erkennen desselben als eines Subjektiven, nur ein Bewußtsein des Gefühls, getrennte Reflexion über dem getrennten Gefühl; die reine, räumliche Objektivität gibt den Vereinigungspunkt für viele, und die gestaltete Objektivität ist zugleich, was sein soll, durch die mit ihm verbundene Subjektivität nicht eine

Und damit ist auch, so wie oben die Antinomie der Zeit, der Moment und die Zeit des Lebens als notwendig gesetzt wurde, die objektive Antinomie in Ansehung des Gegenstands gesetzt; das in der Unermeßlichkeit des Raums unendliche Wesen ist zugleich im bestimmten Raume, etwa wie in dem: "Den aller Himmel Himmel nicht umschloß, / Der liegt nun in Mariä Schoß."¹⁴

For Hegel, God will soon enough die in Nature and be reborn in Spirit,¹⁵ empty space will be filled with God the Son. The entombment of the infinite in the finite, the historical incarnation, is thus already becoming a *moment* of a timeless process, i.e. *der Moment* (Rosenzweig's *Augenblick*) is already passing over the bridge of *die Zeit des Lebens* and becoming his equivalent of Rosenzweig's *Mittelpunkt der christlichen Weltzeit*: i.e. *das Moment*.¹⁶ Hegel already knew where he needed to go; the problem was that he didn't yet have the right word to justify his getting himself there.¹⁷

wirkliche, sondern nur eine mögliche Objektivität, sie kann als solche gedacht werden, aber es ist nicht notwendig, weil sie nicht rein ist."

¹⁴ HW 1.423.

¹⁵ HARRIS, H.S. *Hegel's Development: Towards the Sunlight 1770-1801*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972, p. 393-4: "What reflection cannot grasp in its rational use, when it rises from the concept of 'Nature' to that of 'pure life', is the necessity of embodiment: this is what it captures, in its imaginative use, in the *Vorstellung* of God's Incarnation. But the gulf [sc. at this stage of GWFH's development] between the rational and the imaginative employment of reflection remains. This was the unsolved problem from which Hegel's conception of 'absolute' knowledge' sprang. The 'Father' and the 'Son', the two aspects of this antinomy, have yet to be united in the 'Spirit'." See also MARCUSE, Herbert, *Hegel's Ontology and the Theory of Historicity*, translated by Seyla Benhabib, Cambridge: MIT Press, 1987, 212-8.

¹⁶ Cf. HARRIS, *Hegel's Development*, p. 394.

¹⁷ On an earlier passage in the same 1800 fragment, T.M. KNOX comments: "Desperately but as yet unsuccessfully, Hegel gropes for a method which would understand life by both positing and uniting opposites. Nowhere else can the fountainhead of Hegel's dialectic be better studied than in the intellectual struggle reflected in this paper." See HEGEL, G.W.F. *Early Theological Writings*, translated by T.M. KNOX. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948, p. 312 n. 6. This view is attacked by HARRIS, *Hegel's Development* at p. 388-94, culminating in the observation at p. 391: "...we must not allow ourselves to be misled by the fact that the words 'philosophy' and 'religion' are put in the one relation at this stage in his development, and in the opposite relation a year later; we must attend to what the words mean. When we do this we find that what is called 'philosophy' in the first instance does not subsequently change its status, and that what is called 'philosophy' later *grows out of* what was called 'religion' before." I am inclined to synthesize the views of HARRIS and KNOX: a change in vocabulary (*das Moment*) was "the fountainhead of Hegel's dialectic." Unfortunately, this aspect of the

The contrast between Rosenzweig and Hegel is therefore absolute: Hegel needs a moment of time to vanish into eternity while his student and critic needs to show how eternity emerges in time for the recipient of Revelation. As it happens, the discussion of *die Antinomie der Zeit* to which Hegel here refers the reader is irretrievably lost¹⁸ and perhaps that's just as well. For the thesis I have written is not "The Theological Origins of the Problem of Time in Hegel's Thought"; this title merely suggests a purely speculative future towards which this long, strange, trip is tending, unfolding wondrously in the march (or *Märchen*) of tick-tock time I call my life.

problem is not emphasized by BAUM, Manfred, *Die Entstehung der Hegelschen Dialektik*, Bonn: Bouvier, 1986.

¹⁸ HARRIS, *Hegel's Development*, p. 394 n. 1; but see II.1.2.2.3 (in Chapter 9) below. Naturally I am in complete agreement with his conclusion: "Some of it [sc. the missing parts of the "Systemfragment von 1800"] probably survives in the *Differenzschrift* and in *Glauben und Wissen*."

Introduction

Hegel's Philosophy of History is commonly regarded as teleological. Charles Taylor's description can be taken as typical or even canonical on this point: "Thus history is to be understood teleologically as directed in order to realize *Geist*."¹ But there are important questions: what is the precise nature of Hegel's *τελος* and where is it to be found? Is it the Kingdom of Prussia as fulfillment of the German World? Is it Absolute Knowledge as the culmination of Hegel's own System? Or is it the explicitly anti-Kantian perpetuation, according to plan, of Warring States?²

None of these answers can simply be excluded at the outset. For the present, in the words of Shakespeare, "it sufficeth that the day will end." In other words: the specific nature of the Hegelian *τελος* is less important than the fact that his Philosophy of History unquestionably depends on one. As I will show, the answer to this question ultimately depends on whether one thinks that History for Hegel has *an independent existence*—i.e. the traditional view of every sensible person—or whether one is prepared to recognize the significance of Hegel's "Absolute Idealism" by embracing what Jean Hypollite calls "the immanence of history."³ The latter will locate the *τελος* in the System itself, the former either in the *status quo* of Hegel's own time or in some as yet to be realized future.

It will be noted that the three answers I proposed about Hegel's *τελος* are all *spatial*: they indicate a place—if not geographical, then at least a generalized *locus*—but not a time. In saying this, I indicate the problem at the center of this dissertation: where is the *τελος* of Hegel's Philosophy of History to be found *in Time*? This question inevitably brings to mind the difference between Left and Right Hegelians: the former famously read Hegel in an open-ended fashion that postpones the temporal *τελος* by locating it in the future. My response is negative: it is my purpose to show that Hegel does *not* locate it in the *Future*.⁴ In fact, *I wish to deny that the Hegelian *τελος* takes place in Time at all.*

¹ TAYLOR, Charles, *Hegel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975; p. 389.

² As claimed by WENDT, Alexander, Why a World State is Inevitable, *European Journal of International Relations*, v. 9, n. 4, p. 491-542, 2003.

³ HYPOLITE, Jean, *Genesis and Structure of Hegel's Phenomenology of Spirit*. Translated by Samuel Cherniak and John Heckman. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1974; p. 39-40.

⁴ The Left Hegelian position is naturally pervasive. In addition to Taylor, p. 425-6, see VINCENT, Andrew, The Hegelian State and International Politics, *Review of International Politics*, v. 9, p. 191-205, 1983 and BRAUER, Oscar Daniel, *Dialektik der Zeit: Untersuchungen zu Hegels Metaphysik der Weltgeschichte*, Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Friedrich Frommann, 1982, p. 192: "Die hegelsche

In his *Hegel's Idea of a Phenomenology of Spirit* (1998), Michael Forster attempts to read the entire text historically.⁵ i.e. he claims that Hegel has arranged the various stages of Spirit's manifestation in chronological order.⁶ It is easy to see why Forster wants to do this: taking an historical approach to the most historical and systematic of great philosophers—especially when such an approach brings unity of purpose to a text that other critics have insisted on dividing—seems natural. The problem is that it was precisely Hegel who *first* made History a matter of central philosophical concern. Forster is trying to make Hegel more *historical*, in a post-Hegelian sense, than he possibly could have been. The problem with Forster's approach is that it is both historical and profoundly unhistorical at the same time albeit in two different respects.

As I have suggested previously, Hegel succeeded only too well: the 19th century's obsession with History, an obsession that has hardly lost its grip today, owes more to Hegel than to anyone else. But that very success has obscured *our* sense, as Hegel's heirs, of what Hegel himself was really doing. *We* tend to assume that Hegel was incorporating into Philosophy a fully independent and important branch of knowledge called "History"⁷—as we would be doing if we had been in his place—rather than extending the boundaries of Philosophy by showing that it always already included its own chronological past *as moments in its own logical development*. The difference between these two alternatives constitutes the central problem considered in this dissertation.

Philosophie steht also nicht am Ende *der* Zeit doch am Ende einer Zeit, und zwar als Bewußtsein *einer* Welt, die untergeht und in Bewußtsein des Untergangs das Prinzip der neuen Zeit vorbereitet."

⁵ FORSTER, Michael, *Hegel's Idea of a Phenomenology of Spirit*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998. I deliberately use the word "entire" to distinguish FORSTER's approach from Jean HYPOLLITE's, who sees a shift in Hegel's (hereafter "GWFH") approach midway through the *Phenomenology of Mind* (hereafter "PhG").

⁶ A similar approach to HEGEL, G.W.F. *Hegel's Science of Logic*. Translated by A.V. Miller. London: Allen & Unwin, 1969 (hereafter "WdL") is found in BUTLER, Clark, *Hegel's Logic: Between Dialectic and History*, Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1996.

⁷ SPEIGHT, Allen, *The Philosophy of Hegel*, Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2008, p. 87: "If there is anything for which Hegel is thought to be most philosophically guilty, it is for enmeshing philosophy more deeply than almost any of his predecessors in the problems and contingencies of history."

The essence of this problem is Time.⁸ As children of the 19th century Darwinian Revolution, a revolution in which Hegel played the role of prophet or midwife, we see Time—huge and mighty masses of it—everywhere. We even see Time when we look out into Space: the Speed of Light is our cosmology’s only constant and every twinkling star twinkles precisely in accordance with its distance from us as measured in light-years. Einstein’s relativity has not banished Time, except in a very one-sided and exclusive sense, from our thoughts; it has rather temporalized Space. Time, in sufficient quantities, even becomes productive. It is tempting to regard “billions and billions of years” as our new God: the mighty miracle-worker that has made both species and galaxies.

For those who regard Time as an objective and perhaps even creative reality, it is difficult to conceive or rather remember how deep the classical prejudice against Time—triumphant in Medieval thought—really was. Shakespeare captured this perfectly when he described philosophers as those who’ve “writ in the style of gods and made a pish at time and chance.” In the traditional philosophic view, significant things always happened inevitably for eternal reasons. This habit of mind endured: there was, for example, nothing chronological about the optimism of Leibniz.⁹ Nor was there any place for an historical event, let alone “History” in the timeless truths of dogmatic Philosophy. The very fact that the Lisbon earthquake of 1755 could literally rock the foundations of 18th century *metaphysics* should alert us to the great historical divide that separates our time from Voltaire’s. The philosophy of Leibniz, as A.O. Lovejoy has shown,¹⁰ indicates the coming crisis: an implied chronological meliorism keeps uneasy company with an explicit eternal optimism. And then came Kant.¹¹

⁸ McTAGGART, J. Ellis, Time and the Hegelian Dialectic. *Mind* (n.s.) vol. 2, n. 8, pp. 490-504, 1893 remains the most thoughtful treatment of the subject, marred by the author’s famous denial of the actual existence of time. See McTAGGART, J. Ellis, The Unreality of Time, *Mind* (n.s.), vol. 17, n. 68 (Oct., 1908), pp. 457-474, 1908. ROSENFELD, Denis L. *Politique et liberté; Une étude sur la structure logique de la Philosophie du droit de Hegel*, Paris: Aubier Montaigne, 1984, 70-3 discusses McTAGGART.

⁹ For an interesting juxtaposition of GWFH and LEIBNIZ, see BOURGEOIS, Bernard, *Hegel; les actes de l’esprit*. Paris: J. Vrin, 2000; 261-72.

¹⁰ LOVEJOY, A.O. *The Great Chain of Being: A Study of the History of an Idea*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1936: p. 256-262.

¹¹ SOLOMON, Robert C. *In the Spirit of Hegel*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983; p. 14 (emphasis mine): “On the other hand [SOLOMON’s hypothesis of “Two Hegels” will receive further attention and be confirmed in Part II], he [sc. HEGEL] is the philosopher of change, the phenomenologist of forms, who appreciates, as Kant and most philosophers did not, the rich variety of forms of

As if the philosophical prejudice against Time were not already deep enough, Kant gave idealists a new reason to reject time's empirical reality.¹² The essence of Kant's Copernican Revolution in metaphysics was the claim that just as previous astronomers had failed to account for *their own movement* in explaining celestial motion,¹³ so also had previous philosophers failed to consider the fact that a belief in the transcendental *reality* of Space and Time (along with the Categories) was as unscientific as a belief in the Earth's immobility. First as "sublunary," then as "Form of Intuition," Time's pre-Hegelian position was once as questionable and precarious as it is dominant and unquestioned today. Hegel's thought must be understood not only as belonging to this moment of transition but also as being this transition's greatest artifact. What was inconsistency in Leibniz became a coherent whole in Hegel. *But his whole was hardly ours.* We accept, almost without being able to conceive any alternative, the pervasive historicity of the universe, of our species, and of ourselves. Hegel's system incorporates Time but does so in a profoundly atemporal way.¹⁴ To explore this atemporality, to recover its basis through a kind of philosophical archeology, is the purpose of this dissertation: to rediscover "The Problem of Time in Hegel's Philosophy of History."

Precisely what makes Hegel a great historian is that he obliterates the barrier between the Past and the Present by acknowledging that barrier's existence and then thinking through it. By saying that "Homer is the element in which the Greek World lives, as man does in air,"¹⁵ he is showing that he has entered knowingly into a profoundly contextualized world not as a merely dazed stranger but as himself. What else would we expect of Hölderlin's roommate? It was precisely an awareness of historical

experience and the complex transformations between them." The reader needs to detect Time as the condition for the possibility of SOLOMON's discussion of "change" and "transformations."

¹² For the inaccuracy of this reading, see KANT, Immanuel, *Critique of Pure Reason*. Translated by Norman Kemp Smith. London: Macmillan, 1929; 78 (B 52).

¹³ KANT, *Critique of Pure Reason*, p. 25 (B xxi-ii, n.): "The latter [sc. "the Newtonian attraction"] would have remained for ever undiscovered if Copernicus had not dared, in a manner contradictory to the senses, but yet true, to seek the observed movements, not in the heavenly bodies, but in the spectator."

¹⁴ Compare BOURGEOIS, Bernard, *Éternité et Historicité de L'Esprit selon Hegel*. Paris: J. Vrin, 1991; p. 108: "*l'histoire non historique de la philosophie*" and BOUTON, Christophe, *Éternité et présent selon Hegel*, *Revue philosophique*, n. 1, p. 49-70, 1998; p. 65: "*L'histoire anhistorique.*"

¹⁵ HEGEL, G.W.F. *The Philosophy of History*. Translated by J. Sibree. New York: Dover, 1956 (hereafter "*Philosophy of History*"); p. 223.

differences—as Herder had demonstrated¹⁶—that made such hermeneutic communion with the past possible. When the Crusaders stand at the Church of the Holy Sepulchre drenched in Muslim blood and find the tomb empty,¹⁷ Hegel stands there with them. The event does not simply belong in the Past: the unenlightened eternally seek the Good outside themselves and “the unhappy consciousness” belongs—always has and always will—to every theological dualist who has not achieved Absolute Knowledge. It is precisely the *eternity* of “history”—i.e. its ever-present accessibility to Spirit *in the present*—that Hegel embodied *qua* historian and taught *qua* philosopher.

If Hegel can join his German forebears in Jerusalem, it shouldn't be impossible for us to join him in Berlin: once we do so, History will have reached its End for us as well. The real obstacle we confront in approaching Hegel is not that *he* is out of date but that we rely too much on our own one-sided *Verstand*, an understanding that owes its very existence to the emancipation of History and the independent reality of Time. The purpose of this dissertation is to show that Hegel's Philosophy of History belongs to a unique moment in European Intellectual History when the integration of Philosophy and History first became possible. But we must recognize that this integration did not take place—as it would for us—*on History's terms*: we must beware of granting “History” an ontological reality that we, as post-Hegelians, inevitably take for granted *but that Hegel did not*.¹⁸

In order to recover “The Problem of Time in Hegel's Philosophy of History,” we must realize that the integration of Philosophy and History did not involve and could not have embraced Time's independent and actual existence. The reason that it did not takes us to the dead center of Hegel's thought, i.e. his Absolute Idealism.¹⁹ In order to grasp why Time—and by extension, what we call “History”—has no independent existence for

¹⁶ BEISER, Frederick C. *The Fate of Reason: German Philosophy from Kant to Fichte*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1987; esp. p. 141-44.

¹⁷ One can learn how to read GWFH by comparing PhG p. 131-2 (§217) with *Philosophy of History*, p. 392-3.

¹⁸ Hence the inadequacy of an otherwise sensible statement like the following, found in WILKINS, Burleigh Taylor, *Hegel's Philosophy of History*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1974; 175 (emphasis in the original): “Thus, *if we are to make sense of Hegel's claim that he knows the whole of history, this claim must be construed as meaning that he knows certain properties, aspects, and relations of history, namely those which make it an organized structure.*”

¹⁹ Defined in *Zusatz* to §45 of the *Encyclopedia*; this reference will hereafter be in the form: “*Zusatz* to E §45.” The translation used is: HEGEL, G.W.F. *Hegel's Logic; Being Part One of the Encyclopaedia of the Philosophical Sciences* (1830). Translated by William Wallace. Third Edition. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975 (hereafter “*Encyclopedia Logic*”).

Hegel, we must be prepared to reject, as Hegel did *qua* Idealist, the object/subject distinction and grasp the True as Substance and Subject as well.²⁰ Only in “Absolute Knowing,” does it become possible to think the *Tilgung* of Time.²¹

It is for reasons like these that I cannot say that Hegel’s teleological Philosophy of History ends *in the Present* while Kant’s is moving towards the Ideal Future. Perhaps this statement would be more somewhat more acceptable if the “Present” were understood not only to *include* Past and Future but also to *annihilate them along with itself*. But, for the most part, our temporalized sensibilities are only capable of imagining Eternity itself as *endless Time* stretching into the *infinite Future*. As long as we imagine Time as the infinite series of moments connecting past, Present, and Future, we will never understand Hegel’s conception or conceptualization of History. *For Hegel, what we call “Time,” the tick-tock time of the clock, is completely unreal.* To be more accurate, an endless succession of temporal moments is only Hegel’s “spurious Infinite.”

On the other hand, Hegel’s “True Infinite” is just another name for what I will call “Logical Completeness.” This topic is central to this dissertation. I will show that the true $\tau\epsilon\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ in Hegel’s Philosophy of History is not Chronological Completeness—i.e. “the End of History” in Time—but rather the Logical Completeness characteristic of and essential to Hegel’s Dialectic as a whole. To put it another way: the End of History is a scandalous²² but inevitable side effect of the Logical Completeness of the Hegelian Dialectic, i.e. of Hegel’s thought as a whole.

²⁰ G.W.F. HEGEL, *The Phenomenology of Mind*. Translated by J.B. Baillie. New York: Harper & Row, 1967 (hereafter “Baillie”): p. 80: “In my view—a view which the developed exposition of the system itself can alone justify—everything depends on grasping and expressing the ultimate truth not as Substance but as Subject as well.” See FREY, Christopher, *Reflexion und Zeit: Ein Beitrag zum Selbstverständnis der Theologie in der Auseinandersetzung vor allem mit Hegel*, Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1973, pp. 132-141.

²¹ *The Phenomenology of Spirit*. Translated by A.V. Miller. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977 (hereafter “Miller”); p. 487 (§801): “Time is the Notion itself that *is there* and which presents itself to consciousness as empty intuition; for this reason, Spirit necessarily appears in Time, and it appears in Time just so long as it has not *grasped* its pure Notion, i.e. has not annulled [*tilgt*] Time.” For a balanced discussion, see GRIER, Philip T. Abstract and Concrete in Hegel’s Logic in Di Giovanni, George ed. *Essays on Hegel’s Logic*, p. 59-75. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1990; p. 73 and, in the same volume, HARRIS, Errol E. A Reply to Philip Grier, p. 77-84; p. 84.

²² For a similar use of “scandal” (albeit ultimately deflected from GWFH), see FACKENHEIM, Emil L., *The Religious Dimension in Hegel’s Thought*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1967, pp. 76 and 207n.

The distinction between the two parts of this dissertation is based on the words “scandalous but inevitable” found in the previous sentence. In “Part I,” I will show why the End of History is an inevitable result of applying the Hegelian Dialectic to a process that we know unfolds in tick-tock Time and that the reason that Hegel did not perceive this result as scandalous is because he does not grant Time—and by extension the events of History that unfold within Time—any independent existence or ontological reality apart from his own conception of Absolute Idealism. “Part I” is therefore an attempt to recover, as a matter of philosophical archeology, how Hegel conceptualized the Philosophy of History in terms of Logical Completeness by systematically ignoring the distinction between Logical and Chronological Priority. “Part II” will then offer a critique of Hegel’s solution based on our awareness of tick-tock Time’s independent ontological existence, an awareness that Hegel’s thought paradoxically both helped to make possible and yet could not bring to self-consciousness.

The “problem of Time” is therefore central to Hegel’s entire project whether that project is regarded as metaphysical, logical, ethical, or political: he clearly did not conceive of the Dialectic in temporal terms even while applying the Concept to the ethical-political realm of World-History. His failure to do so—or rather, his failure to return, with questions, to the allegedly timeless Concept after having conceptualized the events of World History in relation to it—is precisely why the relationship between Logical and Chronological Priority is the Achilles’ heel of his thought. But it is only if we can first think in *his* terms (Part I) that we can see that for Hegel, it is Logical Priority—completely divorced from its Chronological origins—that was real for him. It is for this reason that the only *τελος* of World History is not to be located in either Hegel’s Future, or ours. But the remainder of this Introduction will provide some preliminary indication of the critique contained in Part II. A textual indication of Hegel’s scandalous hostility to the independent existence of Time as conceived as an infinite series of moments extending from the Past through the Present to the Future is to be found in his revealing comments about astronomy in his *Philosophy of Nature*, second part of the *Encyclopaedia*.

For Kant, “the starry heavens above me” were famously a perennial source of “awe and wonder.” Hegel’s reaction to the stars is very different. Consider the following passage from the *Wissenschaft der Logik*:

Kant, for example, at the close of the *Critique of Practical Reason*, represents it as sublime “when the subject raises himself in thought above the place he occupies in the world of sense, reaching out to infinity, to stars beyond stars, worlds beyond worlds, systems beyond systems, and

then also to the limitless times of their periodic motion, their beginning and duration.”²³

Although the quotation from Kant continues (and will be quoted in full immediately hereafter), let’s pause for a moment and consider what is happening here. Not only is it noteworthy that Kant makes the jump from “stars beyond stars” to “worlds beyond worlds” but also *from Space to Time*. The certainty that Outer Space is the great unknown is closely related to the Future, in which time *alone* can we hope to know its secrets *or even whether its secrets are worth knowing*. Here, however, Kant is not forming a bridge to what might be called “Astronomy’s Epistemological Future;” it is Hegel who does so. Kant is content to show why “the starry heaven” excite our wonder:

“Imagination fails before this progress into the infinitely remote, where beyond the most distant world there is a still more distant one, and the past, however remote, has a still remoter past behind it, the future, however distant, a still more distant future beyond it; thought fails in the face of this conception of the immeasurable, just as a dream, in which one goes on and on down a corridor which stretches away endlessly out of sight, finishes with falling or fainting.”²⁴

Perhaps most significant in this passage is Kant’s characteristic *epistemological humility*: he is perfectly comfortable with the notion that “beyond the most distant world there is a still more distant one” for the exact same reason that he is comfortable with the *Ding-an-sich*. In this context, the most striking (and philosophically significant) feature of this passage is Kant’s repeated use of *jenseits*; “beyond.” For Kant, not only are God and the Thing-in-Itself beyond our *geocentric* inability to think of things outside of Time and Space, but (providentially?) even Time and Space themselves cannot be thought without a self-contained beyond of their own.

Kant’s admission that the human mind “finishes with falling or fainting” gives Hegel an opening he knows well how to exploit.²⁵ “epistemological humility” is not in his line:

²³ WdL, p. 229 (see n. 6 above). I have found HARRIS, Errol E. *An Interpretation of the Logic of Hegel*. Lanham: University Press, 1983 a particularly useful guide.

²⁴ WdL, p. 229.

²⁵ WdL, p. 229: “This exposition, besides giving a concise yet rich description of such quantitative exaltation, deserves praise mainly on account of the truthfulness with which it states how it fares finally with this exaltation: thought succumbs, the end is falling and faintness.”

What makes thought succumb, what causes falling and faintness, is nothing else but the wearisome repetition which makes a limit vanish, reappear, and then vanish again, so that there is a perpetual arising and passing away of the one after the other and of the one in the other, of the beyond in the here and now, and of the here and now in the beyond, giving only the feeling of the *impotence* of this infinite or this ought-to-be, which would be master of the finite and *cannot*.²⁶

What makes this passage striking is that it borders, quite unconsciously, on the self-referential. After all, what is Hegel's *Logic* except "the [wearisome] repetition which makes a limit vanish, reappear, and then vanish again, so that there is a perpetual arising and passing away of the one after the other and of the one in the other"? Hegel's answer might be that this repetition is not strictly speaking *ad infinitum*: it comes full circle in Logical Completeness.²⁷ Here Hegel comes as close as he can to admitting that the only Good Infinite is actually finite.

But the real reason that this passage cannot be self-referential is not only that Hegel's vanishing and reappearing limits *finally come full circle*. There is one pair of opposites here that does not and cannot apply to Hegel: "of the beyond in the here and now, and of the here and now in the beyond." With his own identification of Subject and Object, the real and the rational, and indeed the *Tilgung* of Time, Hegel can undoubtedly achieve the *first*. But it is not only impossible for Hegel to achieve the second alternative (the presence of "the here and now *in the beyond*"): it is impossible *by nature*. No matter how balanced his reflections may appear to be, there can be no *beyonds* in Hegel's System. A transcendent and inscrutable God is no less unacceptable than the *terra incognita* of the starry heavens; even the Future itself must bow before Hegel's will to knowledge.²⁸ As described by Hegel, Kant is Hegel's own reversed

²⁶ WdL, p. 229. One is tempted to say that GWFH wishes to would be master of the *infinite* but cannot.

²⁷ It is not the "coming into being" and "passing away" that GWFH therefore finds objectionable in KANT's infinities, it is that this kind of *Werden* is not completed in *die absolute Idee*; this is just *one* of the reasons why there is more to be learned about GWFH's *Logic* from the *last* Triad than the first; see I.1.1.2.

²⁸ For the contrary point of view, based on linking the Future to "Potentiality," see HOFFMEYER, John F. *The Advent of Freedom: The Presence of the Future in Hegel's Logic*, Rutherford: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1994; the principal weakness of this approach is admitted at p. 56 (cf. p. 69): "This demonstration will sometimes require reading the *Logic* against the grain of Hegel's understanding of what he is doing in the text, since he insists that the logical element is atemporal." Hence his chimerical "real possibility (2)" of p. 32. On "Potentiality," see CHAFFIN, Deborah G. A Reply to Gabriella Baptist in George

reflection. If Kant is comfortable with “the feeling of the *impotence* of this infinite or this ought-to-be,” then Hegel will accept nothing less than “*the reality of the omnipotence of this finite or this what-is.*” But even for Hegel, there is a limit to reflection: there is no getting *beyond* the beyond. But he tries his best.

Hegel’s most interesting comments on the Stars are found in §268 of the *Encyclopedia*: it is from the section about “*Fall*” (Gravity) in the *Philosophy of Nature*. Not surprisingly, the negative moment of Gravity’s Center of Attraction is *Repulsion*. But Hegel next introduces an interesting distinction between “formal” and “living Repulsion.”

Aber das einfache Fürsichsein des Zentrums ist als diese *negative* Beziehung auf sich selbst wesentlich *Repulsion* seiner selbst;—*formelle* Repulsion in die vielen ruhenden Zentra (Sterne);—*lebendige* Repulsion, als Bestimmung derselben nach *den Momenten des Begriffs* und wesentliche Beziehung dieser hiernach unterschieden gesetzten Zentra aufeinander.²⁹

What separates the Stars is a merely formal Repulsion; the separate but nonetheless connected moments of the Concept are both bound and separated by a “*lebendige Repulsion.*” Not only is it interesting that the Stars are lifeless—there is no trace of Kant’s intuition that there may be other Worlds in Space as well—but that they are so precisely in comparison with the Hegelian Dialectic. More important is the fact that Hegel is preparing us to accept that the Stars are not susceptible to being conceptualized. The relations between them lacks the “*wesentliche Beziehung*” of the Concept.³⁰ They are thus *beyond* its scope. And this is potentially disastrous, as we have already indicated. But Hegel is no fool: it is precisely because *he cannot conceptualize the Stars* that he contrasts what separates them from what separates the moments of the Concept: the “starry heavens” are merely the negative reflection of the Concept’s Logical Completeness.

Hegel explains this further in the *Zusatz*. If the living Repulsion binding the Concept creates a Unity,³¹ the Stars, governed by merely

di Giovanni ed., *Essays on Hegel’s Logic*, p. 145-152. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1990.

²⁹ E §268.

³⁰ For the problems associated with GWFH’s use of “*wesentliche*”—*Wesen* is a technical term in his *Logic*—see I.3.2.3.

³¹ *Zusatz* to E §268: “Das logische Eins ist unendliche Beziehung auf sich selbst, welche Identität mit sich, aber als sich auf sich beziehende Negativität, somit Abstoßen von sich selbst ist; das ist das andere im Begriffe enthaltene Moment.”

formal Repulsion, are a multiplicity.³² And this leads Hegel to another remarkable distinction: the “dead Repulsion” among the Stars is the realm of *Verstand*³³ and therefore they, unlike the Concept, cannot be *die Vernünftige*.

Ihre *Figurationen* können Ausdruck wesentlicher Verhältnisse sein; sie gehören aber nicht der lebendigen Materie an, wo der Mittelpunkt sich in sich unterscheidet. Das Heer der Sterne ist eine *formelle* Welt, weil nur jene einseitige Bestimmung geltend gemacht ist. Dies System müssen wir durchaus nicht dem Sonnensystem gleichstellen, welches erst das System realer *Vernünftigkeit* ist, was wir am Himmel erkennen können.³⁴

The great Hegel, he who wanted to know so much, allows that the constellations *might* be “the expression of essential relations” but he immediately retracts the possibility. Unlike the Solar System—the only heavenly configuration that Hegel deems rational—there is no center (*Mittelpunkt*) of the “starry heavens” and therefore their multiplicity is the mere one-sidedness of lifeless formality. And this is the essential point: are the Stars exempt from rationality because they are *not yet* rationalized or are they not yet rationalized because they are intrinsically irrational? Not only is it a scandal that he who famously proclaimed the rationality of the real is now compelled to implicitly withhold reality from the stars, but he is transparently doing so because he himself cannot prove that their configurations are rational. He cannot wait, like the humble Kant was willing to wait, for Astronomy’s Epistemological Future because he can tolerate *no beyonds*. But the self-imposed scandal of this thought is too much even for Hegel and he will be forced into self-contradiction before the *Zusatz* is finished. For the present, however, he turns his fire directly on Kant:

Man kann die Sterne wegen ihrer Ruhe verehren; an Würde sind sie aber dem konkreten Individuellen nicht gleichzusetzen. Die Erfüllung des Raums schlägt in unendlich viele Materien aus; das ist aber nur das erste

³² *Zusatz* to E §268: “Die formale Repulsion hat auch ihr Recht; denn die Natur ist eben dies, ein abstraktes vereinzelt Moment für sich bestehen zu lassen. Solches Dasein der formellen Repulsion sind die Sterne, als noch ununterschieden, überhaupt viele Körper, die hier aber noch nicht als leuchtend in Betracht kommen, was eine physikalische Bestimmung ist.”

³³ *Zusatz* to E §268 (emphasis mine): “Wir können meinen, es sei *Verstand* im Verhalten der Sterne zueinander; sie gehören aber *der toten Repulsion* an.”

³⁴ *Zusatz* to E §268; emphases mine. The remainder of the *Zusatz* will now be considered in its entirety; citations are therefore unnecessary for all remaining block quotations in this section.

Ausschlagen, das den Anblick ergötzen kann. Dieser Licht-Ausschlag ist so wenig bewundernswürdig als einer am Menschen oder als die Menge von Fliegen.³⁵

If Hegel had left out the remark about flies, it would have been better: its addition raises the ugly possibility that he is not so much elevating the individual human being as simply showing his contempt for the stellar. It is also noteworthy that this attack on idolizing the heavens—which might appeal to those inclined to worship the Almighty God—is coming from a man who did the same to World-History: the battle-deaths of thousands of individuals is God’s Work according to Hegel,³⁶ *but the Stars cannot be!*

Die Stille dieser Sterne interessiert das Gemüt näher, die Leidenschaften besänftigen sich beim Anschauen dieser Ruhe und Einfachheit. Diese Welt hat aber auf dem philosophischen Standpunkt nicht das Interesse, das sie für die Empfindung hat.

The assault on Kant continues: it was precisely Kant’s *Gemüt* that was doubly provoked to *Bewunderung* by the moral law within and the starry heavens above.³⁷ But it is the second sentence that is striking: the unknown is of no philosophical interest. Worst of all, Hegel now feels compelled to prove it: to know that the unknown is unknowable.

Daß sie in unermesslichen Räumen als Vielheit ist, sagt *für die Vernunft* gar nichts; das ist das Äußerliche, Leere, *die negative Unendlichkeit*. Darüber weiß sich die Vernunft erhoben; es ist *dies eine bloße negative Bewunderung*, ein Erheben, das in seiner Beschränktheit steckenbleibt [emphases mine].

³⁵ To listen to GWFH explain why the stars are not “*bewundernswürdig*” reminds me of listening to an alcoholic who never earned a B.A. explain why a University education is a waste of time. It’s not so much that the drunk is *wrong* that repels—we all know that going to University hardly makes a fool well-educated—it’s the fact that he *needs* his argument to be true that inspires pity or contempt.

³⁶ *Philosophy of History*, p. 457: “That the History of the World, with all the changing scenes which its annals present, is this process of development and the realization of Spirit—this is the true *Theodicaea*, the justification of God in History. Only *this* insight can reconcile Spirit with the History of the World—viz., that that what has happened, and is happening every day, is not only not ‘without God,’ but is essentially His Work.”

³⁷ On the “Conclusion” of KANT, Immanuel, *Critique of Practical Reason*, see BECK, Lewis White. *A Commentary on Kant’s Critique of Practical Reason*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960; p. 281-3.

And here is the argument: the “spurious Infinite” is not subject to *Vernunft*, only the Good Infinite is.³⁸ In other words, only Logical Completeness is Logically Complete. Is it for this implicit tautology that we are being asked to feel *eine positive Bewunderung*? Probably not: *any* kind of *Bewunderung*, admitting as it does “the beyond,” is antithetical to Hegel’s outward position. And “outward” is the word. Although he claims that the Stars are irrational, it almost seems that he only arrived at that conclusion after a struggle with himself. Could anyone who had not once dreamt—if only as a curious and precocious child—of *rationalizing the constellations* have written these words:

Das Vernünftige in Ansehung der Sterne ist, *die Figurationen zu fassen, in denen sie gegeneinander gestellt sind*. Das Ausschlagen des Raumes in abstrakte Materie geht selbst nach einem inneren Gesetze, daß die Sterne Kristallisationen vorstellten, die eine innere Verbindung hätten. Die Neugierde, wie es da aussieht, *ist ein leeres Interesse* [emphases mine].

Perhaps it was because he had such a high standard of rationality that he now must pronounce his former attempt “empty.” But the outward self-contradiction into which his words now fall, after a parting shot at Kant, suggest that there was still an unresolved struggle within himself. Apparently leaving the stars behind, Hegel offers a most uncharacteristic lesson:

Die Würde der Wissenschaft muß man nicht darin setzen, daß alle mannigfaltigen Gestaltungen begriffen, erklärt seien; sondern man muß sich mit dem begnügen, was man in der Tat *bis jetzt* begreifen kann. Es gibt vieles, was *noch nicht* zu begreifen ist; das muß man in der Naturphilosophie zugestehen [emphases mine].

It is the “*bis jetzt*” and the “*noch nicht*” that are remarkable. Does their inclusion mean that Hegel is retracting everything he has just said about the Stars and that he has embraced the possibility of future discoveries? The context belies the view that this sensible position was Hegel’s. Burned once

³⁸ Compare JAESCHKE, Walter, *World History and the History of Absolute Spirit* in Robert L. Perkins ed., *History and System: Hegel’s Philosophy of History*, p. 101-115. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1984; p. 114: “If the meaning of history is defined as the realization of a certain goal, this history necessarily comes to an end when this goal is achieved—unless one determines this goal in such a way that it is unfulfillable, and thus history leads to an infinite progress. But nothing is more alien to Hegel than this.”

before by *astronomy's epistemological future*,³⁹ Hegel doubtless leaves himself a *bis jetzt* where *Naturphilosophie* is concerned. But he does so only after proving that the *locus classicus* of the *noch nicht*—the “starry heavens above me” celebrated by Kant (who merely captured thereby the common sense of mankind)—is not simply “*was noch nicht zu begreifen ist*,” but *unbegreifbar*. Indeed it is the self-contradiction that reveals the depths of Hegel’s commitment to Logical Completeness. The insertion of “*jetzt*” merely proves that he was aware that his remarks on the stars are a self-incriminating scandal. He therefore must retreat momentarily into the haven of common sense.

Das vernünftige Interesse bei den Sternen kann sich *jetzt* nur in der Geometrie derselben zeigen; die Sterne sind das Feld dieser abstrakten unendlichen Direction, worin das Zufällige einen wesentlichen Einfluß auf die Zusammenstellung hat [my emphasis].

But even in his unusual admission of the “*jetzt*,” he leaves no doubt that the heavens *will never be subject*, as World-History will show itself to be, to the *free necessity* of the Concept.

³⁹ A magisterial account of GWFH’s doctoral thesis on astronomy can be found in HARRIS, H.S. *Hegel’s Development: Night Thoughts (Jena 1801-1806)*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983.

Part I

Introduction

I have divided Part I of this Dissertation, in good Hegelian fashion, into *three* parts. Also in keeping with the spirit of Hegel, I will begin this overview with a description of *the third part first*. Although contrary to common sense, this approach is in keeping with Hegel's dialectical method: Hegel's Philosophy of History is best understood as the synthesis of previous moments. The subject of Part I.3 is therefore "Hegel's Philosophy of History" itself: how Hegel integrates History into his System, and how we are to understand World History as progress towards Freedom.

Although not yet appearing in its complete form—something that takes place only in the synthetic third step as the full Concept—the first moment of any Hegelian Triad always already contains the Whole implicitly. The first section of Part I (I.1) is therefore concerned with the Hegelian Dialectic, the basis of Hegel's Philosophy of History. For example: the Dialectic can explain, then reabsorb, and finally abolish any given dichotomy. Dualism comes to rest in separation but the Hegelian Dialectic restores and ceaselessly reproduces *completeness*. Apparent opposites are only temporarily—or rather momentarily!—separable "moments" of one Logically Complete and timeless totality. I intend to show that Hegel's Philosophy of History is already implicit in *the Logical Completeness of the Hegelian Dialectic*.

It is the second moment of a dialectical triad that is always the most interesting. Here the duality that will be eventually resolved in the final Concept temporarily holds the stage. But Hegel, as already hinted above, would strongly object to my use of the word "temporarily" in the last sentence: he did not regard the Dialectic as unfolding *in Time*. On the other hand, the application of the timeless Dialectic to the temporal pageant of World History will require that a Chronological process be explained in Logical—and for Hegel that means Dialectical—terms.

The relationship between the Logical Completeness of the Dialectic and the Chronological Completeness of World History is the subject of section I.2. There the bizarre question of "the End of History" will be connected inseparably with "The Problem of Time in Hegel's Philosophy of History." Only if World History has in some important sense *come to an end* can it be given the appearance, thanks to the Hegelian Dialectic, of progress towards Freedom. By examining what Hegel has to say about both Time and Absolute Knowledge, his decision to discount the possibility that the Future could possibly bring anything new to light—an example from astronomy has already

been presented in the Introduction—becomes not only intelligible *but also inevitable*.

Any common sense approach to the problem of historical progress is based on a distinction between events occurring in time and some objective and timeless standard by which temporal developments acquire some meaningful direction, i.e. an ever greater degree of whatever objective quality constitutes the timeless criterion of progress. Once the necessary presence of the philosopher of history is acknowledged, it is worthwhile to point out that this analysis is also based on *a triad*: (1) the philosopher evaluates (2) events occurring in time (*res gestae*) on the basis of (3) an unchanging criterion of progress. Although it could be claimed that any conception of historical progress is a *synthesis* of *three elements* in which the distinctions between them are *resolved in its Concept*, it is precisely the sharp and enduring distinctions between them that prove the common sense approach to progress antithetical to Hegel's.

The common sense approach requires a clear-cut distinction between historical events and evaluative standard. The most vulnerable element in this kind of analysis is the objective criterion of what constitutes progress; a relativist would deny the possibility of such a standard. The claim that any alleged evaluative criterion is merely the philosopher's *subjective* fancy collapses the distinction between two of the three elements involved. Equally relativistic—and therefore tending equally to collapse distinctions—is the view that any philosopher's evaluative criterion is merely a product of the historical process itself. On the contrary, the common sense approach necessarily involves the *independence* of an unchanging standard not only from the historical process that it is used to evaluate but from the philosopher of history as well. In other words, all three elements maintain an *ontological separation* despite their temporary—and not altogether unproblematic—synthesis in any given vision of progress.

In Hegel's thought, however, none of these elements—indeed nothing whatsoever besides the Whole—maintains what I have just called “ontological separation.” It would be tempting to say that *nothing maintains its independence in Hegel's System*. But as the first triad in the System proves, Hegel's assault on dualism¹—i.e. the presupposition of any enduring distinction between one thing and another—is so radical that *not even* Nothing

¹ VIELLARD-BARON, Jean-Louis, L'Idee Logique, L'Idee de la Philosophie et la Structure Théologico-Historique de la Pensée de Hegel, *Hegel-Studien* v. 38, p. 61-82, 2003; p. 70: “L'essence de la philosophie est de dépasser toutes les dichotomies dualistes figées [i.e. coagulated].”

maintains its separation from *everything* (i.e. Being): the two *are* one in Becoming.

Nor is Hegel's assault on dualism confined to the abstractions of Logic. Although an Introduction is hardly the place to prove it, it will be useful for the reader to entertain the possibility that, for Hegel, no objective evaluative criterion is separable from the temporal historical process of which the philosopher who conceives it is likewise an inseparable part. The philosopher, in other words, is inseparable from both any evaluative criterion and the chronological process of which the philosopher is product, part, and creative collaborator. For Hegel, the historical process itself is simply the ongoing realization of an evaluative criterion and has no objective existence apart from the philosopher, i.e. Hegel, who conceptualizes it. Hegel's repudiation of the presuppositions upon which a common sense approach to the Idea of Progress could not possibly be more radical or complete.

Common sense—to the extent that it has been bewitched by relativism—may well be *uncomfortable* with the suggestion that any evaluative criterion of progress has an objective existence apart from either the historical process or the philosopher. But common sense in any form categorically repudiates the notion that the historical process has no objective existence apart from the philosopher. *It is therefore of decisive importance to remember that "Idealism" for Hegel does not mean a commitment to the objective Ideas of Platonism: it means the collapse of the subject/object distinction in favor of the subject that is substance as well.*²

As I will show in I.3.1, the inclusion of History in the Hegelian System is inextricably connected to his explicit rejection of Kant's vision of what that future would—or, better yet, should and will—be like. The relationship between the Idea of Progress and any desirable set of future conditions I will call "Kantianism." The distinction between evaluative criterion and historical progress I will call "Platonism." It is no accident that the first triad in Hegel's System presents Becoming, as the triad's third moment, as explaining, reabsorbing, and finally abolishing autonomous Being. An attack on Platonism's separable realm of Being is the very first step in Hegel's System while an attack on Kantianism's no less ideal Future is the first step in his integration of History into that System. Finally, it is only on the basis of Hegel's absolute repudiation of any objective evaluative criterion ("Platonism") or any desirable historical outcome ("Kantianism") that his Philosophy of History can be shown *not* to be the paradigmatic example of the

² PhG, p. 80 (Baillie): "In my view—a view which the developed exposition of the system itself can alone justify—everything depends on grasping and expressing the ultimate truth not as Substance but as Subject as well."

Idea of Progress it appears to be and also why it must, to be consistent, teach that History has reached its End.

Introduction to I.1 Logical Completeness in Hegelian Dialectic

Two of Hegel's most quotable "sound-bites" constitute a convenient basis for introducing the two chapters of Part I; Section 1. The first, from the Preface to his first book, *The Phenomenology of Spirit*, is: "The truth is the whole."³ The second, from the Preface to his last book, *The Philosophy of Right*, is: "What is rational is actual and what is actual is rational."⁴

In Chapter 1 (I.1.1), the Hegelian Dialectic will be explicated in terms of what I will call "Logical Completeness." Beginning with Kant's Antinomies of Pure Reason, I will show how Hegel developed a more comprehensive—indeed all-pervasive—conception of Dialectic. Crucial for understanding the Hegelian Dialectic—or rather (in order to deliberately avoid using a word with a pejorative sense in Hegel) for *conceptualizing* it—is the distinction between Understanding (*Verstand*) and Reason (*Vernunft*). To speak in Hegel's terms: although the one-sided distinctions of *Verstand*—each part of which *appear* to be independent of each other—are a necessary moment of the comprehensive *Begriff*, they are sublated in the dialectical *Concept* that is the Dialectic itself. It is *Vernunft* that is responsible for the Dialectic's *Aufhebung*—i.e. the simultaneous preservation and elimination—of the dichotomies created by *Verstand* in the *Begriff*. To put it another way: the merely *partial* is necessarily a product of *Verstand*. Logical Completeness—the conceptual basis for the claim that "the truth is the whole"—is the domain of *Vernunft*. The chapter will also include the textual exegesis of a specific example of a paradigmatic Hegelian Triad.

Chapter 2 (I.1.2) describes three examples drawn from the Hegelian System in which the Logical Completeness of the Dialectic is applied not merely to Logical but rather to Chronological development. This application is obviously the basis for conceptualizing World History in terms of the Concept but is more easily seen in Hegel's Anthropology, his Philosophy of Religion, and his History of Philosophy. Because "What is rational is actual and what is actual is rational," *was wirklich ist* must at the same time be *vernünftig*; i.e. must unfold in accordance with the Dialectic of *Vernunft*. By the same token,

³ PhG, 81 (Baillie). The passage continues: "The whole, however, is merely the essential nature reaching its completeness through the process of its own development."

⁴ HEGEL, G.W.F. *Philosophy of Right*. Translated by T.M. Knox. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1942 (hereafter "*Philosophy of Right*"), p. 10.

the Dialectic of *Vernunft* is necessarily embodied in “what is actual” even when it unfolds gradually in Time. The fact that the Logical Completeness of the Concept is or can be actualized in a Chronological Process—and, by the same token, that a Chronological Process is intelligible only in terms of Logical Completeness—is at once the basis for Hegel’s application of the Dialectic to World History and of World History’s reasonable character.

Chapter 1 (I.1.1) The Hegelian Dialectic as Logical Completeness

This chapter on the Hegelian Dialectic will consist of two parts, not three and this fact calls for comment at the outset. Hegel is clearly at pains to persuade us that the self-enfolding trinities of his System—Triads within Triads within Triads etc.—are *no mere external form*. Perhaps he is right about that. But Triads are *ubiquitous* in Hegel and that indisputable fact is essential—although it would be more Hegelian to say “*conceptual*” because “essential” relates to *the second moment (Wesen)* of each triad and not the Triad as a whole; i.e. to Understanding but not to Reason—to *grasping* (although “be-grasping” would better capture the German *Begriff*) what I am calling “Logical Completeness.” Hegelian Triads are ubiquitous because in Hegel’s System, the distinction between any two opposites is always nullified—although the two alternatives are nevertheless preserved as *moments*—in their synthesis. In other words, both the *first* and *second* moments are equally, identically, and *essentially incomplete*; *what completes them is the third*. By definition, then, “Logical Completeness” is simply another word for what Hegel accomplishes with his ubiquitous Dialectical Triads.

This chapter will demonstrate how the Hegelian Dialectic achieves Logical Completeness in two different ways. In the first section (I.1.1.1), a historical overview of Hegel’s Dialectic will be presented. On the grounds that such an approach is seldom satisfying due to its vagueness and its reliance on mere Prefaces and Introductions, however, it will be followed in section I.1.1.2 with a more exacting textual exegesis of one particular Hegelian Triad. Between the two—or rather by synthesizing the two—the reader should come away with a clear understanding (as *understood* by common sense, not by Hegel) of how to *conceptualize* Hegel,⁵ or rather how Hegel has conceptualized himself or his System, thanks to the Dialectic.

⁵ Despite an unfortunate reference to “understanding’s concepts” at p. 12, a recent and useful treatment of *Verstand* and *Vernunft* can be found at NUZZO, Angelica, Dialectic,

1.1.1.1. The Hegelian Dialectic

Dialectic is a word often used and seldom conceptualized.⁶ Without conceptualizing it, Hegel's philosophy is unintelligible. Hegel calls dialectic nothing less than "the life and soul of scientific progress, the dynamic which alone gives immanent connection and necessity to the body of science."⁷ He will also call it "the principle of all natural and spiritual life."⁸ This section will attempt to elucidate these cryptic descriptions using Kant's mere *understanding* of dialectic as a starting point, an appropriate starting-point, it should be added, because Hegel's conception of Dialectic builds on Kant's more limited understanding of it.

"Kant rates dialectic higher."⁹ With these words Hegel describes "one of the most important steps in the progress of modern philosophy,"¹⁰ and among the greatest of Kant's services. It is a somewhat curious compliment. The use of the comparative "higher" suggests that even Kant's great achievement is *incomplete*. Hegel hails Kant because he plays an important role in the story of a more important thing:¹¹ he valued dialectic more than had his predecessors. The explanation for this muted or partial praise is that, in Hegel's view, Kant himself did not *conceptualize* the true nature of dialectic. Kant's real significance was that he furnished Hegel with a notion of dialectic that he could use as a springboard to his own, complete grasp or conception of it. For the very reason that Hegel holds Kant's view of dialectic *as inadequate but necessary*, Kant's view can also serve us in the office of a springboard towards our conceptualizing of the Hegelian Dialectic.

On the first page of the *Science of Logic* Hegel sums up the teaching of the Kantian Philosophy: "Understanding ought not to float above experience."¹² Hegel is referring to the importance of *sense experience* in Kant's thought. Kant argued that when Understanding becomes entranced with abstract metaphysical questions, it separates itself from sense experience and

Understanding, and Reason: How Does Hegel's Logic Begin? in LIMNATIS, Nectarios G. (ed.), *The Dimensions of Hegel's Dialectic*, p. 12-30. London: Continuum, 2010.

⁶ See LIMNATIS, Nectarios G. (ed.), *The Dimenstons of Hegel's Dialectic*, London: Continuum, 2010, p. 3: "If there is one concept running throughout Hegel's writings, it is perhaps his often mentioned, but not often studied conception of dialectic."

⁷ *Zusatz* to E §81; *Encyclopedia Logic*, p. 116.

⁸ WdL, p. 56.

⁹ WdL, p. 56.

¹⁰ E §48; *Encyclopedia Logic*, p. 77.

¹¹ For GWFH's use of this polemical technique, see PINKARD, Terry. *Hegel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

¹² WdL, p. 25.

observation and inevitably meets with disaster.¹³ If disaster is to be avoided, more mundane truths will have to suffice, lest, as Hegel aptly expresses it, “we take hold on clouds of error instead of the heaven of truth.”¹⁴ Surveying the results of his thoroughgoing Critique of Pure Reason’s pretensions, Kant writes:

We have found indeed, that although we had contemplated building a tower which should reach to the heavens, the supply of materials suffices only for a dwelling-house, just sufficiently commodious for our business on the level of experience.¹⁵

Kant maintains that when the mind detaches itself from sense experience there inevitably arise what he calls “*pseudo-rational doctrines*”¹⁶ which can neither be confirmed or refuted. Kant calls the most important of these “The Antinomies of Pure Reason” and he treats them in the Division of his *Critique of Pure Reason* called “Transcendental Dialectic.” The Antinomies are especially important because they originate in four perennial metaphysical questions. These may be paraphrased as “Does God exist?,” “Is every action predetermined?,” “Are things made up of atoms?” and “Is the universe infinite?” Kant readily admits that there are other metaphysical questions; what makes the Antinomies so important is that irrefutable arguments can be made for answering each both affirmatively and negatively. Kant expresses this situation graphically in the *Critique of Pure Reason* by taking up each Antinomy in turn and placing the “*pseudo-rational doctrines*” *pro* and *contra* on opposite sides of the page. Since one doctrine is as irrefutable as its opposite, Kant argues that pure reason can not resolve these questions with an “either/or” decision, but can only realize that both positions rest on an unavoidable illusion.

Rather than look at these arguments and the conclusions Kant draws from them in detail, it is best to grasp the significance of Kant’s Antinomies for Hegel. It was through them, according to Hegel, that Kant elevated Dialectic. What makes the Antinomies dialectical on the simplest level is that they juxtapose two doctrines. “Dialectic” comes from a Greek word meaning “to converse.” It takes at least two parties to have a conversation. Most simply then, the Antinomies are “conversations.” But they are conversations of a special kind, and special not so much because of their subject matter, but

¹³ KANT, *Critique of Pure Reason*, B349-B355.

¹⁴ PhG (Baillie), p. 131.

¹⁵ KANT, *Critique of Pure Reason*, p. 573 (B735).

¹⁶ KANT, *Critique of Pure Reason*, p. 394 (B449)

because of the inconclusive nature of the conversations in question: instead of agreeing the two parties flatly contradict one another.

Zeno is called the father of Dialectic¹⁷ and his paradoxes can help us to understand Kant's Antinomies. Everyday we experience reaching our destination. Along comes Zeno proving that it is impossible for anything to ever get where it is going. It must first of all, he argued, travel half the distance to its goal, and then half the distance again. At this rate, it never arrives. Everyone knows that things in fact reach their destinations, but Zeno's argument remains a logical one. Here Dialectic is a conversation not between two speakers but between everyday experience and a reasonable argument.

Zeno's Paradoxes should be kept in mind while we listen to Kant explaining what the Antinomies are and what they are not.

A dialectical doctrine of pure reason must therefore be distinguished from all sophistical propositions in two respects. It must not refer to an arbitrary question such as may be raised for some special purpose, but to one which human reason must necessarily encounter in its progress. And secondly, both it and its opposite must involve no mere artificial illusion such as at once vanishes upon detection, but a natural and unavoidable illusion, which even after it has ceased to beguile still continues to delude though not to deceive us, and which though thus capable of being rendered harmless can never be eradicated.¹⁸

The key to this passage is the distinction between the artificial illusion of sophistical propositions (a probable reference to Zeno) and the "natural illusion" of the Antinomies. It is this "natural illusion," expressed by Hegel as "the necessity of contradiction,"¹⁹ which is the seed of his conception of Dialectic. Listen now to the way in which Hegel describes the Antinomies:

The problem of these Antinomies is no mere subjective piece of work oscillating between one set of grounds and another; it really serves to show that every abstract proposition of understanding, taken precisely as it is given, naturally veers round into its opposite.²⁰

Both men agree that the Antinomies are unavoidable, but Hegel radically expands their domain. Kant has only four Antinomies; Hegel finds as many as there are what he calls "abstract propositions of understanding."

¹⁷ DIOGENES LAERTIUS, IX.25, attributed to ARISTOTLE.

¹⁸ KANT, *Critique of Pure Reason*, p. 394 (B449-B450).

¹⁹ *Werke*, IV, p. 54; translation mine, cf. WdL, p. 56.

²⁰ *Zusatz* to E §81; *Encyclopedia Logic*, p. 117.

To account for this discrepancy, Hegel's criticism of the Antinomies *as he finds them in Kant* must be analyzed. The problem here is that, Hegel identifies many errors: Kant has used shabby arguments for each of the speakers *pro* and *contra* in the conversations,²¹ he has no good argument as to why there should be exactly four,²² the selection of the particular four he finds arbitrary,²³ and most importantly, Kant has failed to grasp the source of the necessity of the contradiction. The remainder of my explication will consider only Hegel's final criticism: on this issue Hegel attacks Kant from the standpoint of his own conception of Dialectic.

Although Kant saw the question "Does God exist?" as the basis for an Antinomy, he was neither an atheist nor an agnostic. His point was not that it is impossible for God to exist, but only that when reason tries to prove God's existence—or the opposite—it runs into unavoidable contradictions. Of his criticism of reason in relation to such questions, Kant wrote: "I have therefore found it necessary to deny knowledge to make room for faith."²⁴ For Kant, the Antinomies are merely one phase of a larger project: his *Critique of Pure Reason*.

Hegel's reply is swift and sure. Kant's mistake is identified as "an excess of tenderness for the things of this world."²⁵ Hegel wants to *know* the things that Kant took on faith. From Hegel's point of view, Kant's attitude towards reason is precisely the opposite of what it should be. That of all people *a thinker* should, when confronting a difficulty, merely throw up his hands and pin the blame on thinking, is ridiculous. Rather than distrust our reason, we should seek some other explanation for our difficulties. Hegel's reaction to Kant's critique of reason is simply: "it is not easy to understand why, conversely, a distrust should not be placed in this very distrust."²⁶ How then does Hegel propose that our distrust be allocated? How can reason be rehabilitated?

Perhaps the easiest solution would be to do away entirely with all "tenderness for the things of the world." If Kant's mistake was to denigrate reason, the solution must be to turn the tables and *denigrate experience of the world*. Kant had seen contradictions in four problems and had blamed reason for them. Perhaps we should see the "things of this world" as the source of contradiction, and leave reason, our nearest and dearest friend, untainted by illusion.

²¹ *Zusatz* to E §48; *Encyclopedia Logic*, p. 79.

²² E §48; *Encyclopedia Logic*, p. 77-78.

²³ *Werke*, VI, p. 45.

²⁴ KANT, *Critique of Pure Reason*, p. 29 (Bxxx).

²⁵ E §48; *Encyclopedia Logic*, p. 77.

²⁶ PhG (Baillie), p. 132.

Although Hegel is an idealist,²⁷ this is not the solution he proposes. The central distinction in Hegel's philosophy is not between the world and our reason—indeed that distinction will be collapsed in his version of “Absolute Idealism”—but within the mind itself. The key to Hegel's rehabilitation of Reason [*Vernunft*] is his distinction between it and Understanding [*Verstand*].²⁸ The term Understanding has already been encountered, namely in Hegel's interpretation of the Antinomies quoted above. What the Antinomies show is “that every *abstract proposition of understanding* veers round into its opposite.” At first glance, it is the word “every” that is most striking, and the contrast between the four Antinomies of Kant and the potentially infinite number for Hegel was duly noted. But the ground of the Antinomies is in fact what Hegel calls “Understanding.” By grasping the distinction between Understanding and Reason, Hegel's interpretation of the Antinomies, the relationship between them and Dialectic, and finally the place of Dialectic within the larger framework of Hegel's Logic, will become intelligible.

Hegel defines Understanding in the following way: “Thought, as Understanding, sticks to fixity of characters and their distinctness from one another: every such limited abstract it treats as though it had a subsistence and

²⁷ More specifically, GWFH is an “absolute idealist.” See the *Zusatz* to E §45 of the *Encyclopaedia*: “Nach der Kantischen Philosophie sind die Dinge, von denen wir wissen, nur Erscheinungen für *uns*, und das *Ansich* derselben bleibt für uns ein uns unzugängliches Jenseits. An diesem subjektiven Idealismus, wonach dasjenige, was den Inhalt unseres Bewußtseins bildet, ein *nur* Unsriges, nur durch *uns* Gesetztes ist, hat das unbefangene Bewußtsein mit Recht Anstoß genommen. Das wahre Verhältnis ist in der Tat dieses, daß die Dinge, von denen wir unmittelbar wissen, nicht nur für *uns*, sondern *an sich* bloße Erscheinungen sind und daß dieses die eigene Bestimmung der hiermit endlichen Dinge ist, den Grund ihres Seins nicht in sich selbst, sondern in der allgemeinen göttlichen Idee zu haben. Diese Auffassung der Dinge ist dann gleichfalls als Idealismus, jedoch im Unterschied von jenem subjektiven Idealismus der kritischen Philosophie als *absoluter Idealismus* zu bezeichnen, welcher absolute Idealismus, obschon über das gemein realistische Bewußtsein hinausgehend, doch der Sache nach so wenig bloß als ein Eigentum der Philosophie zu betrachten ist, daß derselbe vielmehr die Grundlage alles religiösen Bewußtseins bildet, insofern nämlich auch dieses den Inbegriff alles dessen, was da ist, überhaupt die vorhandene Welt, als von Gott erschaffen und regiert betrachtet.” Although the approach I am taking in this chapter is more *epistemological*, an adequate grasp of GWFH's thought requires conceptualizing his “Absolute Idealism” (as defined by GWFH here) in *ontological* terms as well.

²⁸ For a crystal clear analysis of *Reflexion*, GWFH's original term for *Verstand*, see HORSTMANN, Rolf-Peter, *Jenaer Systemkonzeptionen* in PÖGGELER, Otto (ed.), *Hegel: Einführung in seine Philosophie*, p. 43-58, Freiburg/München: Karl Alber, 1977, at p. 50-1.

being of its own.”²⁹ One of the examples used by Hegel himself will make this compressed statement clear. Biology is the science that studies Life.³⁰ “Life” as the object of a science, is, in Hegel's view, an example of one of Understanding's limited abstract entities. Life is treated as though it had a being of its own by distinguishing it from Death. Both Life and Death, and the resulting dividing-line between them, are the creations of Understanding. Each is viewed as wholly outside of the other; as though each were independent. The limitation of such a view is expressed in the familiar paradox: “You begin to die the day you are born.” Hegel's manner of saying this is richer, but the basic thought is the same:

We say, for instance, that man is mortal, and seem to think that the ground of his death is in external circumstances only; so that if this way of looking were correct, man would have two special properties, vitality and also mortality. But the true view of the matter is that life, as life, involves the germ of death and that the finite, being radically self-contradictory, involves its own self-suppression.³¹

In this example, the “finite” is either Life or Death when viewed “as though it had a subsistence and being of its own.” The reason that the Finite is “radically self-contradictory” is that such an abstract entity is defined only by affirming its opposite; i.e. Death. The abstract propositions of Understanding thus owe their existence to a contradiction.³² Since to affirm Life is just as much to affirm the opposite, the Finite unavoidably suppresses itself. The same relationship that Kant described graphically by means of the two contrary arguments on opposite sides of the page is here expanded to *all of the abstractions of the Understanding*. Just as for Kant there was an equally valid argument to affirm freedom as there was to deny it, so here there are equally valid grounds for seeing death as a part of life as for seeing life as a part of death. Hegel's “Antinomies,” are not, however, caused by turning away from experience, as Kant had claimed: *they are the inevitable logical result of*

²⁹ E §80; *Encyclopedia Logic*, p. 113.

³⁰ FOUCAULT, Michel, *The Order of Things; An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*. New York: Pantheon, 1971 demonstrates (p. 265) that this use of “biology” is anachronistic.

³¹ *Zusatz* to E §81; *Encyclopedia Logic*, p. 116-7.

³² A view that depends on the famous dictum of SPINOZA (Letter to Jarig Jellis of 2 June 1674) that *omnis determinatio est negatio*; see the illuminating analysis of PARKINSON, G.H.R. Hegel, Pantheism, and Spinoza, *Journal of the History of Ideas*, v. 38, n. 3, p. 449-459, 1977 at p. 451.

*Understanding's proclivity to make distinctions between things that must be conceptualized as a Whole.*³³

Thousands of years earlier, Heraclitus expressed this idea by saying "Disease makes health pleasant and good, hunger satiety, weariness rest."³⁴ By observing that health is good only because disease is bad, Heraclitus saw that it was *dependent*; in Hegel's words that it was "finite" and "radically self-contradictory." On the very same example of life and death, Heraclitus had made the cryptic statement: "Immortal mortals, mortal immortals, living their death and dying their life."³⁵ Heraclitus is relevant to the discussion because of the conclusion he drew from these observations. He said simply: "Everything flows."³⁶ It is easy to see that if everything flows, there is nothing permanent on which the mind can hold. Each thing flows into its opposite and the result is that no distinctions can be made. Will the conclusion that Hegel draws from similar observations lead to the conclusion that knowledge is impossible?

The first step is to grasp that for Hegel it is not *everything* that flows, but only *the one-sided abstractions of the Understanding when treated as though each had a being of its own*,³⁷ i.e. when treated in a one-sided or non-Dialectical manner. For Hegel, every creation of the cut and dried distinctions of Understanding is forced, by the very nature of the logical principles that make them possible, to *converse* with its opposite. This is their *essence*. This is what it means to say that the finite characterizations of Understanding necessarily pass over into Dialectic. The "necessity of contradiction" has been ripped out of the narrow context in which Kant had placed it, and is made by Hegel into the distinctive feature of Understanding's way of understanding *everything*. Hegel's immediate problem is to put this failure of Understanding within a framework that will avoid the Heraclitean conclusion that knowledge is impossible.

³³ For the corresponding "farewell to Hegel" (p. 144) see ADORNO, Theodor W., *Negative Dialectics*, translated by E.B. Ashton, New York: Continuum, 1973, pp. 135-158.

³⁴ In KIRK, G. S. and RAVEN, J. E. *The Presocratic Philosophers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1957; p. 189, Fragment #204.

³⁵ KIRK and RAVEN, #242 (p. 210).

³⁶ PLATO, *Cratylus*, 402a.

³⁷ DAHLSTROM, Daniel O. *Between Being and Essence* in Di Giovanni, George ed. *Essays on Hegel's Logic*, p. 99-111. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1990; p. 109: "For what proves contradictory is the notion that the determinations of reflection, e.g. the poles of opposition, have a self-sufficiency of their own or have been posited by something other than the movement of reflection itself." The influence of SPINOZA should once again be noted.

Instead of distinguishing sharply between the mind and the world—as Kant had done—Hegel’s solution was to make a distinction within the mind itself. One part of the mind has now been defined as Understanding; the key to the rehabilitation of knowledge will be the faculty of mind called Reason. Introducing distinctions can often help to solve a problem. But Hegel’s account of Understanding has created a problem that most philosophers avoid. By showing the Dialectic into which the distinctions of Understanding inevitably pass, Hegel has undermined his own ability to make distinctions, *including the one between Reason and Understanding*. As a product of Hegel’s Understanding, Hegel’s *Verstand* itself, like any other finite abstraction, should be radically self-contradictory. The solution to this difficulty lies in grasping that Understanding and Reason are for Hegel both distinct *and* integrated. *They are inseparable to such a degree, in fact, that the previous account of Understanding has already included an aspect of Reason*. The first appearance of Reason is the Dialectic in which these abstractions are inevitably involved. Reason is that which shows the finite abstractions of Understanding to be self-contradictory. It is *Reason* that requires that the abstractions of Understanding pass over into their opposites. Reason as Dialectic is the concept of Understanding.

Reason is something more than merely Dialectic, however. Hegel calls Dialectic the *negative* aspect of Reason. There remains its positive aspect. Just as negative Reason—in the form of Dialectic—proved to be the essence of Understanding, positive Reason is the essence of negative Reason. The very nature of Understanding’s creations led to Dialectic: in trying to create self-subsistent entities, it created a conversation between two interdependent entities. In the same way that each entity makes the other possible, positive Reason makes the Dialectic between them possible. The *reason* that two opposite abstractions must converse is that neither can stand alone, and the Reason for that is: *that in reality they are not two at all, but one*.³⁸ Understanding takes one part out of a whole and treats it as a whole. This starts up a conversation between the part and the rest of the whole, which is therefore one-sidedly treated as another whole. The reason that the two parts must converse is that they are, in reality, *parts of one whole*. In fact, they *are* the whole. In treating its finite abstractions as self-subsistent, Understanding sought to create sovereign units; i.e. it treated what were in fact parts of a whole as if *they* were a whole. Negative Reason shows that these units are in

³⁸ WdL, p. 835: “The *second* negative, the negative of the negative, at which we have arrived, is the sublation of the contradiction, but just as little as the contradiction is it *an act of external relection*, but rather the *innermost, most objective moment* of life and spirit, through which a *subject, a person, a free being*, exists.”

no way sovereign; as soon as Understanding defines one unit, another unit—opposite to it—comes into being. The reason for this inevitable opposition—this inevitable dialectical “conversation”—is that in reality, no such opposition can be made. Positive Reason shows that the two participants in the Dialectic are one; it is because they are one that they must converse.

Understanding, negative Reason, and positive Reason proceed *from one to two to one*. Negative and positive Reason are merely different aspects of the relationship of two to one. In its negative aspect, Reason shows that Two is inherent in Understanding’s merely momentary One, and in its positive aspect, that One is inherent in negative Reason’s Two. *Reason is the simultaneity of the two ways in which One and Two are simultaneous*. Both Reason and Understanding therefore end up with unities. But the process from One to Two to One is not circular because the One created by Understanding is different from the One created by Reason. The “one” of Understanding tried to exclude two. The One of Reason is made up of Two. From one to two to one is the soul of Hegel’s Logic.³⁹

Within this framework, Hegel’s characterization of Dialectic as “the principle of all natural and spiritual life” becomes intelligible. The abstractions of Understanding attempt to reduce life to a series of lifeless units. But life will not be dealt with in this way. As the previous example showed: treating life as finite leads inevitably to the Dialectic between life and death. But Dialectic between two finite abstractions is not the last word of Hegel’s Logic: if it were, knowledge would be impossible. *Knowledge is grasping the necessity of the movement from one to two to one*. The truth is the whole of this process, not any one merely momentary part of it. The contradictions of Dialectic are grounded in the process as a whole, and rather than being hindrances to knowledge,⁴⁰ become the life and soul of science. Hegel writes:

The bud disappears when the blossom breaks through, and we might say the former is refuted by the latter; in the same way when the fruit comes, the blossom may be explained to be a false form of the plant’s existence, for the fruit appears as its true nature in place of the blossom. These stages are not merely differentiated; they supplant one another as being compatible with one another. But the ceaseless activity of their own inherent nature makes them at

³⁹ The difference between the first “One” and the second is that the latter includes the *moment* of “Two.” The “problem of time” may be said to arise from the fact that it is precisely a “process” that separates the two.

⁴⁰ WdL, p. 831: “It must be regarded as a step of infinite importance that dialectic is once more recognized as necessary to reason, although the result to be drawn from it must be the opposite of that arrived at by Kant.”

the same time moments of an organic unity, where they not merely do not contradict one another, but where one is as necessary as the other; and this equal necessity of all moments constitutes the life of the whole.⁴¹

For Kant, the dialectics of the Antinomies stood squarely in the face of Reason's attempt to know the whole, and thereby played a key role in the project of limiting reason to make room for faith. In Hegel's hands, the necessity of contradiction, far from *limiting* knowledge of the whole, *demand*s it. The dialectic of the finite becomes the road to the infinite.

But once a single step is taken on this road, there is no turning back. For how can knowledge be finite? If we would pretend that it was finite, the law of the Dialectic would show that *our conception of knowledge* was itself a mere abstraction of the Understanding. *To exist at all, knowledge must be complete; i.e. Absolute.* Moreover, knowledge consists in the infinite repetition of the process from one to two to one. The result of these two requirements is the Hegelian system. Considering that his logic forces him to begin with the whole and work his way down,⁴² it comes as no surprise that he always had difficulty beginning his books. But by grasping that *he must know everything to know anything*, the boundless pretensions of the Hegelian system become less mysterious.

I.1.1.2 The *Last Triad* in Hegel's *Logic*

Too many books devote careful attention to *the first Triad* in Hegel's System as a way of explaining the Hegelian Dialectic:⁴³ there is no need to rehearse this well-worn material one more time. It's a pity, too: since the distinction between Being and Becoming is central to what I have called "Platonism," their synthesis in Hegel's first Triad would seem to be particularly relevant. But the comparison is a specious one: by "Being," Hegel scarcely meant what Plato meant.⁴⁴ The grounds of Hegel's rejection of Platonic Being are not found in the First Triad but in his attack on Kant's

⁴¹ PhG (Baillie), p. 68.

⁴² With which the method of Plato's Eleatic Stranger in *Sophist* and *Statesman* should be compared; for GWFH on these dialogues, see in particular LPH (Volume 2), 62-8.

⁴³ See, for example, HOULGATE, Stephen, *Freedom, Truth and History: An Introduction to Hegel's Philosophy*. London: Routledge, 1991.

⁴⁴ For PLATO in *Republic* VI-VII, "Being"—sharply opposed to "Becoming," which stands in an intermediate position between "what is" and "what is not"—is unchanging, i.e. timeless, and therefore the *locus* of the Idea of the Good, eternal exemplar of "an evaluative criterion."

“Thing-in-itself,”⁴⁵ in his unmasking of “the Unhappy Consciousness,”⁴⁶ in the whole anti-dualistic tenor of his thought. If any reader requires from me an account of Hegel’s “Being, Nothing, and Becoming”—and the latter, I should add, *is* identical to what Plato meant by the same word—I will point them to Paul Redding’s version: a miracle of succinct presentation.⁴⁷ For my part, I will try something new: I will use as the paradigmatic example of the Hegelian Dialectic not the first but *the last triad in Hegel’s Logic* as presented in the *Encyclopedia*.⁴⁸

“*Die Absolute Idee*” has an impeccable genealogy in Hegelian terms: it is the synthetic Third moment of a Triad⁴⁹ that is itself the Third⁵⁰ of a Third.⁵¹ The “Absolute Idea” is thus the synthesis of *Sein* and *Wesen* (as *Begriff*), of *Subjektivität* and *Objektivität* (as *Idee*), and of *Leben* and *Erkennen* (as *die Absolute Idee*). Only “Philosophie” (the final Third of *the Third Part* of the System as a whole; “*Die Absolute Idee*” is by contrast the culmination of *Logic*, the System’s *First Part*) can boast a larger number of Thirds in its family tree. But “*Die Absolute Idee*” is specifically mentioned in “*Philosophie*” (the final moment of *The Philosophy of Spirit*)⁵² and can therefore scarcely be said to be absent even at the end. Of course no moment is or could be *absent at the end*: “The True is the Whole.” Moreover, although Logic precedes Nature and Spirit in the System, each can be conceived as being the Middle Term that connects the other two:⁵³ there is no End or Beginning in a Circle.

⁴⁵ KANT even employs PLATO’s word for the realm of “Being;” it is *noumenal* as opposed to *phenomenal*, i.e. the “Ding an sich” is a *noumenon*.

⁴⁶ In the PhG, “the Unhappy Consciousness” is the *primitive* stage wherein a difference between God and Man—and by extension, between noumenal and phenomenal (KANT) and Being and Becoming (PLATO)—has not yet been overcome “in Christ.”

⁴⁷ REDDING, Paul in the online Stanford *Encyclopedia of Philosophy*.

⁴⁸ Compare WdL, p. 824-44.

⁴⁹ Consisting of “Life,” “Knowledge,” and “The Absolute Idea.”

⁵⁰ Consisting of “Subjectivity,” “Objectivity,” and “The Idea.”

⁵¹ Consisting of “Being,” “Essence,” and “Concept.”

⁵² E §574: “Dieser Begriff der Philosophie ist *die sich denkende* Idee, die wissende Wahrheit (§ 236), das Logische mit der Bedeutung, daß es die im konkreten Inhalte als in seiner Wirklichkeit *bewährte* Allgemeinheit ist.”

⁵³ See E §575, §576, and §577. In the §577—the last paragraph of the *Encyclopedia*—the *Logische Idee* (i.e. “*Die Absolute Idee*”) stands in the *middle* between Nature and Spirit. “Der dritte Schluß [the two preceding paragraphs have arranged the three in two other syllogisms as Logic, Nature, and Spirit (§575) and Nature, Spirit, and Logic (§576)] ist die Idee der Philosophie, welche *die sich wissende Vernunft* [meaning, presumably, that it is the *Reason* that knows itself while thinking “*die sich denkende Idee*”], das Absolut-Allgemeine [i.e. *die Logische Idee*] zu ihrer *Mitte* hat, die sich in *Geist* und *Natur* entzweit [in other words, “*Die Absolute Idee*” divides itself into Spirit

Although the System's First Triad has received more scholarly attention,⁵⁴ the last Triad of the Logic is dramatic not only because it is—as shown in the preceding paragraph—very much present at the end of the System as a whole; i.e. not simply because it is last. It is also very much a fresh beginning: in the last paragraph, Hegel describes how the Logical Idea resolves to freely release itself into Nature.⁵⁵ And Nature, of course, is the middle of the System

and Nature], jenen [sc. Spirit] zur Voraussetzung als den Prozeß der *subjektiven* Tätigkeit der Idee [note that “Die Absolute Idee” is the synthesis of *subjectivity*—here linked with Spirit—and objectivity; about to be conjoined by GWFH with Nature] und diese [sc. Nature] zum allgemeinen Extreme macht, als den Prozeß der *an sich*, objektiv, seienden Idee [this, as we will see, directly recalls the language of the last paragraph of “Die Absolute Idee” as it releases itself freely into Nature]. Das *Sich-Urteilen* [a crucial expression preserving the etymology of “Urteil” as primordial division; here “Die Absolute Idee” of Logic “sich in *Geist* und *Natur* entzweit” and thus is the Middle between the two] der Idee in die beiden Erscheinungen (§575/6) [each of the three juggled syllogisms is—taken alone—a mere *appearance*] bestimmt dieselben als *ihre* (der sich wissenden Vernunft) [see above] Manifestationen [the first shall be last: Logic has the last word and as true Middle subsumes the other two figures as manifestations of *it*], und es vereinigt sich in ihr [three are one in it], daß die Natur der Sache, der Begriff [itself a third that embraces two], es ist, die sich fortbewegt und entwickelt [in other words, “Die Absolute Idee” advanced and developed *itself* into Nature and Spirit], und diese Bewegung ebensoschr die Tätigkeit des Erkennens ist [not to be confused with “knowledge” of an external object: “der sich wissenden Vernunft” is thinking *itself* (as “Absolute Idee”) in Nature, Spirit, and Logic], die ewige an und für sich seiende Idee [GWFH uses this formula for “die Absolute Idee” in the *Zusatz* to §236] sich ewig als absoluter Geist betätigt, erzeugt und genießt.”

⁵⁴ But not as insightfully as JANET, Paul, *Études sur la dialectique dans Platon et dans Hegel*, Paris: Librairie philosophique du Ladrangé, 1861, p. 355: “Il y a une autre idée qui entre également dans le devenir, et don't il n'y a pas trace dans les deux premiers termes; c'est l'idée du temps. Qu'est-ce en effet que le devenir? C'est, suivant Hégel, l'*identité* de l'être et du néant. Je le nie: le devenir est le *passage* de l'être au néant et du néant à l'être [this notion of time refutes the “proof” offered by McTAGGART in 1908], ce qui est bien différent. Ce passage ne peut avoir lieu que dans le temps: ce n'est que dans le temps que l'être et le néant peuvent se concilier: ils se concilient en se succédent.” *Vive la France!*

⁵⁵ E §244: “Die Idee, welche *für sich* ist [note that it is not, as in E §577, “die ewige *an und für sich seiende* Idee”], nach dieser ihrer *Einheit* mit sich [as “*die sich denkende* Idee”] *betrachtet* [in other words, when *we* consider it as the Idea thinking itself], ist sie *Anschauen* [in other words, it is not only us who *consider* it: *es sich anschaut/betrachtet* by being the *Anschauen* of itself]; und die anschauende Idee *Natur* [insofar as it thinks itself, it does so as Nature: *die anschauende Idee*]. Als *Anschauen* aber ist die Idee in einseitiger Bestimmung der Unmittelbarkeit oder Negation [*Anschauen* assumes itself to be the immediate *Anschauung* of something external to itself; this only appears to be the case here] durch äußerliche Reflexion [“nach dieser

consisting of the *Logic*, *Philosophy of Nature*, and *Philosophy of Spirit*. The metaphor of circle where every moment is both end and beginning—a metaphor that seems very mechanical and hard to take seriously at times⁵⁶—is very palpable in *die Absolute Idee*: it is the *end* of the *Logic* that is (by the same token) the *beginning* of Nature that is itself the *middle* of the System.

The section called “*die absolute Idee*” consists of nine paragraphs (§236-§244) of which the first two are introductory. The first (§236) reminds us that even *die Idee* (of which “*die absolute Idee*” is, as it were, the Concept) was the unity of *subjectivity* and *objectivity*: this prepares us to accept Hegel’s definition of “the absolute Idea” as *the Idea that thinks itself*: it is, in itself, both *subject* (in that it thinks) and *object* (in that it is that of which it thinks).⁵⁷

ihrer *Einheit* mit sich *betrachtet*”] gesetzt [just as Nature is the second moment of the System, so is *Reflexion*—the essence of *Wesen*—the second moment of the Logic]. Die absolute *Freiheit* der Idee [this sentence hearkens back to the prior Triad of Life, Knowledge and Idea] aber ist, daß sie nicht bloß ins Leben übergeht, noch als endliches Erkennen dasselbe in sich *scheinen* läßt, sondern in der absoluten Wahrheit ihrer selbst sich *entschließt*, das Moment ihrer Besonderheit oder des ersten Bestimmens und Andersseins [i.e. as Nature], die *unmittelbare Idee* [i.e. die Absolute Idee] als ihren Widerschein [as its *Reflexion*; as if it were external to itself and being *looked at* externally by an other *whereas in fact* it is merely its own *Widerschein*], sich als *Natur* [Nature is the Absolute Idea as *Widerschein* of itself] *frei aus sich zu entlassen* [the Absolute Idea that freely releases itself into its own reflection].” See MARCUSE, Herbert, *Hegel’s Ontology and the Theory of Historicity*, translated by Seyla Benhabib, Cambridge: MIT Press, 1987, pp. 184-5.

⁵⁶ WdL, p. 842 (emphasis mine): “By virtue of the nature of the method just indicated, the science exhibits itself as a *circle* returning upon itself, the end being wound back into the beginning, the simple ground, by the mediation; this circle is moreover a *circle of circles*, for each member as **ensouled by the method** is reflected into itself, so that in returning unto the beginning it is at the same time the beginning of a new member. Links of this chain are the individual sciences {of logic, nature and spirit}, each of which has an antecedent and a successor—or, expressed more accurately, *has only the antecedent* and *indicates its successor* in its conclusion.” The fact that GWFH sees this circular logical “life”—with its beginnings, returns, conclusions, antecedents, and successors—as completely atemporal is precisely “The Problem of Time in Hegel’s Philosophy of History.”

⁵⁷ E §236 (emphasis mine): “Die Idee als Einheit der subjektiven und der objektiven Idee ist der Begriff der Idee, dem die Idee als solche der Gegenstand, dem das Objekt sie ist; - ein Objekt, in welches alle Bestimmungen zusammengegangen sind. Diese Einheit ist hiermit die *absolute und alle Wahrheit, die sich selbst denkende Idee*, und zwar hier *als* denkende, als *logische* Idee”). Note that it is this paragraph to which GWFH refers in §574. In the *Zusatz*, he uses two other expressions that join our passage to the end of the System as a whole: he uses *νοησις νοησεως*, the Aristotelian formula with which the whole *Encyclopedia* closes, and defines his subject here as “die *an* und

In addition to using the metaphor of the Old Man that will prove to be extremely important hereafter,⁵⁸ the second paragraph (§237) makes Hegel's meaning more transparent than the first: "the absolute Idea" is in fact something that we all know perfectly well. It is the entire *Logic* that we are now almost finished reading.⁵⁹ If its Content is all that has gone before—all that we have read up to this point⁶⁰—its Form is none other than what Hegel calls "the Method of this content."⁶¹ After this introduction, he then devotes the

für sich seiende und hiermit *absolute* Idee." The *Zusatz* as a whole reminds us that we are dealing with the synthesis of Life and Knowledge: in so far as the Idea has Life, it can (as subject) have Knowledge. But it can also have Knowledge of Life (as object).

⁵⁸ GWFH uses *der Greis* (i.e. the old man) to illustrate the proposition that the whole is contained in the end—we will see that GWFH does not see Old Age as enfeeblement but as Completion (see I.1.2.1)—at E §237 *Zusatz* (emphases mine): "Die absolute Idee ist in dieser Hinsicht dem Greis zu vergleichen, der dieselben Religionssätze ausspricht als das Kind, für welchen dieselben aber die Bedeutung seines ganzen Lebens haben. Wenn auch das Kind den religiösen Inhalt versteht, so gilt ihm derselbe doch nur als ein solches, außerhalb dessen noch das ganze Leben und die ganze Welt liegt. - Ebenso verhält es sich dann auch mit dem menschlichen Leben überhaupt und den Begebenheiten, die den Inhalt desselben ausmachen. Alle Arbeit ist nur auf das Ziel gerichtet, und wenn dies erreicht ist, so ist man verwundert, nichts anderes zu finden als eben dies, was man wollte. **Das Interesse liegt in der ganzen Bewegung.** Wenn der Mensch sein Leben verfolgt, dann kann ihm das Ende als sehr beschränkt erscheinen, aber der ganze *decursus vitae* ist es, welcher darin zusammengenommen ist. - So ist denn auch der Inhalt der absoluten Idee **die ganze Ausbreitung**, die wir bisher vor uns hatten. **Das Letzte ist die Einsicht, daß die ganze Entfaltung den Inhalt und das Interesse ausmacht.**" The emphasized passages illustrate the proposition that "the True is the Whole" and "the *Greis* metaphor" (as it will be called hereafter) adds a Chronological dimension to Logical Completeness.

⁵⁹ E §237: "Für sich ist die *absolute* Idee, weil kein Übergehen noch Voraussetzen und überhaupt keine Bestimmtheit, welche nicht flüssig und durchsichtig wäre, in ihr ist, die *reine Form* des Begriffs, die *ihren Inhalt* als sich selbst anschaut." GWFH suggests that the Form (that ceaselessly flows through its Triads treating none as fixed determinations) is a living thing *that beholds itself* in its Content. It must be remembered that die absolute Idee is the synthesis of *Leben* and *Erkennen*: it both lives and knows (itself) as living.

⁶⁰ *Zusatz* to E §237: "...der wahre Inhalt ist indes kein anderer als das ganze System, dessen Entwicklung wir bisher betrachtet haben."

⁶¹ E §237 (emphasis mine): "Sie ist sich *Inhalt*, insofern sie das ideelle Unterscheiden ihrer selbst von sich [i.e. all the various *Bestimmtheiten* that have, each in turn, become *flüssig* and *durchsichtig*, are all merely moments of the absolute Idea] und das eine der Unterschiedenen die Identität mit sich ist [the absolute Idea can only be a Totality if it combines its Content in a Form that thinks itself], in der aber **die Totalität der Form als das System** der Inhaltsbestimmungen enthalten ist [i.e. the System itself]. Dieser Inhalt ist das System *des Logischen*. Als *Form* bleibt hier der Idee nichts als [only as]

bulk of the section (5 paragraphs: §238-§242) to describing “the Moments of the speculative method” (naturally, there are *three* such moments). Finally there are two concluding paragraphs (§243 and §244) the second of which has already been considered.⁶²

It is the middle section—the five paragraphs containing Hegel’s discussion of the speculative Method’s three moments—that contains the section’s Triad and therefore illustrates the Hegelian Dialectic. Abstract as the Content of the first Triad of “Being, Nothing, and Becoming” undoubtedly was, the last Triad is—in the common sense understanding of the word, at any rate—even more abstract: its only Content is the System’s own dialectical movement. Hegel, to be sure, does not consistently look at it as abstract: the last Triad is to some extent the most concrete in the Logic because it contains the rich content of all that has preceded it. But it is also his description of a Method: a Form that has been (and will be) used again and again. The actual Triad is therefore in no way different from the First (or any other) *in Form*. But he is describing a Form that now, for the first time, *knows itself as Content*. He therefore discusses the Last Triad with the objectivity and generality of a critic describing “Hegel’s Dialectic” from the outside. Despite its complex position

die *Methode* dieses Inhalts,—das bestimmte Wissen von der Wahrung ihrer Momente.” It is precisely the Form as System—or rather the Method that thinks itself as Content—that is described in the section we are considering. Thus it is an ideal passage for illustrating the Dialectic: GWFH is not just using the Dialectical Method (as in the First Triad) but explaining the moments of that Method itself. Cf. WdL, p. 825: “Therefore what remains to be considered here is not content as such, but the universal aspect of its form—that is, the *method*.”

⁶² For E §244, see earlier note on the transition to Nature. The other concluding paragraph (E §243) is intended to make sure we don’t think the Method (as Form) is external to the Content. The only basis on which these two can be distinguished is that as Content, each moment within the Concept appeared to possess the Wholeness of the Concept; see E §243: “Die Methode ist auf diese Weise nicht äußerliche Form, sondern die Seele und der Begriff des Inhalts, von welchem sie nur unterschieden ist, insofern die Momente des *Begriffs* auch an *ihnen selbst* in ihrer *Bestimmtheit* dazu kommen, als die Totalität des Begriffs zu erscheinen.” In fact, the Form is the *flüssigkeit* of the Content thought (systematically) as *Begriff*. Thus Content leads back (*zurückführt*) to Form and the Absolute Idea is really just the unity of these two: the particular moments are the Content without which “the dialectic of the Concept” could not be Form. “Indem diese Bestimmtheit oder der Inhalt sich mit der Form zur Idee zurückführt, so stellt sich diese als *systematische* Totalität dar, welche nur *eine* Idee ist, deren besondere Momente ebensowohl *an sich* dieselbe sind, als sie durch die Dialektik des Begriffs das einfache *Fürsichsein* der Idee hervorbringen. - Die Wissenschaft schließt auf diese Weise damit, den Begriff ihrer selbst zu fassen, als der reinen Idee, für welche die Idee ist” (E §243).

in the System as a whole—a position I have tried to briefly elucidate above—the Triad itself is therefore no more complicated than any other. But because it is concerned with the dialectical Method itself, it can be elucidated *in Hegel's own words* without generalizing from them from the outside. After all, commentators discuss the First Triad only in order to explain Hegel's Dialectic in general. But Hegel's discussion of *die absolute Idee* is Hegel's own discussion of the Dialectic; this makes it a much better Triad to consider as paradigmatic.

The First Moment of any Triad based on the Speculative Method appears *to itself* (*für sich*) to be something it is *not*: an immediate, self-standing existent.⁶³ But from the perspective of the Absolute Idea (whose Form is the Method), it is judged (*urtheilt*) to be the mere negative of itself: its *crime*—i.e. the cause of its inadequacy or one-sidedness—is simply that it is the Beginning.⁶⁴ Because it merely *begins* a process—without the whole of which, it merely *masquerades* as independent—its immediacy is nullified and it itself is merely posited as a presupposition of the entire process: it is less *Sein* than *Gesetzsein*.⁶⁵ The First Moment, whether it is “Being” in the First Triad *or any other content informed by the Speculative Method*, is *conceptually* as much the Logically Complete Concept as the Second and even the Third (synthetic) moment. But its negativity—the fact that it inevitably leads to the dialectic of the Second Moment—is implicit in itself simply because *as Beginning* it must necessarily be one-sided in its apparent but fraudulent immediacy. Hegel calls it “the (not yet as Concept) posited Concept” and “*Begriff an sich*.”⁶⁶ It is not

⁶³ E §238: “Die Momente der spekulativen Methode sind *a*) der *Anfang*, der das *Sein* oder *Unmittelbare* ist; für sich aus dem einfachen Grunde, weil er der Anfang ist.”

⁶⁴ E §238: “Von der spekulativen Idee aus aber ist es ihr *Selbstbestimmen*, welches als die absolute Negativität oder Bewegung des Begriffs *urteilt* und sich als das Negative seiner selbst setzt.” Posited as immediate beginning—which in fact it is not—it is both positive (as being put forward as beginning) and negative (the fact of its “being put forward as beginning” means equally that it is not the beginning at all). This division of itself into Positive and Negative (one might say that the Negative is implicit in the Positing of the Positive) is where the First Moment is judged to be one-sided and therefore is subjected to a primal bifurcation. The word “*Urteil*” is crucial here: it is a condemnatory *judgment* that finds the defendant guilty of being one-sided and therefore *primordially divides* it into two parts.

⁶⁵ E §238: “Das *Sein*, das für den Anfang als solchen als abstrakte Affirmation erscheint, ist so vielmehr die *Negation*, *Gesetzsein*, *Vermitteltsein* überhaupt und *Vorausgesetzsein*.”

⁶⁶ E §238 (emphasis mine): “Aber als die Negation des *Begriffs*, der in seinem Anderssein schlechthin identisch mit sich und die Gewißheit seiner selbst ist, ist es **der noch nicht als Begriff gesetzte Begriff** oder der *Begriff an sich*.” It is the Concept, but since, as first, it must enter as *the merely posited Concept*, it is the concept that is not

yet the *Begriff* that knows itself as *Begriff* and is therefore a mere incomplete generality.⁶⁷ But this self-misunderstanding belongs to the First Moment *only as determinate Content*. As Form—and that is what we are now considering—the whole process has now become transparent to itself and therefore even the First Moment knows itself to be what it is: a merely First Moment.

Of the five paragraphs that constitute Hegel's discussion of the Speculative Method, the first (§238) and last (§242) are devoted, respectively, to the First and Third moments of the Dialectic. This division means that the Second moment—he calls it “the second sphere”—receives three full paragraphs (§239–§241) and therefore the most attention. The virtues of using *die absolute Idee* as paradigm quickly become apparent when these three central paragraphs are considered.

Hegel introduces the Second Moment as the Progress (*Fortgang*) into bifurcation of the Idea—or indeed any other Content—arising automatically from the fact that it was *posited as a beginning* in the first place. “*Der Fortgang ist das gesetzte Urteil der Idee.*”⁶⁸ Its bifurcation (the German word “*Ur-teil*” means “primal division”) is simultaneously a judgment (“*Urteil*” as “guilty verdict”) on its merely posited (*gesetzt*) status as immediate Universal. It is therefore subject to the Dialectic: “*Das unmittelbare Allgemeine ist als der Begriff an sich die Dialektik, an ihm selbst seine Unmittelbarkeit und Allgemeinheit zu einem Momente herabzusetzen.*”⁶⁹ It is most refreshing to attend to the way Hegel himself introduces *die Dialektik*. Because the First Moment is not the complete Concept but merely the *Begriff an sich*, its “immediate universality” is the Dialectic! Dialectic is not something that

yet itself. In the “Absolute Idea,” this is all transparent: the Method knows that the Beginning can only be posited and therefore must progress to the negation of itself. The First Triad lacks this self-knowledge.

⁶⁷ E §238: “Dies Sein ist darum als der noch unbestimmte, d. i. nur an sich oder unmittelbar bestimmte Begriff ebensowohl das *Allgemeine*.” As a Universal, it might be said to be a Whole that contains the other two moments. On the other hand, the one-sidedness of this Universal—lacking the further Content inevitably developing from its one-sidedness—shows it to be a Part lacking a Whole. Therefore GWFH spends the rest of the paragraph (and the *Zusatz*) explaining how the Speculative Method is both analytic (First Moment as Whole) and synthetic (First Moment as Part). “Die philosophische Methode [i.e. the Speculative Method] ist sowohl analytisch als auch synthetisch, jedoch nicht in dem Sinn eines bloßen Nebeneinander oder einer bloßen Abwechslung dieser beiden Methoden des endlichen Erkennens [a synonym for *Verstand*], sondern vielmehr so, daß sie dieselben als aufgehoben in sich enthält und demgemäß in einer jeden ihrer Bewegungen sich als analytisch und synthetisch zugleich verhält” (E §238, *Zusatz*).

⁶⁸ E §239.

⁶⁹ E §239.

happens to some Content from outside: the Speculative Method is no merely external Form. The First Moment *is the Dialectic* by virtue of its one-sidedness wherein its so-called “universality” and “immediacy” *are what they are*: mere *moments* of the complete Concept that knows itself as complete, i.e. as Concept. The Second Moment is merely a negative judgment on the “immediacy” of the First: it is thus the First Moment’s *mirror image* (both different and the same, identical and opposite). “*Es ist damit das Negative des Anfangs oder das Erste in seiner Bestimmtheit [compare Spinoza’s omnis determinatio est negatio] gesetzt; es ist für eines, die Beziehung Unterschiedener, - Moment der Reflexion.*”⁷⁰ This, then, is the first of three paragraphs on the Second Moment.⁷¹

But it is the *second* of the three paragraphs (§240)—as it were, the middle of the middle of this middle⁷²—that will prove to be most revealing.

⁷⁰ E §239. GWFH returns to the analytic/synthetic question in the last sentence of the paragraph: “Dieser Fortgang ist ebensowohl *analytisch*, indem durch die immanente Dialektik nur das gesetzt wird, was im unmittelbaren Begriffe enthalten ist, - als *synthetisch*, weil in diesem Begriffe dieser Unterschied noch nicht gesetzt war.” Here again, the Dialectic is immanent in the one-sided *Gesetzsein* of the Beginning.

⁷¹ Another important aspect of GWFH’s treatment of the Last Triad in the Logic is that he connects his discussion of the Speculative Method with his System as a whole. This is readily apparent in the *Zusatz* to E §239. He begins by reminding us that the Second Moment proves that the First was not what it appeared to be. “*Im Fortgang der Idee erweist der Anfang sich als das was er an sich ist, nämlich als das Gesetzte und Vermittelte und nicht als das Seiende und Unmittelbare.*” These pairings—“mediated” and “immediate,” “posited” and “existent”—are extremely important; the second pair in particular. As *gesetzt*, the First Moment is not *seiende*: its *Sein* is in fact *Gesetzsein*. GWFH then proceeds to apply these distinctions to the other two parts—Nature and Spirit—of the System as a whole. “*Nur für das selbst unmittelbare Bewußtsein ist die Natur das Anfängliche und Unmittelbare und der Geist das durch dieselbe Vermittelte.*” Only because our own immediate consciousness is itself a fraudulent immediacy does Nature appear to be a self-standing “Thing-in-itself” in relation to which our Minds are merely derivative. “*In der Tat aber ist die Natur das durch den Geist Gesetzte, und der Geist selbst ist es, der sich die Natur zu seiner Voraussetzung macht.*” In the context of the System as a whole, this sentence is of great importance. On the verge of releasing itself into Nature as its own intuiting reflection, the Logical Idea will only be recovered at the end of Spirit. GWFH rejects a Cartesian dualism between immediate consciousness as Subject and Nature as Object. Not only is Nature posited by Spirit—a Spirit that has come to know *Nature’s true nature* as mere Reflection of the Logical Idea—but Nature is the precondition of its own self knowledge. Viewing Nature as derivative justifies viewing Time the same way; the Absolute Idea’s self-release into Nature is the origin of “the *externality of space and time*” (WdL, p. 843).

⁷² The five paragraphs dealing with the three moments of the Speculative Method are the *middle* of the nine-paragraph section on the Absolute Idea. The *middle* of those five

Die abstrakte Form des Fortgangs ist im Sein ein *Anderes* und *Übergehen* in ein Anderes, im Wesen *Scheinen in dem Entgegengesetzten*, im *Begriffe* die Unterschiedenheit des *Einzelnen* von der *Allgemeinheit*, welche sich als solche in das von ihr Unterschiedene *kontinuier*t und *als Identität* mit ihm ist.⁷³

The crucial words in this paragraph are “*im Sein*,” “*im Wesen*,” and “*im Begriff[e]*.” These—Being, Essence, and Concept—are the three constitutive parts of the *Logic* as a whole. Because every Triad in the System has a Second Moment, that Second Moment can appear in a variety of ways.⁷⁴ By distinguishing precisely *three* of these ways, we are not only witnessing Hegel describing the Dialectic but describing it *dialectically*. To use the First Triad as an example: Being can be presented (*im Sein*) as a transition into Nothing as Another (*Übergehen in ein Anderes*). But such “Another” merely *appears* to be such: it is essentially (*im Wesen*) merely *itself* as mirror image (*Scheinen in dem Entgegengesetzten*). But in complete Concepts (*im Begriffe*), even this reflected *difference in identity* is superseded by *identity in difference*: the opposites are not conceptually distinct but *continuous*, not different but *identical with themselves*. In the *Concept* of the Second Moment, therefore, the Universality of the First is reconciled with the two Particulars of the Second. Every Moment of the Triad is thereby conceptualized. To put it another way, no Part of the Dialectic can be conceptualized (*im Begriffe*) without the Whole.

It is §240 that clearly illustrates the proposition that the true Content of the Absolute Idea is “nothing else than the entire System of whose unfolding we have up until now been witnessing.”⁷⁵ The Second Moment can indeed be looked at merely as “the Second Sphere” (as it is in §241).⁷⁶ But the entire Logic—all of Being, Essence, and Concept—are included in the Speculative Method as the inevitable and inseparable Form to its Content. That same Form

consists of the three paragraphs about the Second Moment. The *middle* of these three is E §240.

⁷³ E §240 (complete).

⁷⁴ This is what Rolf-Peter HORSTMANN is getting at by saying that *Sein*, *Wesen*, and *Begriff* are in fact three different Syntaxes, each with its own Semantics (“The Metaphysics of the self: Hegel’s Metaphysical of Self-consciousness,” Lecture at UFSC, 14 March 2006).

⁷⁵ *Zusatz* to E §237; translation mine.

⁷⁶ E §241: “In der zweiten Sphäre ist der zuerst an sich seiende Begriff zum *Scheinen* gekommen und ist *so an sich* schon die *Idee*.” It is the Absolute Idea but only *an sich*. In E §240, by contrast, he described the Second Moment from the perspectives of the First, Second, and Third Moments (*Sein*, *Wesen*, and *Begriff*) in turn. Note that here, the Second Sphere is *Scheinen* only.

was already implicit in Being, Nothing, and Becoming. In the Second Moment of the First Triad, Being passed over into Nothing and Nothing passed back into Being. In the Absolute Idea, this “doubled movement” is this Content and many others as well: the inevitable means through which alone the Whole is whole and Unity can shed its immediate one-sidedness.⁷⁷

To illustrate the Logical Completeness of the Hegelian Dialectic, one would suppose that Hegel’s description of the Third Moment was particularly important. It is the negation of negativity of the First Moment that both annuls and preserves its implicit Dialectic.⁷⁸ Including within itself both its one-sided Beginning and its resulting Difference as merely posited determinations of its own reality, it is “the realized Concept.”⁷⁹ It therefore produces what is really “first” although it appears to be a Result.⁸⁰ As Idea, it consists of its moments; as *sich denkende Idee*, it is that same Idea as a single Totality.⁸¹ Logical Completeness so pervades the Hegelian Dialectic that Completeness is not

⁷⁷ E §241: “Die Entwicklung dieser Sphäre wird Rückgang in die erste, wie die der ersten ein Übergang in die zweite ist; nur durch diese gedoppelte Bewegung erhält der Unterschied sein Recht, indem jedes der beiden Unterschiedenen sich an ihm selbst betrachtet zur Totalität vollendet und darin sich zur Einheit mit dem anderen betätigt. Nur das Sichaufheben der Einseitigkeit *beider an ihnen selbst* läßt die Einheit nicht einseitig werden.” We can think this as the First Triad but it is, in fact, every Triad. Note that although difference must be given its due (*sein Recht*) it must be completed in a Totality (*zur Totalität vollendet*).

⁷⁸ E §242: “Es ist das Negative des Ersten und als die Identität mit demselben die Negativität seiner selbst; hiermit die Einheit, in welcher diese beiden Ersten als ideelle und Momente, als aufgehobene, d. i. zugleich als aufbewahrte sind.”

⁷⁹ E §242 (emphasis mine): “Der Begriff, so von seinem *Ansichsein* vermittelt seiner Differenz und deren Aufheben sich mit sich selbst zusammenschließend, ist **der realisierte Begriff**, d. i. der Begriff, das *Gesetzsein* seiner Bestimmungen in seinem *Fürsichsein* enthaltend,…” The First Moment possessed only *Ansichsein*: the realized Concept, knowing the determinations within it to be *flüssig* by virtue of their *Gesetzsein*, possesses *Fürsichsein*. As Complete, it knows itself to be what it is.

⁸⁰ E §242: “...die *Idee*, für welche zugleich als absolut Erstes (in der Methode) dies Ende nur das *Verschwinden* des *Scheins* ist, als ob der Anfang ein Unmittelbares und sie ein Resultat wäre;” In the Speculative Method (as *Form* of the Absolute Idea), it is the “realized Concept” that is appears “as absolute First.” But from the perspective of *Content* (as we saw), the Beginning was falsely but inevitably taken as immediate (and hence was implicitly the Dialectic) and the Third appeared “as if it was a was a Result.” In fact, the End is always already implicit in the Beginning. GWFH must insist on this to avoid the appearance of even *logical* movement or development in Time.

⁸¹ GWFH adds another clause that completes the sense at E §242 (my emphasis): “...die *Idee*, für welche zugleich als absolut Erstes (in der Methode) dies Ende nur das *Verschwinden* des *Scheins* ist, als ob der Anfang ein Unmittelbares und sie ein Resultat wäre; - das Erkennen [however], [knows] **daß die Idee die eine Totalität ist.**”

simply the Result of a process but the reality of each moment of the process: only as a Totality can the process be what it is. It should be noticed that although Hegel employs the words “first,” “result,” and “moment” repeatedly, he conceives—and this conception is the origin of “The Problem of Time in Hegel’s Philosophy of History”—that this process is strictly logical and has nothing whatsoever to do with Time.

The problem with Logical Completeness is that it is singularly unsuitable for describing processes that *do not* or even *have not yet* come to an end.⁸² This will become a crucial consideration when the Logical Completeness of the Dialectic is applied to History. The human drama of World History not only *begins* in the distant Past but it can only be understood as *continuing* into the endless Future. Hegel’s thought is so dominated by Logical Completeness that he has no place—at least no respectable place, for the Endless. This becomes very apparent in the language he uses to describe the transition from Second to Third Moments:

Die zweite Sphäre entwickelt die Beziehung der Unterschiedenen zu dem, was sie zunächst ist, zum *Widerspruche* an ihr selbst—im *unendlichen Progreß*,—der sich γ) in das *Ende* auflöst, daß das Differenten als das gesetzt wird, was es im Begriffe ist.⁸³

Hegel emphasizes the fact that the Third Moment puts an end to the “doubled movement”—i.e. to the back and forth transitions, for example, between Being and Nothing—of the oppositions of the Second. He raises the possibility that the back and forth movement of this reflected self-contradiction could go on forever *only to immediately end it*. But there is a problem here. It is difficult to imagine Becoming, for example, as finite or coming to an end. The same is even truer of Time. It is crucial to bear in mind that there is no room for the Endless in Hegel’s thought: *unendlichen Progreß* is quickly reduced to a mere logical “moment”—with no hint of chronological infinitude—within the completed Concept.

⁸² When a syllogism closes with the conclusion that “Socrates is mortal,” it may be said to bridge the gap between logic and the future only because the object in question, i.e. a mortal man, is both temporal and finite: the proof depends precisely on the latter. But if “history” is admitted to be temporal, there can be no such limitation.

⁸³ E §242; first sentence.

Chapter 2 (I.1.2) The Hegelian Dialectic in Action

It was only in the *Rechtsphilosophie*—the last of his published books—that Hegel clearly stated the principle governing the Dialectic’s actual operation: “*Was vernünftig ist, das ist wirklich, and was wirklich ist, das ist Vernünftig.*”¹ This famous statement must be understood as putting the Dialectic *into action*: *Vernunft* (and it’s precisely the Dialectic that, for Hegel, is *was vernünftig ist*) becomes operative (*wirkt*) in *was wirklich ist*. The identity of *Vernunft* and *Wirklichkeit* means that Reason is no idle bystander and does not inhabit a world apart: the central point to grasp is that *Vernunft wirkt*. The *Wissenschaft der Logik* could conceivably give someone the wrong idea: that it is Logic alone *daß Vernünftig ist*. The truth is that *whatever* is *wirklich* is, by the same token, Dialectical (*vernünftig*). Thus, *Wirklichkeit* (*was wirklich ist*) must always be explicable in terms of the Dialectic. Conversely, whatever—like the Absolute Idea of the *Wissenschaft der Logik*—has been shown to be reasonable, must, as it were, manifest itself as *was wirklich ist*; e.g. as Nature or, as the return to itself of Spirit, even in History.

In this chapter, the application of the Dialectic to three distinct but actual or chronological processes will be considered. In the first section (I.1.2.1), Hegel’s Anthropology will be used to show how Dialectical or Logical Completeness can be applied to the four stages of human development. In the second (I.1.2.2), the application of the three basic moments of Hegel’s *Wissenschaft der Logik* to the History of Religion will show how easy it is for Hegel to build a bridge between Logic and History. Finally (in I.1.2.3), an analysis of the Introduction to Hegel’s *Lectures on the History of Philosophy* will demonstrate just how close the connection between Logic and History can be.

I.1.2.1. Anthropology: the Four Ages of Man

In *As You Like It*, Shakespeare puts his famous speech about the *seven* ages of man in the mouth of the melancholy Jacques (Act II scene 7). Jacques emphasizes the circularity of this process: old age is “second childishness,” and the follies of youth and manhood are ended in the futility of “mere oblivion.” It is a sense of resignation to this futility that leads to the pronouncement, “All the world’s a stage, and all the men and women merely players.”

Hegel gives his version of the same story in the third part of his

¹ *Philosophy of Right*, p. 10 (see p. 18 n. 4).

Encyclopaedia of the Philosophical Sciences.² Although he reduces the number of ages to four, he would seem to agree that the whole process is *circular*. Old Age, the final act, “leads back to childhood.”³ The most interesting part of Hegel’s account of the four ages of man is neither its beginning nor its end, but rather what happens between them. In the eyes of Jacques, the follies of the youthful lover are simply succeeded in Manhood by the follies of reputation and pride. For Hegel also Youth is a time of fancies,⁴ but unlike Jacques, he sees the transition from Youth to Manhood as a fruitful step. He characterizes the Man as possessing a “true relationship to his environment.”⁵ The transition from the Youth to the Man dramatizes one of Hegel’s most important doctrines: that the rational is the real and the real is the rational.⁶ Because this dictum is the ultimate basis of the position accorded to World History in the Hegelian system, Youth is a good subject with which to begin the discussion of his integration of Logic with the Philosophy of History.

Hegel characterizes Youth as the age of high ideals. Whether it be the ideal of love, or the quest for a “universal state of the world,”⁷ the discrepancy between *the way things are* and *the way they ought to be* contrast sharply with the oblivion experienced in Childhood and Old Age. Unlike the Child, the Youth is “no longer at peace with the world,” and therefore attempts to transform it in accordance with his ideals.⁸ Manhood, according to Hegel, brings with it a decisive change. The youth’s desire to realize his ideals having been frustrated, a progressive submission to the world-as-it-is heralds the appearance of the Man. Gradually “the plan for completely transforming the world” is abandoned, and the Man recognizes that the world is “a self-dependent world which in its essential nature is

² HEGEL, G.W.F. *Hegel’s Philosophy of Mind*. Translated by William Wallace and A. V. Miller. Oxford: Clarendon Pressford, 1971 (hereafter “*Philosophy of Mind*”); p. 55-64

³ *Zusatz* to E §396; *Philosophy of Mind*, p. 64.

⁴ *Zusatz* to E §396; *Philosophy of Mind*, pp. 61-63.

⁵ E §396; *Philosophy of Mind*, p. 55.

⁶ For the parallel passage in the *Encyclopaedia*, see *Zusatz* to E §396; *Philosophy of Mind* p. 62: “The world is this actualization of divine Reason; it is only on the surface that the play of contingency prevails.”

⁷ *Zusatz* to E §396; *Philosophy of Mind*, p. 61. “Dies Ideal hat aber im Jüngling noch eine mehr oder weniger subjective Gestalt: möge daher als Ideal der Liebe and der Freundschaft, oder eines allgemeinen Weltzustandes in ihm leben.” The aged Kant thus becomes the eternal youth.

⁸ *Zusatz* to E §396; *Philosophy of Mind*, p. 62: “So wird der Friede, in welchem das Kind mit der Welt lebt, von Jüngling gebrochen.”

already complete.”⁹

As a rule, the Man believes that this submission is only forced on him by necessity. But, in truth, this unity with the world must be recognized, not as a relation imposed by necessity, but as the rational.¹⁰ The very next sentence reveals the root of Hegel’s position:

The rational, the divine, possesses the absolute power to actualize itself and has, right from the beginning, fulfilled itself; it is not so impotent that it would have to wait for the beginning of its actualization.¹¹

It is against this backdrop that the dictum that the rational is the real and the real is the rational is most easily understood. Just as the man turns away from the ideal ought-to-be’s of Youth and achieves a “unity with the world” as it actually is, so Hegel demands that philosophy explore the real, the “present and the actual,” rather than indulge in “the erection of a beyond, supposed to exist, God knows where . . .”¹² The rational is no otherworldly ideal, if ideals are truly rational, they would be potent enough to realize themselves. The *Encyclopaedia* states: “The world is the actualization of divine reason.”¹³ Rather than look beyond it, the philosopher should look *within* it: “The great thing is to apprehend in the show of the temporal and transient the substance which is immanent and the eternal which is present.”¹⁴

It is important to emphasize the Dialectical aspect of this four-part process. The opposition that always characterizes the second moment appears in the guise of the conflict between Youth and Manhood. Once

⁹ “...die Welt als eine selbständige, im wesentlichen fertige unerkennen . . .”, *Zusatz* to E §396; *Philosophy of Mind*, p. 62. For the importance of the idea of progress in this transformation, cf. the later passage in the same paragraph: “For although the world must be recognized as already complete in its essential nature (*im wesentlichen fertig*), yet it is not a dead, absolutely inert world but, like the life process, a world which perpetually creates itself anew, which while merely preserving itself, at the same time progresses [*zugleich Fortschreitendes*].”

¹⁰ *Zusatz* to E §396; *Philosophy of Mind*, p. 62.

¹¹ *Zusatz* to E §396; *Philosophy of Mind*, p. 62: “Das Vernünftige, Göttliche besitzt die Absolute Macht, sich zu verwirklichen, and hat sich von jeher vollbracht; es ist nicht so ohnmächtig, daß es erst auf dem Beginn seiner Verwirklichung warten mußte.”

¹² *Philosophy of Right*, p. 10: “...das Aufstellen eines *Jenseitigen*. . . das Gott weiß wo sein sollte.” Actually, GWFH tells exactly where this “beyond” exists: “in dem Irrthum eines einseitigen, leeren Raisonnirens.”

¹³ *Zusatz* to E §396; *Philosophy of Mind*, p. 62: “Die Welt ist diese Verwirklichung der göttlichen Vernunft...”

¹⁴ *Philosophy of Right*, p. 10: “...in dem Scheme des Zeitlichen and Vorübergehenden die substanz, and das Ewige, das gegenwärtig ist, zu erkennen.”

again, the beginning and the end of the process are free of this opposition, but the manner in which each is free is different. The Child makes no distinction between the real and the rational, simply because it is unable to do so; Childhood is “mind wrapped up in itself.”¹⁵ Old Age is also free from this conflict, but only because *it has lived through it*: it has already recognized “the objective necessity and reasonableness of the world”¹⁶ and that it can only do by having endured a moment of negativity: of seeing the World as merely external. The Last stage thus removes and contains (*aufhebt*) the opposition of the second, and indeed it is *only because this opposition is retained that it can be resolved*. For at the end of the process, unity is not the thoughtless and subjective unity of Childhood; it is the self-conscious apprehension of the real in the rational and the rational in the real.¹⁷ That is the legacy of the Man’s triumph over the Youth.¹⁸

I.1.2.2. The Logical Articulation of Hegel’s *Philosophy of Religion*

Although Hegel’s Anthropology describes a chronological process, it is by no means an historical one: like the lifecycle of natural growth, it is endlessly repeated and by no means unique, as an historical process would be. In *História e Metafísica em Hegel: Sobre a Noção de Espírito do Mundo*, Maria Borges emphasizes an instructive example of the application of Hegel’s Dialectical Logic to a unique chronological process: the History of Religion.¹⁹

The three Parts of Hegel’s *Logic* (as we saw in considering §240 of the *Encyclopedia* in I.1.1.2) are Being, Essence, and Concept. In the *Lectures on the Philosophy of Religion*, Hegel uses *Sein*, *Wesen*, and *Begriff* to describe three types of Religion that are, moreover, arranged in chronological order.²⁰ Just as Hegel will place Asian history before that of Greece in his *Philosophy or History*, he deals first with the religions of

¹⁵ E §396; *Philosophy of Mind*, p. 55: “...dem in sich eingehüllten Geiste.” For the dialectical/ logical function of youth see the words which follow: “His next step is the fully developed antithesis . . .”

¹⁶ E §396; *Philosophy of Mind*, p. 55: “...der objectiven Nothwendigkeit and Vernünftigkeit der bereits vorhandenen fertigen Welt.”

¹⁷ Referred to at E §396; *Philosophy of Mind*, p. 55 as the “...Vollbringung der Einheit mit dieser Objectivitat.”

¹⁸ One might well imagine GWFH’s anthropology as a *Bildungsroman*.

¹⁹ BORGES, Maria de Lourdes Alves, *História e Metafísica em Hegel: Sobre a Noção de Espírito do Mundo*, EDIPUCRS, Porto Alegre, 1998 (hereafter “BORGES”).

²⁰ BORGES, p. 164: “Segundo o nosso propósito, mostraremos que, novamente, o percurso temporal das religiões não é um percurso aleatório, mas segue, para Hegel, as grandes divisões da *Ciência da Lógica*: teremos as religiões do ser, da essência e do conceito.”

China and India on the basis of their antiquity; it is these he links with *Sein*.²¹ The religions of Greece and Israel—where the divine is no longer immediately present as it is in the religions of the East—he links with *Wesen*.²² The opposition that always characterizes the Second Moment is here expressed as the division between human and divine.²³ Finally Christianity appears on the scene and resolves this separation through Christ;²⁴ this is therefore the Religion of the Concept.²⁵ The Concept—as the logical basis of Christianity—becomes the culmination of an historical process and therefore the expression of a distinct advance on Judaism, the Greco-Roman Pantheon (as Essence), and the religions of the East (as Being).²⁶

Hegel introduces Time into the System only at the beginning of the *Philosophy of Nature* and it is abundantly clear that Hegel doesn't want us to think of the *Logic* as unfolding chronologically. But by using Being, Essence, and Concept to describe a chronological movement like the History of Religion, he blurs the distinction between timeless logic and historical development, as Borges has shown.

I.1.2.3. Chronology and Concept in Hegel's *History of Philosophy*

Hegel's Introduction to his *Lectures on the History of Philosophy* contains the fullest treatment he ever gave to the central methodological question arising from the application of his Dialectical Logic to events

²¹ BORGES, p. 164-5: “As religiões do ser são aquelas nas quais há uma imediatidade do divino: el epode aparecer na forma de um fenômeno natural, como na religião chinesa, onde o céu (*Tien*) é a própria divindade; ou, mesmo na forma de um homen, como na religião budista.”

²² BORGES, p. 165-6: “Áo religões do ser, Hegel opõe as religiões da essência, as quais, introduzindo o elemento de diferença, tentam a separação entre o divino e o natural.”

²³ BORGES, p. 166: “Se nas religiões orientais havia uma identidade sem diferença entre sensível e o humano, aqui a diferença entre estes dois termos é levada ao seo extremo: de um lado, o terreno, o natural, o humano; de outro o divino.”

²⁴ BORGES, p. 168: “Hegel, ao contrário de Schiller, não considera os deuses gregos como mais humanos do que o Deus cristão. Christo é realmente a encarnação do divino no humano: não se trata apenas de uma forma humana, tal como o antropomorfismo grego, mas do homen concreto. A Apaição do divino encarnado, esse é o atestado da superioridade da religião cristã frente à grega.”

²⁵ BORGES, p. 168: “Por fim, na história das religiões, chegamos à própria religião do Conceito.”

²⁶ BORGES, p. 169: “Ela [sc. Christianity] é a culminação de um processo histórico, na qual houve um amadurecimento da Idéia de Deus, até que essa idéia possa ser tomada no sau mais alta significação. Para Hegel, isto significa conceber a idéia de divindade como aquela que tem força de expor-se num mundo, de tornar-se sensível e retornar a si.”

unfolding in Time. To what extent does the Chronological Order found in the History of Philosophy, or even History itself, replicate the Logical Order arising from the Dialectic, that determines the sequence in which his System as a whole unfolds? To prove that the study of the History of Philosophy *is in fact the study of Philosophy itself*,²⁷ Hegel's Introduction to the *Lectures on the History of Philosophy* contains some unusually clear statements about the close relationship between Dialectical and Chronological Progression. In other words, he makes it explicit that the History of Philosophy *is Philosophy itself* precisely to the extent that the *order of presentation* found in the Logic—the Dialectical Order appropriate to Philosophy²⁸—is replicated in the order of presentation found in the History of Philosophy, i.e. the Chronological Order appropriate to History.²⁹ It is this claim that makes the *Lectures on the History of Philosophy* no less important than his *Lectures on the Philosophy of History* for understanding Hegel's Philosophy of History as a whole.

Hegel's defense of this claim is found in a single paragraph that begins, appropriately enough, with the claim itself.

Now in reference to this Idea, I maintain that the sequence in the systems of Philosophy in History is similar to the sequence in the logical deduction of the Notion – determinations in the Idea.³⁰

It is noteworthy that Hegel is cautious enough to use the word “similar” rather than “identical.” This manner of speaking suggests a distinction between what might be called the *strong* and *weak* forms of his claim. He

²⁷ HEGEL, G.W.F. *Lectures on the History of Philosophy*. Translated by E.S. Haldane and Frances H. Simson. London: Routledge, 1955 (hereafter “LHP”), p. 30: “I would only remark this, that what has been said reveals that the study of the history of Philosophy is the study of Philosophy itself, for, indeed, it can be nothing else.”

²⁸ LHP, p. 29: “The one kind of progression which represents the deduction of the forms, the necessity thought out and recognized, of the determinations, is the business of Philosophy; and because it is the pure Idea which is in question and not yet its mere particularized form as Nature and as Mind, that representation is, in the main, the business of logical Philosophy.”

²⁹ LHP, p. 29-30: “But the other method, which represents the part played by the history of Philosophy, shows the different Stages and moments in development in time, in manner of occurrence, in particular places, in particular people or political circumstances, the complications arising thus, and, in short, it shows us the empirical form. This point of view is the only one worthy of this science. From the very nature of the subject it is inherently the true one, and through the study of this history it will be made manifest that it actually shows and proves itself so.”

³⁰ LHP, p. 30.

seems to be aware that a strong form of the claim—that the Chronological Order in “the sequence in the systems of Philosophy in History” is *identical* with “the sequence in the logical deduction of the Notion”—would be difficult to prove and perhaps even counterproductive. But he does offer the outlines of a proof that would, when fleshed out, apply to both strong and weak forms of the claim.

The first step in showing the similarity between the two sequences is to strip the History of Philosophy of what might be called its contingent elements.

I maintain that if the fundamental conceptions of the systems appearing in the history of Philosophy be entirely divested of what regards their outward form, their relation to the particular and the like, the various stages in the determination of the Idea are found in their logical Notion.³¹

Hegel is intentionally vague about what these systems would look like once “entirely divested of what regards their outward form.” But it is worthwhile to state the obvious: he cannot mean by “the particular and the like” *the Chronological Order* of their appearance. Appearance at a specific Time may well make a system “particular” but this itself is not merely a question of a system’s “outward form,” an example of which would be the geometrical form of Spinoza’s *Ethics*. If it were, it would vitiate his argument entirely.³²

Having shown under what circumstances—after being “divested of what regards...outward form”—the historical will come more closely to resemble the logical progression, Hegel then closes the gap from the other side:

³¹ LHP, p. 30. See DE LAURENTIIS, Allegra, *Metaphysical Foundations of the History of Philosophy: Hegel’s 1820 Introduction to the “Lectures on the History of Philosophy, Review of Metaphysics*, v. 59, n. 1, p. 3-31, 2005; p. 23 n. 53: “On the margin of this passage in the manuscript Hegel notes: “only because of this do I bother to deal with it, to lecture on it [nur darum gebe ich mich damit ab, halte Vorlesungen darüber]” (HW 18:51), that is on the history of philosophy.”

³² Nor does it seem likely that he means by “outward form” the *nationality* of the philosopher in question. See the analogy between Logic and Grammar presented in WdL (HW 5.52): “Wer dagegen einer Sprache mächtig ist und zugleich andere Sprachen in Vergleichung mit ihr kennt, dem erst kann sich der Geist und die Bildung eines Volks in der Grammatik seiner Sprache zu fühlen geben; dieselben Regeln und Formen haben nunmehr einen erfüllten, lebendigen Werth. Er kann durch die Grammatik hindurch den Ausdruck des Geistes überhaupt, die Logik, erkennen.”

Conversely in the logical progression taken for itself, there is, so far as its principal elements are concerned, the progression of historical manifestations; but it is necessary to have these pure Notions in order to know what the historical form contains.³³

Hegel seems to be making a distinction between the logical progression's "principal elements" and the whole of "the logical progression taken for itself." This distinction suggests that *both* Chronological and Logical sequences must be divested of the merely outward or contingent (hence the use of the word "conversely") in order for the similarity between them to become visible. Since Hegel has already claimed that the logical progression is precisely *necessary*,³⁴ it is difficult to guess what he means by distinguishing within it its "principal elements;" it would appear to vitiate the claim that the whole sequence is self-generating.³⁵ But the second, and vastly more important, part of the sentence restores the primacy of the Logical Order: the philosophical Historian of Philosophy—i.e. Hegel himself—must, he now suggests, have a prior knowledge of this "logical progression...in order to know what the historical form contains." This is a very large claim, and for those, like ourselves, who take the objective existence of Time as a given, a potentially scandalous one.³⁶ By

³³ LHP, p. 30.

³⁴ LHP, p. 29: "That is to say, the progression of the various stages in the advance of Thought may occur with the consciousness of necessity, in which case each in succession deduces itself, and this form and this determination can alone emerge."

³⁵ WdL at HW 5.49 (emphases mine): "Wie würde ich meinen können, daß nicht die Methode, die ich in diesem Systeme der Logik befolgt, - *oder vielmehr die dieß System an ihm selbst befolgt*, - noch vieler Vervollkommnung, vieler Durchbildung im Einzelnen fähig sey, aber ich weiß zugleich, daß sie die einzige wahrhafte ist. Dieß erhellt für sich schon daraus, daß sie von ihrem Gegenstande und Inhalte nichts Unterschiedenes ist; - denn es ist der Inhalt in sich, die Dialektik, die er an ihm selbst hat, welche ihn fortbewegt. Es ist klar, daß keine Darstellungen für wissenschaftlich gelten können, welche nicht den Gang dieser Methode gehen und ihrem einfachen Rhythmus gemäß sind, *denn es ist der Gang der Sache selbst*." See also HOULGATE, Stephen, *Freedom, Truth and History: An Introduction to Hegel's Philosophy*, London: Routledge, 1991.

³⁶ LHP, p. 31: "It is shown from what has been said regarding the formal nature of the Idea, that only a history of Philosophy thus regarded as a system of development in Idea, is entitled to the name of Science: a collection of facts constitutes no science. Only thus as a succession of phenomena established through reason, and having as content just what is reason and revealing it, does this history show that it is rational: it shows that the events recorded are in reason. How should the whole of what has taken place in reason not itself be rational? That faith must surely be the more reasonable in which chance is not made ruler over human affairs, and it is the

saying that History can only be made intelligible for one who *already* understands “these pure Notions” as they unfold in Logic, he is admitting that his approach to history is *a priori*³⁷ and not empirical. I intend to show that the real difference between a logical and empirical approach to history is actually rooted in “The Problem of Time in Hegel’s Philosophy of History.”

Rather than plunge more deeply into these dangerous waters, Hegel contents himself at this time with simply restating his claim.

It may be thought that Philosophy must have another order as to the stages in the Idea than that in which these Notions have gone forth in time; but in the main the order is the same.³⁸

This formulation is a compromise between what I have called the strong and weak forms of Hegel’s claim: the phrase “the order is *the same*” (my emphasis) suggests the strong form while the qualifying words “in the main” suggests the weak one. Already committed to Chronological Order in his presentation of the History of Philosophy, Hegel next explicitly refuses to elaborate on what the alternative mode of presentation—i.e. in terms of the Logical Order dictated by the Dialectic—would look like in practice.

This succession undoubtedly separates itself, on the one hand, into the sequence in time of History, and on the other into succession in the order of ideas. But to treat more fully of this last would divert us too far from our aim.³⁹

This sentence leaves open the possibility that Hegel has already presented the “succession in the order of ideas” in *The Science of Logic*.⁴⁰

business of Philosophy to recognize that however much its own manifestations may be history likewise, it is yet determined through the Idea alone.”

³⁷ LHP, p. 30-31: “But in order to obtain a knowledge of its progress as the development of the Idea in the empirical, external form in which Philosophy appears in History, a corresponding knowledge of the Idea is absolutely essential, just as in judging of human affairs one must have a conception of that which is right and fitting.”

³⁸ LHP, p. 30.

³⁹ LHP, p. 30.

⁴⁰ Note that GWFH has already made a similar claim, as it were from the other side, in *Wissenschaft der Logik* at HW 5.89-90 (emphasis mine): “Das Denken oder Vorstellen, dem nur ein bestimmtes Seyn, das Daseyn, vorschwebt, ist zu dem erwähnten Anfange der Wissenschaft zurück zu weisen, welchen Parmenides gemacht hat, der sein Vorstellen und damit auch das Vorstellen der Folgezeit zu dem reinen Gedanken, dem Seyn als solchen, geläutert und erhoben, und damit das

Having proved to his satisfaction the claim *that* the two orders of presentation are “in the main...the same,” Hegel next provocatively broaches the subject of *how* this can possibly be true.

The first question which may be asked in reference to this history, concerns that distinction in regard to the manifestation of the Idea, which has just been noticed. It is the question as to how it happens that Philosophy appears to be a development in time and has a history.⁴¹

The priority of the Logical Order is here simply assumed; it is the very possibility that the Idea could unfold itself in a Chronological Order—i.e. “that Philosophy *appears* to be a development in time and has a history” (emphasis mine)—that must be given philosophical justification. Unfortunately, Hegel has no intention of giving us a complete justification of this possibility; he is, however, willing to identify the *locus* of any such justification.

The answer to this question encroaches on the metaphysics of Time, and it would be a digression from our object to give here more than the elements on which the answer rests.⁴²

Given the great importance that History unquestionably has for Hegel, it is much to be regretted that he seems to have found *no place in his writings* where his “answer to this question” would *not* be “a digression.” His failure to provide such an answer indicates his failure to solve adequately or persuasively “The Problem of Time.” Therefore, the reader must be content only with “the elements” of the answer found here; it offers us little comfort that Hegel tells us he himself unquestionably possesses the answer in its full form. But if the answer in the *Lectures on the History of Philosophy* is admittedly incomplete, the existence of *this particular question* is revealing enough and it is this question that constitutes the subject of this dissertation. Since it is unquestionably the Logical development of the Idea that is prior for Hegel; the question is: how can this development also occur in Time? This is a perfect example of Marx’s

Element der Wissenschaft erschaffen hat. - *Was das Erste in der Wissenschaft ist, hat sich müssen geschichtlich als das Erste zeigen.* Und das Eleatische Eine oder Seyn haben wir für das Erste des Wissens vom Gedanken anzusehen; das Wasser und dergleichen materielle Principien sollen wohl das Allgemeine seyn, aber sind als Materien nicht reine Gedanken; die Zahlen sind weder der erste einfache noch der bei sich bleibende, sondern der sich selbst ganz äußerliche Gedanke.” For the anachronism involved here, see II.1.2.3.

⁴¹ LHP, p. 32.

⁴² LHP, p. 32.

critique of Hegel: Philosophy is here walking on its head. Hegel is not justifying his Philosophy by saying that it incorporates all previous systems of philosophy as they have unfolded chronologically in History but rather feels called upon to justify the possibility that Philosophy (i.e. his System) could ever have appeared in Time in the first place. It is therefore a question of “the metaphysics,”⁴³ i.e. “the problem of Time.”

As will be discussed in more detail hereafter (I.2.2.1), Hegel’s fullest treatment of “the metaphysics of Time” is found in his *Philosophy of Nature*. This is not a very promising place to find an answer to a question about Philosophy’s appearance; Philosophy is an artifact of Mind, not a manifestation of Nature. Therefore, before giving the outlines of his answer, Hegel must first situate Time, previously considered only as part of Nature, in the context of Mind.⁴⁴ Mind presupposes Nature but, unlike Nature, must come to know itself as Mind.⁴⁵ As such, Mind reflects (on) itself: an inevitable doubling, apparently synonymous with *existence*, therefore occurs.⁴⁶ By doubling itself, Mind appears to be externalizing itself. It is this externality to itself that links Mind back to what Hegel has already told us of Nature and therefore to Time.⁴⁷ In other words, Philosophy, as Mind’s attempt to “know itself,” presupposes a moment of externality to itself that is reminiscent of Nature’s relationship to Logic.⁴⁸ Moreover, the essence of this externalization is—in the case of Nature—precisely Time. It therefore makes sense that, by analogy, finite Mind’s

⁴³ See BODEI, R. Die “Metaphysik der Zeit” in Hegels Geschichte der Philosophie in Dieter Henrich and Rolf-Peter Horstmann (eds.), *Hegels Logik der Philosophie*. Stuttgart, 1984.

⁴⁴ LHP, p. 32: “It has been shown above in reference to the existence of Mind, that its Being is its activity. Nature, on the contrary, is, as it is; its changes are thus only repetitions, and its movements take the form of a circle merely.”

⁴⁵ LHP, p. 32: “To express this better, the activity of Mind is to know itself. I am, immediately, but this I am only as a living organism; as Mind I am only in so far as I know myself. Know thyself, the inscription over the temple of the oracle at Delphi, is the absolute command which is expressed by Mind in its essential character.”

⁴⁶ LHP, p. 32: “But consciousness really implies that for myself, I am object to myself. In forming this absolute division between what is mine and myself, Mind constitutes its existence and establishes itself as external to itself.”

⁴⁷ LHP, p. 32: “It postulates itself in the externality which is just the universal and the distinctive form of existence in Nature. But one of the forms of externality is Time, and this form requires to be farther examined both in the Philosophy of Nature and the finite Mind.”

⁴⁸ MARCUSE, Herbert, *Hegel’s Ontology and the Theory of Historicity*, translated by Seyla Benhabib, Cambridge: MIT Press, 1987, p. 306.

externalization from itself—the precondition of its coming to “know itself” through Philosophy—also unfolds in Time. Hegel’s proof of this begins as follows:

This Being in existence and therefore Being in time is a moment not only of the individual consciousness, which as such is essentially finite, but also of the development of the philosophical Idea in the element of Thought.⁴⁹

This then, is Hegel’s claim; it hardly seems important. But we would do well to carefully scrutinize his answer to this peculiar question (“How can Philosophy appear in Time?”) if we wish to fully understand him. This is difficult because *his* question is not *our* question; for us, the appearance of Philosophy in Time—the History of Philosophy—is simply a given. But if not for us, then at least Hegel’s problem is undoubtedly a problem *for Hegel*; his claim was therefore problematic for him. He is asking how the Idea, which is not finite, could conceivably take on the attributes—above all the finitude—of “Being in time”? This is hardly its normal, or immediate condition.

For the Idea, thought of as being at rest, is, indeed, not in Time. To think of it as at rest, and to preserve it in the form of immediacy is equivalent to its inward perception.⁵⁰

Hegel here seems to be saying that the Idea’s own “inward perception” of itself is unquestionably that it is “at rest.” In “the form of immediacy”—i.e. as it is *to itself*—it is unquestionably “not in Time.” The Idea does not inwardly perceive itself or think of itself as being in Time. *We* assimilate *its own way of thinking about itself* when we think of it “as being at rest.” But this perception fails to take account of the fact that the Idea is concrete; i.e. it is Dialectical.

But the Idea as concrete, is, as has been shown, the unity of differences; it is not really rest, and its existence is not really sense-perception, but as differentiation within itself and therefore as development, it comes into existent Being and into externality in the element of Thought, and thus pure Philosophy appears in thought as a progressive existence in time.⁵¹

Just as Logic passes over into Nature—i.e. the realm of Time—so also does the negative or self-differentiating moment of the Dialectic require that

⁴⁹ LHP, p. 32-3.

⁵⁰ LHP, p. 33.

⁵¹ LHP, p. 33.

Philosophy *appears* to unfold in Time. In the full concreteness of the infinite Idea, it is safe to say that Time is merely a vanishing *moment* provided that we embrace Hegel's practice of disconnecting the word "moment" from any merely temporal sense. But, like each moment in the Dialectic, it is a *necessary* moment. It is particularly important to understand why Hegel uses the word "appears" in this proof. The Logical Order of the Idea is *reflected* in the self-differentiation characterized by finite existence in Time. Philosophy—the highest artifact "in the element of Thought"—therefore *appears* in Time simply because the Dialectic, by which it and everything else is moved, is "the unity of differences" and thus *requires* a "development" that "comes into existent Being and into externality." It is only in order for those differences to be united that there must be the moment of self-differentiation: it is from this moment—parallel to Nature in the System as a whole—that Time inevitably appears. For Hegel, "Time" is derived from the dialectical necessity of a Logical Process;⁵² it does not occur to him that a Logical Process necessarily presupposes the objective existence of Time. He therefore continues:

But this element of Thought is itself abstract and is the activity of a single consciousness. Mind is, however not only to be considered as individual, finite consciousness, but as that Mind which is universal and concrete within itself; this concrete universality, however, comprehends all the various sides and modes evolved in which it is and becomes object to the Idea.⁵³

The individual philosopher, being finite, lacks the full concreteness of the dialectical Idea. But it is not only the individual philosopher who thinks. Divested of the inevitable particularity of its apparent creator, which is itself merely a question of "outward form," the Thought embodied in each philosophical system is not simply "the activity of a single consciousness." Considered as such, each system of Thought is in fact an artifact of Mind itself: of a "concrete universality" that contains within itself, that in fact *is*, the Idea thinking itself. This is precisely what Philosophy is. And enclosed within the externality of this very reflection of itself is the merely finite existence in Time of the many individual philosophers.

⁵² It would be interesting to consider the difference between Hegelian and traditional syllogistic logic with respect to time; it is clearly not logic *per se* that presupposes movement and development. Similar questions might arise from considering the temporality of analytic and synthetic judgments.

⁵³ LHP, p. 33.

Thus Mind's thinking comprehension of self is at the same time the progression of the total actuality evolved. This progression is not one which takes its course through the thought of an individual and exhibits itself in a single consciousness for it shows itself to be universal Mind presenting itself in the history of the world in all the richness of its form.⁵⁴

This "richness of...form," the delight of the scientist who strives to know the reason for things, is further accentuated by the fact that each individual philosopher must think the Thoughts required by a particular time and place. The unfolding of Philosophy in Chronological Order is just the externalized form of Thought thinking itself. But the fact that Hegel specifically refers to "the history of the world" and not simply the History of Philosophy indicates just how important this unique passage really is.

It is probably no accident that Hegel chose to give his only account—brief and incomplete as it is—of the crucial connection between Logical and Chronological Development in the case of the History of Philosophy rather than in History as a whole as treated, for example, in his *Lectures on the Philosophy of History*. To take an example he himself uses, it is easier to show that Mathematics is identical to the History of Mathematics than it is to show the History of Philosophy is Philosophy.⁵⁵ Mathematics is precisely not an accumulation of errors and false steps made by those calling themselves "Mathematicians." If *development* is less obvious in Philosophy,⁵⁶ it is even less obvious in World History.⁵⁷ It is not only that

⁵⁴ LHP, p. 33.

⁵⁵ LHP, p. 30: "Whoever studies the history of sciences such as Physics and Mathematics makes himself acquainted with Physics and Mathematics themselves."

⁵⁶ GWFH asserts development in LHP repeatedly. LHP, p. 41: "From this it follows—since the progress of development is equivalent to further determination, and this means further immersion in, and a fuller grasp of the Idea itself—that the latest, most modern and newest philosophy is the most developed, richest and deepest. In that philosophy everything which at first seems to be past and gone must be preserved and retained, and it must itself be a mirror of the whole history."

⁵⁷ Here again GWFH justifies the errors (to use no stronger word) of the past by means of the end result of the whole process of development; LPH, p. 21: "But even regarding History as the slaughter-bench at which the happiness of peoples, the wisdom of States, and the virtue of individuals have been victimized—the question involuntarily arises—to what principle, to what final aim these enormous sacrifices have been offered. From this point the investigation usually proceeds to that which we have made the general commencement of our enquiry. Starting from this we pointed out those phenomena which made up a picture so suggestive of gloomy emotions and thoughtful reflections—as *the very field* which we, for our part, regard as exhibiting only the means for realizing what we assert to be the essential destiny—the absolute aim, or—which comes to the same thing—the true *result* of the World's History."

World History contains more apparent errors than the History of Mathematics. It is also less easy to eliminate the “outward form” of the “particular” from World History than it is in the case of the History of Philosophy. Therefore it is important to attend to the fact that Hegel ends his one paragraph justification of the claim of that Philosophy can appear in Time with categories that call to mind World History rather than Philosophy divested of the particular.

The result of this development is that one form, one stage in the Idea comes to consciousness in one particular race, so that this race and this time expresses only this particular form, within which it constructs its universe and works out its conditions. The higher stage, on the other hand, centuries later reveals itself in another race of people.⁵⁸

Although Hegel chooses to bridge the gap between the Logical Order of Dialectical Progression (on the one hand) and the Chronological Order of Progression in Time (on the other) precisely and distinctively in the case of the History of Philosophy, his emphasis in this passage on the racial element—the structural principle on which his *Lectures on the Philosophy of History* is based—bridges, in turn, the gap between Hegel’s History of Philosophy and his Philosophy of History. Based on the Dialectic itself—and in particular on its negative moment of reflection and self-differentiation—Hegel has provided a far reaching theoretical justification for his claim about the similarity of Logical and Chronological Progression. This justification is far reaching because it applies not simply to the presentation of the History of Philosophy but to the unfolding of Mind in Time. It also indicates the wide-ranging ramifications of Hegel’s peculiar if not scandalous solution to “The Problem of Time.”

⁵⁸ LPH, p. 33.

Introduction to Part I Section 2 (I.2) Chronology and Logic

As I.1.2.3 showed, a methodological discussion of the parallel between the Logical and the Chronological Order of Presentation of the History of Philosophy—the two being, as he himself said, either “similar” or “in the main...the same”—is as close as Hegel comes to sorting out with any kind of rigor the extremely important relationship in his thought between what I will call “Logical” and “Chronological Priority.” It is perfectly obvious to us that it is one thing to be first *in time* and quite another to be *logically* prior. But this distinction is hardly clear in Hegel. For example, the first moment of the Hegelian System is the perfectly abstract moment of pure, undifferentiated Being. But the first philosophical systems were also, according to Hegel, perfectly abstract. Does his *Science of Logic*, for all its claims to self-generation, therefore simply mirror the chronological development of the way Philosophy actually unfolded in time?¹ Or, as is more likely, is Hegel’s apparently empirical presentation of the History of Philosophy all that remains of the actual truth after having been forced to conform to his own System’s *a priori* commitments?

Hegel himself, of course, would choose neither of these insulting alternatives. He maintains that Philosophy unfolded in time in accordance with the Logical Idea and that an empirical presentation of the History of Philosophy is inevitably similar to what unfolds itself in his *Science of Logic*. But if a tendentious set of alternatives like the preceding receives the response “neither,” then another set of alternatives can easily be greeted with a more properly Hegelian “both.” For example, is Hegel’s Philosophy historical or is his vision of History philosophical?² Hegel would doubtless reject *these* mirrored alternatives as examples of mere Understanding’s determination to divide that which is actually one: in the light of Reason, both sides are equally true and bound together by the Dialectic and grounded in the Absolute. But even if Hegel would reject framing this question in terms of alternatives, it is nevertheless important for us to ask ourselves, in as naïve a manner as possible—i.e. with loyalty to the truth

¹ An interesting (and respectful) attempt to show how this could be true is BUTLER, Clark, *Hegel’s Logic: Between Dialectic and History*, Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1996.

² The merely one-sided answer to this question characteristic of Alexander KOJËVE (to be considered in I.2.1.1) is the basis of JUSZEZAK, Joseph, *Hegel et la Liberté*, Paris: Société d’édition D’enseignement Supérieur, 1980; p. 92: “Hegel ne conçoit pas l’histoire à partir de l’Idée éternelle mais el représente l’éternité de l’Idée comme ce qui se profile à l’horizon du progrès de l’histoire.”

rather than to Hegel—about the problematic relationship of Philosophy and History in Hegel’s thought.

This is particularly important because Hegel was the first great philosopher to accord such an important place in his thinking to History: if he is not the first Philosopher of History,³ then he was undoubtedly the first who was also a Historian of Philosophy.³ It is certainly not too much to say that Hegel, more than any of his predecessors, made History a crucial part of Philosophy itself. But we, living in a world still decisively influenced by Hegel’s philosophical embrace of History—i.e. the adoption of World History and the History of Philosophy by Philosophy itself—are apt to think of History in its fully developed form, as it is for us, and not as the mere infant in relation to Philosophy that it was in Hegel’s own time. In fact, I want to suggest that its infancy *then* was precisely the necessary precondition for Hegel’s innovative achievement. *It was precisely not History as we know it today that was absorbed into the Hegelian System.* For us, History has no need of *justifying itself* at the tribunal of Philosophy: it simply exists. This was hardly the case in Hegel’s time. Hegel is not so much bringing History into Philosophy—this would already imply that History was a fully independent subject matter, as it is for us—as he is extending the boundaries of Philosophy (more specifically of Logic and Metaphysics) for the first time into the domain of the totality of human actions considered specifically as part of an unfolding chronological process. We tend to neglect the deeply entrenched prejudice of the philosophical tradition against the merely ephemeral, ceaselessly changing, and perpetually impermanent things of this phenomenal world.

The real reason that Chronological Priority is not sharply distinguished from Logical Priority in Hegel’s thought is that Time itself had always been regarded with so much suspicion by previous philosophers, and in particular, by Hegel’s great predecessor Kant. This suspicion is still visible in Hegel, despite the fact—or rather, precisely *because of the fact*—that he was taking History so seriously for the first time. The question that we find amazing: “How can Philosophy unfold in Time?” can only be understood in this context. It must also be emphasized that Hegel was not simply constructing an unknown and unknowable prehistoric past out of whole cloth—like Hobbes’s State of Nature, for example—in order to justify some preconceived philosophical position. After all, both his Philosophy of History and his History of Philosophy are highly detailed and remarkably comprehensive. But these remarkable achievements were made possible precisely by blurring the boundary between Chronological and Logical Priority. A strong case could doubtless be made for the view that Hegel’s

³ A case could be made for the priority of ARISTOTLE.

failure to sharply distinguish between the two is the greatest weakness—the “Achilles heel,” as I call it—of his entire System. On the other hand, philosophical archeology reveals that his System would have been undermined and indeed *could never have come into existence* had he made a clear distinction between the two. In order to be properly historical, we must recognize that Hegel did not denigrate Chronological Priority by allowing it to be indistinguishably absorbed into Logical Priority: Chronological Priority had never before been paid the high compliment of a great Philosopher’s serious attention.

If Hegel’s own failure to clearly distinguish Logical from Chronological Priority is understandable, the subsequent lack of attention to the question on the part of Hegel scholars is not.⁴ Nor is it forgivable. Rudimentary questions about “The Problem of Time” here remain unanswered and even worse, *unasked*. A clear example of an obvious but unexplored problem is Hegel’s ubiquitous use of the word “*Moment*.” What does this word really mean? There is no doubt that Hegel himself wants to use it in a strictly Logical sense; he manifestly wishes to divest it of any Chronological significance whatsoever. But the word itself is intractable on this score and his use of it is therefore revealing: it is impossible for us (unless properly Hegelianized) to think of “a Moment” except as a Moment of Time. Even if the word “Moment” had been clearly defined by Hegel (which it was not) to mean something like “a timeless step in a Dialectical process” (which is what his System requires that it mean), the word’s etymology, the shadowy nature of its putative referent, and above all the probable self-contradiction involved in any notion of a “timeless step”⁵ would, one hopes, have caused scholars to give serious attention to “The

⁴ A provocative step in the right direction is found in KOSOK, Michael, The Formalization of Hegel’s Dialectical Logic in Alasdair MacIntyre ed., *Hegel: A Collection of Critical Essays*, New York: Doubleday, 1972.

⁵ A syllogism reaching the conclusion “Socrates is mortal” deduces this result from the finite nature of man; the proof has stages only insofar as we are attempting to instantiate a particular truth about Socrates from the finite nature of mortal man in general: the analytic deduction does not, therefore, involve time, only the object in question does. The synthetic aspect of GWFH’s logic, by contrast, inserts a temporal aspect, i.e. a process, even when the object in question is non-temporal. It is important to distinguish between “stages” that are necessary in order to prove a proposition and those that are intrinsic to the logical process under consideration. If one were to ignore GWFH’s determination to integrate Subject and Substance, one might say that traditional logic depends on an external synthetic process enacted by the logician that derives analytic judgments already implicit in the internal structure of the object while in GWFH’s the synthetic process is already implicit in the object’s internal structure while the logician’s task is to embed this process in a whole that renders it ultimately analytic.

Problem of Time in Hegel's Philosophy of History." Doesn't every *process*—indeed *movement* itself, the etymological origin of “moment” in the Latin word “*movimentum*”⁶—inescapably involve motion in Time and therefore the logical priority of Chronological Priority? *The answer to this question is “Yes.”* It is not accidental that Hegel would respond with a botanical metaphor at this point. But should we let him do so? Precisely as a circle, Hegel chooses the life cycle of a plant to supplant the very notion of Chronological Priority; this is why it is a favorite with Hegel. *But all movement in Time isn't circular.* The linguistic marker of Hegel's “Achilles heel” is the word “moment,” the word Hegel must use even when describing *timeless* circular movement like the Logical Concept. This dissertation constitutes an attempt to give the problem underlying this problematic usage the long overdue attention it deserves. Hegel's failure to clearly define the crucial word “moment” should have raised not only the problem addressed here but also the most revealing problem of all: what does the fact that he doesn't clearly define it tell us about his level of self-awareness?

Scholarship certainly hasn't failed to recognize the great influence that Aristotle exercised on Hegel. On the specific question of Priority, the literature contains countless references to the Aristotelian distinction between “first for us” and “first by nature” and how this distinction plays out in Hegel's thought. But nowhere is this Aristotelian distinction properly temporalized, as it really should be when applied to Hegel. The *Science of Logic* is a book that is read, written, and thought sequentially; it unfolds in Time. At the very least, then, its basis in Chronological Priority is something necessary “for us” who read it and also, at least as a matter of

⁶ For the distinction between *das Moment* and *der Moment*, see VIELLARD-BARON, Jean-Louis, *Hegel et l'idéalisme allemand; Imagination, speculation, religion*. Paris: J. Vrin, 1999; p. 171 and n. 4, where he cites HÖLDERLIN's use of the latter. INWOOD, Michael J. *A Hegel Dictionary*. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 1992; p. 311 explains the distinction but notes the decisive etymology shared by both. Cf. the remarks about “trailing clouds of etymology” at AUSTIN, J.L. A Plea for Excuses, the Presidential Address, *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* n.s. 57, 1956-1957, 1-30; p. 27-8: “One is that a word never—well, hardly ever—shakes off its etymology and its formation. In spite of all changes in and extensions of and additions to its meanings, and indeed rather pervading and governing these, there will still persist the old idea.” The word “scandalous” applies in this case because GWFH needed to blind himself to the temporal implications of *das Moment*, implications of which he was fully aware; see II.1.2.2.

exposition,⁷ for Hegel who writes it. Hegel's famous comment about the *Science of Logic* containing the Mind of God before the Creation⁸ is only one of many texts that reveal that Hegel insists that the Logic does not unfold in Time. But at best it doesn't unfold in Time "by nature;" it unquestionably unfolds in Time "for us." It is easy to see how Hegel wishes us to think of this: it is only at the end of the journey that we can realize that the journey itself has only *appeared* to be sequential. By confining his remarks on "the metaphysics of Time" to the *Philosophy of Nature*—i.e. only *after* the going forth of the Logical Idea into externalization in the Physical World—Hegel hoped to avoid the problem of Chronological Priority essential "for us" who read no less than for him who writes the *Logic*. But to turn Hegel's Aristotle on his head for a *moment*: isn't it obvious that although Time is subsequent to Logic *for Hegel*, it is prior to even its first Dialectical Triad *by nature*?

In Hegel's Philosophy of History, an obvious feature of Hegel's Logic—what I have called "Logical Completeness"—is necessarily *superimposed* on a Chronological Process. Precisely because Hegel *failed* to adequately distinguish Logical and Chronological Priority, it was easy for him to view World History in strictly logical terms. Hegel's Logic is a closed circle; I must now show why History inevitably becomes something similar for Hegel. To prove my point, I need only explore what I will call "the Chronological Completeness" of Hegel's Philosophy of History: this is an old and hotly debated problem of "the End of History." But the "end of History" is simply the most obvious *symptom* of Hegel's prior—in both a Logical and Chronological sense—suppression of the chronological element in Logical Completeness. In Part II, I will argue that Hegel managed *to hide from himself* the temporal element in the Hegelian Dialectic. For the present, however, I can take Logical Completeness as I find it in Hegel's Dialectic (as in I.1.1) and then show that something similar is manifest in his account of World History.

But it is important to realize that the critique I will present in "Part II" is already implicit in "Part I." In other words, even though I will focus on the problematic solution that *follows* from Hegel's failure to distinguish Logical from Chronological Priority, the problem Hegel ignores in constructing that solution is always already implicit. In other words, the application of Hegel's allegedly a-temporal Logic to the ineluctably temporal unfolding of History *requires* Chronological Completeness, as I

⁷ It is not only the literary *exposition* of the Concept that opens up "the problem of time": the logical momentum of its *Momente* moves it around.

⁸ WdL, p. 50: "It can therefore be said that this content [sc. "logic...understood as the system of pure reason, as the realm of pure thought"] is the exposition of God as he is in his eternal essence before the creation of nature and a finite mind."

will show. And it is hardly difficult to show that this result—the End of History—is highly problematic. In fact, it is so obviously problematic that Hegel’s defenders—successors to the Left Hegelians of the 19th century like Feuerbach and Marx—are simply forced *to deny that this was Hegel’s position*. Their dominance in Hegel scholarship today forces me to discuss their denial of Chronological Completeness in Hegel’s Philosophy of History (see II.3.1) and this I have found to be an infinitely less rewarding exercise than discussing Hegel himself. Furthermore, there is doubtless a connection here: the failure of Hegel scholars⁹ to see *the prior problem*—i.e. Hegel’s failure to distinguish Logical and Chronological Priority—is closely connected with their own refusal to acknowledge the problematic character of Hegel’s *subsequent solution*: the superimposition of Logical Completeness on World History as Chronological Completeness. If they admitted the problematic nature of Hegel’s *solution*, they would have been forced to return to the problematic *presupposition* on which that solution is based. Conversely, if I have managed to suggest persuasively that Hegel’s failure to distinguish the two senses of Priority is in fact problematic, I have given the reader additional grounds to believe not only that Hegel’s subsequent solution—i.e. the conflation of two senses of completeness—is problematic but that it was, despite the denials of his Left Hegelian defenders, *precisely Hegel’s subsequent solution*.

My discussion of Logical and Chronological Completeness in Hegel’s thought, to which Section 2 of Part I as a whole is devoted and to which the foregoing remarks have been merely introductory, will be divided into two chapters. In Chapter 3, I will review several approaches taken by important scholars to the general connection between Logic and History in Hegel’s thought. This will furnish both an empirical basis—i.e. it will indicate the literature on which I rely to support my claim that the connection between Logic and History *actually exists* in Hegel’s System—and a theoretical context for my own approach to what I will call “the Logical and Chronological Parallel.”

Next, in Chapter 4, I will offer some new theoretical arguments for “the End of History” by showing that Time as most of us think about it—i.e. the linear process of tick-tock time extending into the infinite future—is flatly rejected by Hegel in his *Philosophy of Nature* and therefore that Chronological Completeness, no matter how repugnant such a view may be to our own limited *understanding*, is perfectly consistent with Hegel’s theoretical rejection of what he calls “the Spurious Infinite.” Chapter 4 therefore contains the philosophical archeology to which I have several times referred and which will become the basis for the critique of Hegel I

⁹ For example, see Chapter 1 of JARCYK, Gwendoline, *Système et Liberté Dans la Logique de Hegel* (2nd edition), Paris: Éditions Kimé, 2001.

will present in Part II. I will also explore a most promising way to think about *how* the Parallel between Logical and Chronological development turns into the presence of Completeness in both: Hegel's revival of "final causality" in the Dialectic and how this connects to the teleological Theodicy that he claims World History actually constitutes.

Chapter 3 (I.2.1) The Logical and Chronological Parallel

Although Logical and Chronological *Completeness* can and will hereafter be meaningfully discussed without attempting to solve the more difficult problem from which it arises *by nature*—i.e. from the blurred distinction between Logical and Chronological *Priority* in Hegel's thought—it arises in the first place from the simple observation of a clear parallel between Hegel's Dialectical Logic on the one hand and the way he treats various processes like Religion, the History of Philosophy, or World History in general that unfold chronologically on the other. In other words, it is only because there is a clear connection between the Hegelian Dialectic and the way he presents e.g. World History in the first place, that something parallel to the *Logical* Completeness of the Hegelian Dialectic also manifests itself as *the Chronological Completeness of World History*: i.e. the End of History. Moreover, unlike the problem of Logical and Chronological *Priority*, the more general *Logical and Chronological Parallel* in Hegel's thought has already received serious scholarly attention. In *História e Metafísica em Hegel: Sobre a Noção de Espírito do Mundo*, Maria Borges has demonstrated the Logical and Chronological Parallel in Hegel's Philosophy of History.¹⁰ Revealing a willingness to take Hegel's metaphysics seriously, Borges shows that Hegel's Philosophy of History in fact constitutes what she calls "an indirect proof" of the existence of God and, for much the same reason, the truth of the Hegelian System.¹¹ In other words, Borges points to the Logical and Chronological Parallel as a reason for taking Hegel's defense of metaphysics *more seriously* while I am using this same Parallel rather to raise *the central problem* of Hegel's Philosophy of History. But despite the difference in our purposes, the Logical and

¹⁰ BORGES, Maria de Lourdes Alves, *História e Metafísica em Hegel: Sobre a Noção de Espírito do Mundo*, Porto Alegre: EDIPUCRS, Porto Alegre, 1998 (hereafter "BORGES").

¹¹ BORGES, p. 232: "Quanto à prova indireta, a filosofia mostra a validade histórica das seqüências categorais da *Ciência da Lógica*; afirma-se a tese desta indiretamente, visto que, quem a nega, não poderá dizer algo com sentido do mundo. ¶ A prova histórica complementar a prova da *Lógica*."

Chronological Parallel remains the same for both and is, moreover, at the heart of both our projects.

Borges documents this Parallel in the second Part of her book called “Tempo e Conceito.” Because she is working specifically with Hegel’s Philosophy of History, Borges pays particular attention to “the concept of Objective Spirit:” it is at the end of this division that World History enters Hegel’s System. In other words, she does not so much consider the Concept in itself in relation to Time but describes a particular aspect of the Parallel between them primarily in the *Philosophy of Mind* and *The Philosophy of Right*. But her title “Time and Concept” is nevertheless most appropriate: the relationship between “Concept” and “Time” in general is certainly the theoretical basis for what I am calling “the Logical and Chronological Parallel”—visible throughout Hegel’s account of Objective Spirit as Borges has shown—in Hegel’s thought as a whole.

And it is under the title “Concept and Time” that some of the most serious and illuminating work has been done on the theoretical basis for the Logical and Chronological Parallel in Hegel’s thought. Having explicitly taken the work of Borges as the basis for the claim that this Parallel actually exists in the Hegelian System, I will next discuss three scholars who have discussed the more general question of “Concept and Time”—the theoretical basis for this Parallel—in Hegel’s philosophy. These are Alexander Kojève (whose views are closely related, as I will show, and will therefore be discussed in connection to those of Martin Heidegger), Jean Hypollite, and, most recently, by Karin de Boer.

I.2.1.1. Kojève and Heidegger

In his 1938-39 lectures published as *Introduction à la Lecture de Hegel*,¹² Alexander Kojève offered a bold explanation for what I have called “the Logical and Chronological Parallel:” he claimed simply that, for Hegel, the Concept *is* Time.¹³ The textual basis for this claim he finds in *The Phenomenology of Spirit* and is stated by Kojève as “*Die Zeit ist der daseinde Begriff selbst*” (“Time is the Concept itself which is there [in empirical existence]”).¹⁴ He also emphasizes another radically

¹² KOJÈVE, Alexander, *Introduction à la Lecture de Hegel. Leçons sur la Phénoménologie de l’Esprit professées de 1933 à 1939 à l’École des Hautes-Études*, Paris: Raymond Queneau, 1947. My citations are to KOJÈVE, Alexander, *Introduction to the Reading of Hegel, Lectures on the Phenomenology of Spirit*. Translated by James H. Nichols Jr. and Allen Bloom. New York: Basic Books, 1969 (hereafter “KOJÈVE”).

¹³ KOJÈVE, p. 102.

¹⁴ KOJÈVE, p. 101.

decontextualized phrase from Hegel's unpublished lecture notes from the Jena period to the effect that "Geist *ist* Zeit" ("Spirit is Time").¹⁵

In his "Concept and Time in Hegel," John Burbidge has shown that Kojève distorts Hegel's intentions and I am fully persuaded by Burbidge that Kojève's analysis of Hegel is wrong.¹⁶ But I would add that it is wrong in a revealing way. Kojève completely ignores what Hegel himself has to say about Time. Instead of trying to make sense of Hegel's rather bizarre conception of Time as revealed in the *Philosophy of Nature*, Kojève takes Time and History as givens—as they undoubtedly are—and then claims that Hegel is orienting himself to them, which he emphatically is not. "The aim of Hegel's philosophy is to give an account of the fact of History."¹⁷ As we saw in the Introduction to the *Lectures on the History of Philosophy*, Hegel's actual aim was the exact opposite: the given for Hegel (what Kojève calls a "fact") was *Philosophy as it unfolds in a timeless Logical process*; Hegel's aim was to demonstrate how Philosophy can also unfold in Time, i.e. in History. *Philosophy was Hegel's given, not History*. Kojève is therefore correct about the Logical and Chronological Parallel but for exactly the wrong reason: Hegel clearly has no intention of claiming that the Chronological is prior to the Logical but exactly the reverse.

Nor is this the only instance of Kojève being right for the wrong reason. The most important example of this fascinating phenomenon is the vexed question of "the End of History."¹⁸ Kojève's name has unfortunately

¹⁵ KOJÈVE, p. 133-34.

¹⁶ See BURBIDGE, John, Concept and Time in Hegel in *Dialogue* v. 12, p. 403-22, 1973; p. 404: "A conceptual comprehension of history, however, cannot take place if the concept is time." Hence the erroneous reversal of GWFH at JUSZEZAK, Joseph, *Hegel et la Liberté*, Paris: Société d'édition D'enseignement Supérieur, 1980; p. 92: "Hegel ne conçoit pas l'histoire à partir de l'Idée éternelle mais el représente l'éternité de l'Idée comme ce qui se profile à l'horizon du progrès de l'histoire."

¹⁷ KOJÈVE, p. 133. Perhaps the strongest form of this erroneous claim is found on KOJÈVE, p.145: "...there is conceptual understanding only where there is an essentially temporal, that is, historical reality..." Although KOJÈVE doubtless distorts GWFH's intentions, he at least offers an answer to the question of Logical and Chronological Priority: the chronological kind is unquestionably prior.

¹⁸ As to the possibility of being *wrong* (about the End of History in Hegel) for the wrong reason, see ROSENFELD, Denis L. *Política e Liberdade em Hegel*, São Paulo: Editora Brasiliense, 1983; p. 60. "O problema consiste em analisar as relações entre o conceito e o tempo, entre o lógico e o histórico. A identificação de um com o outro permite, de um lado, mostrar que o espírito é tempo e que o conceito forma-se historicamente [i.e. what I am calling "the wrong reason"], mas, por outro lado, esta identificação pode também resultar na concepção falsa, mas vulgarizada, de sistema hegeliano como um sistema fechado que expressaria o fim da história."

become inextricably linked to his correct perception of the End of History in Hegel's thought. This is a great advantage to Hegel's defenders: they would much prefer to attack Kojève¹⁹ and those who follow him on this point²⁰ rather than be forced to defend Hegel. Conversely, any critic of Hegel—as one would think *almost* anyone who attributes to him the remarkable conception of the End of History must be²¹—must necessarily appear to be a defender of Kojève and his followers. It is therefore important for me to state categorically: in attributing the End of History, or what I call “Chronological Completeness,” to Hegel, I will not be following Kojève but simply reading Hegel's text as I find it. In order to emphasize my disagreement with his approach, I will suggest that Kojève sees the End of History in Hegel less as a result of a good reading of Hegel—even though precisely *a good reading of Hegel* sustains his conclusion—than as a result of illegitimately reading Heidegger into Hegel. In any case, it is in Alexander Kojève's approach to the End of History that Martin Heidegger's influence on him becomes obvious.²²

On the basis of the Jena fragment, Kojève offers a suspiciously Heideggerian formulation for Hegel's conception of Time:

In the Time of which Hegel speaks, on the other hand, the movement is engendered in the Future and goes toward the Present by way of the Past: Future→Past→Present (→Future). And this indeed the specific

¹⁹ See, for examples, MAURER, Reinhart Klemens, *Hegel und das Ende der Geschichte; Interpretationen zur »Phänomenologie des Geistes«*, Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1965; 139-156 and BURBIDGE, John, *Hegel on Logic and Religion: The Reasonableness of Christianity*, Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992. The latter's attempt to read the future into Hegel's approach to Christianity disproves the old adage that the enemy (BURBIDGE) of my enemy (KOJÈVE) is necessarily my friend.

²⁰ For the most interesting among these, see ROSEN, Stanley, *G. W. F. Hegel: An Introduction to the Science of Wisdom*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974. A more slavish example is COOPER, Barry, *The End of History: An Essay on Modern Hegelianism*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1984. My point, of course, is that one can agree with KOJÈVE on this point (sc. the End of History) and not be his follower.

²¹ An exception would be FUKUYAMA, Francis, The End of History? in *The National Interest* v. 16, p. 3-18, 1989. Naturally, FUKUYAMA acknowledges the influence of KOJÈVE (see II.2.2).

²² The clearest indication (and first warning) of the Heideggerian orientation of his approach to pseudo-Hegel (because GWFH himself often seems to vanish in his remarks) is found at KOJÈVE, p. 102, n. 1. Having written in the text: “Third Possibility: the Concept is Time, and hence is related neither to Eternity nor Time; this is Hegel's position” (KOJÈVE, p. 102), he adds in the note: “(Hegel and Heidegger represent this third possibility).”

structure of properly *human*—that is, *historical*—Time.²³

Although it is well beyond the scope of my present purpose to elaborate the point, Kojève's examples of "a future war,"²⁴ of Julius Caesar at the Rubicon,²⁵ and his emphasis on *Arbeit* and *Kampf*²⁶ (all buried in footnotes)

²³ KOJÈVE, p. 134. Compare HEIDEGGER, Martin, *Sein und Zeit*, Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1976 (hereafter "SZ"), p. 326 as found in HEIDEGGER, Martin, *Being and Time*. Translated by Joan Stambaugh, Albany: State University of New York Press, 1996; (hereafter "BT"), p. 300: "Futurally coming back to itself, resoluteness brings itself to the situation in making it present. Having-been [sc. the Past] arises from the future in such a way that the future that has been (or better, is in the process of having-been) releases the present from itself."

²⁴ See KOJÈVE, p. 136, n. 24. Speaking in 1938-39, KOJÈVE not only points out that "in deciding for the future war, one decides *against* the prevailing peace" but he specifically states that "if it [sc. "the prevailing peace"] is humiliating, its negation is an act worthy of a statesman." Moreover, the use of "a future war" as an example to illustrate HEIDEGGER's conception of Time [note that n. 24 is attached to the following sentence: "The Time that Hegel has in view, then, is human or historical time: it is the time of conscious and voluntary action which realizes in the *present* a Project for the *future*, which Project is formed on the basis of knowledge of the *past*"] provides supporting evidence for my view that already in *Sein und Zeit* (1927), HEIDEGGER (who joined the Nazis in 1933), was calling for remaking Germany's present by resolutely deciding on a future (World War II) that emerged from her past (the World War which would thereby become "the First World War." He was already calling it "the first World War" in 1934 (See "25 Jahre nach unserem Abiturium") in HEIDEGGER, Martin, *Gesamtausgabe*, Bd. 16, Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 2000; p. 280). See also my "Martin Heidegger and the First World War; *Being and Time* as Funeral Oration" (unpublished manuscript).

²⁵ KOJÈVE, p. 135, n. 25: "The moment is historic because the man taking a nocturnal walk is thinking about a *coup d'état*, the civil war, the conquest of Rome, and world wide dominion."

²⁶ KOJÈVE, p. 142, n. 33: "In Hegel, on the other hand, the "mediation" is active; it is *Tat* or *Tun*, action negating the given, the activity of Fighting and Work." The second time he says the same thing in this note, he uses his German more revealingly. "Now, the transformation of given Being in terms of the concept-project is, precisely, conscious and voluntary *Action* [like Caesar's decision to cross the Rubicon], *Tun* which is *Arbeit* and *Kampf*" (ibid.). It must be kept in mind that KOJÈVE was the friend and collaborator of Leo STRAUSS, the master of exotericism and "writing between the lines" (see STRAUSS, Leo, *On Tyranny; Including the Strauss-Kojève Correspondence*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000). STRAUSS compared the National Socialist Revolution to ancient Rome in a 1933 letter to Karl LÖWITH. "And, as to the substance of the matter: i.e. that Germany having turned to the right does not tolerate us, that proves absolutely nothing against right-wing principles. On the contrary: only on the basis of right-wing principles—on the basis of fascistic, authoritarian, *imperial* principles—is it

will give the interested reader some political indications of why I have such a rooted antipathy to being associated with his views in any way. For the present, the important point is that the primacy of the Future (that he attributes to Hegel) is in fact thoroughly Heideggerian in origin. “Now, this Future, for Man, is his death, that future of his which will never become his Present; and the only reality or real presence of this Future is the knowledge that Man has in the present of his future death.” It is on this thoroughly Heideggerian basis that Kojève announces the End of History in Hegel:

If, then, the Concept is in Time, that is, if conceptual understanding is *dialectical*, the existence of the Concept—is essentially finite. Therefore History itself must be essentially *finite*; collective Man (humanity) must die just as the human individual dies; universal History must have a definitive *end*.²⁷

Although Kojève gives a superficially Heideggerian reading to Hegel, Martin Heidegger himself offered some very useful observations about the Concept and Time in Section of §82 of *Sein und Zeit*. Heidegger accurately situates Hegel’s version of Time *within the Concept* rather than, as is the case with Kojève, adapting Hegel’s Concept to Heidegger’s notion of Time. To begin with, Heidegger takes seriously the Hegelian problem of how Mind can possibly “fall into time.”²⁸ Heidegger also pays due regard to treatment of Time in Hegel’s *Philosophy of Nature*²⁹ and emphasizes a

possible with integrity, without the ridiculous and pitiful appeal to the *droits imprescriptibles de l’homme*, to protest against the repulsive monster [*das meskine Unwesen*]. I am reading Caesar’s *Commentaries* with deeper understanding, and I think about Virgil: *Tu regere imperio...parcere subjectis et debellare superbos*. There exists no reason to crawl to the cross [*zu Kreuze zu Kriechen*], to liberalism’s cross of as well, as long as somewhere in the world there yet glimmers a spark of the *Roman idea*” (STRAUSS, Leo, *Gesammelte Schriften*, edited by Heinrich Meier, with the editorial assistance of Wiebke Meier, Volume 3: *Hobbes’ Politische Wissenschaft und zugehörige Schriften; Briefe*, J. B. Metzlar, Stuttgart and Weimar, 2001; translation mine).

²⁷ KOJÈVE, p. 148. This is not to say that KOJÈVE completely misreads GWFH: the next sentence puts it very well. “We know that for Hegel the end of history is marked by the appearance of Science in the form of a Book—that is, by the appearance of the Wise Man or of *absolute Knowledge in the World*” (KOJÈVE, p. 148). Hegel himself is the—at once textual and extra-textual—proof of the End of History.

²⁸ HEIDEGGER, SZ, p. 428/BT, pp. 391-92.

²⁹ HEIDEGGER, SZ, p. 429/BT, p. 392. HEIDEGGER emphasizes that GWFH is thereby (i.e. by placing his systematic discussion of Time within the *Philosophy of Nature*) following ARISTOTLE, the *locus classicus* of what HEIDEGGER calls the

crucial fact that Kojève either ignores or suppresses: that Hegel's vision of Time is inseparable from Intuition³⁰ and is therefore not a self-standing "fact" as Kojève had called it. Not only does Heidegger place Time in its Hegelian context—in the *second* part of System, i.e. the *Philosophy of Nature*—but he goes on to link it to the *second* moment of the first Triad in Hegel's Logic (*Nichts* or "nothing") and, moreover, comes very close to brilliantly linking Time to the *second* moment of the Logic as whole (*Wesen* or "essence").³¹ Both because the discussion of the theoretical basis for the Logical and Chronological Parallel it contains is thought provoking and because he considers the entire passage from the *Phenomenology* from which Kojève misleadingly extracts his central text,³² an exegesis of a single crucial paragraph in Section §82 of *Being and Time* will not be out of place here.³³

Since the restlessness of the development of *spirit* bringing itself to its concept is the *negation of a negation*, it is in accordance with its self-actualization to fall "into *time*" as the immediate *negation of a negation*.

This is a brilliant insight on Heidegger's part. Taking seriously Hegel's placement of Time at the beginning of the *Philosophy of Nature*, itself the externalized negation of *Logic*, he carefully explains how the purely abstract and undifferentiated form of this negation (Space) is itself negated, and thereby becomes differentiated, as Time.³⁴ Just as the *Philosophy of*

"vulgar" conception of Time. According to HEIDEGGER, GWFH's "conception of time presents the most radical way in which the vulgar understanding of time has been given form conceptually" (SZ, p. 428/BT, p. 292).

³⁰ HEIDEGGER, SZ, pp. 430-31/BT, pp. 393-94. For criticism of Heidegger's connection of GWFH and ARISTOTLE, see MAJETSCHAK, Stefan, *Die Logik des Absoluten. Spekulation und Zeitlichkeit in der Philosophie Hegels*, Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1992. In his review of MAJETSCHAK's book in *Geschichte, Zeit und versöhnende Ewigkeit bei Hegel, Hegel-Studien* v. 29, p. 158-169, 1994, Stephan BAECKERS points out that Karl JASPERS had earlier criticized HEIDEGGER on this score (p. 167).

³¹ This link is implied (but not further developed) in the two questions with which HEIDEGGER begins his inquiry at SZ, p. 428, BT, p. 392 (emphases mine): "(1) How does Hegel define the *essence* of time? (2) What belongs to the *essence* of spirit that makes it possible for it to "fall into time"?"

³² As BURBIDGE points out in *Concept and Time in Hegel*.

³³ This paragraph (HEIDEGGER, SZ, p. 434) will be broken into five parts in the following discussion. They will not be cited individually.

³⁴ HEIDEGGER shows himself to be a skilled exegete of GWFH in the paragraph about Space and Time on SZ, p. 430 (BT, p. 393). Emphasizing GWFH's expression "*Punktualität*" (Space is *the condition of the possibility of the individual Point* rather than being either any one Point or the totality of said Points),

Spirit constitutes the negation of Nature's negation of Logic, so also is Time the negation of Space's negation of the Idea in Itself (Logic) and is, therefore, itself accurately positioned as the first moment of Nature. On the basis of this parallel—i.e. that both Time and Concept are “the negation of a negation”—Heidegger offers us a suggestive explanation, one that seems quite faithful to Hegel's intentions, for the possibility of Spirit “falling into” Time.³⁵

At this point, Heidegger quotes Hegel himself: the passage from which Kojève lifted his excerpt.

For “time is the *concept* itself that *is there*, and it represents itself to consciousness as empty intuition. For this reason spirit necessarily appears in time, and it appears in time as long as it has not *grasped* its pure concept, that is, has not annulled [*tilgt*] time. Time is the pure self that is externally intuited and *not grasped* by the itself, the concept merely intuited” [Heidegger cites “Phänomenologie des Geistes. WW. II, S. 604” in a footnote].

This crucial passage about “annulled time” is central to any adequate understanding of Time (and therefore History) in Hegel's System. Unless one grasps that Time is subject to *Tilgung* (annulment) simply by accurately grasping its “pure concept,” one cannot possibly grasp the condition for the possibility of what I have called “Chronological Completeness.” Time can only become complete—History can have an End—because for Hegel, Time is annulled (*tilgt*) in its pure Concept. At the risk of making the exact same point for a third time, the Logical Completeness of *conceptual* Time annuls—and therefore *completes*—*chronological* Time. Although Heidegger does not emphasize Hegel's debt to Kant, his insistence that Time is “the merely intuited” Concept—that Time is for consciousness merely “an empty intuition”—shows that Time is no more a “fact” for Hegel than it was for Kant. Spirit appears in time—and the word “appears” is decisive—for us only *before* we grasp that it is

HEIDEGGER shows how purely undifferentiated “punctuality” becomes distinct as (both the individual Point *and*) Time by “...the positing of itself for itself” as the “now-here, now-here, and soon.” Thus: “Every point “is” posited for itself as a now-point.” This, by the way, confirms HEIDEGGER's own view that GWFH, while radicalizing it, is simultaneously *preserving the vulgar dominance of the present in the traditional concept of time*. It will be seen that KOJÈVE, by collapsing the distinction between HEIDEGGER and GWFH on Time, misreads HEIDEGGER. But, in fairness, he seems to do so *intentionally* (i.e. in full knowledge of GWFH's actual position). See KOJÈVE, p. 143, n. 34 where he demonstrates his awareness of that position.

³⁵ See also WdL, p. 842-3.

annulled *by its concept*. It will be noted that the ambiguity of the word “before” reveals the bedeviling reappearance—“bedeviling,” that is, from Hegel’s perspective; say rather *sublime* from ours—of the problem of Logical and Chronological *Priority*.

Heidegger comments only briefly on this passage and therefore fails to persuade us that his most brilliant insight—the possible connection of Time to *Wesen*, the second moment of Logic—is anything more than an undeveloped hypothesis: “Thus spirit appears in time necessarily *in accordance with its essence*.” Time, of course, is external to Hegel’s *Science of Logic* as understood by Hegel himself and therefore as he wants us to understand it. In other words, there is no doubt that Hegel’s System accords priority to *Logical* rather than Chronological Priority. But even if we are unwilling to see Chronological Priority at work from *the very beginning* of the Logic,³⁶ we could perhaps suggest that Hegel should have introduced it (as mere *Schein*, of course) in the Doctrine of Essence (*Wesen*) rather than wait until the *Philosophy of Nature*. Be that as it may, although Heidegger doesn’t draw our attention explicitly to the problems that arise from placing Time in Nature—rather than in the *Reflexion* of *Wesen*—he does perhaps suggest them by the second quotation from Hegel in the paragraph:

“Thus world history in general is the interpretation of spirit in time, just as the idea interprets itself in nature as space” [Heidegger cites “Die Vernunft in der Geschichte a. a. O. S. 134” in a footnote].

This passage calls to mind the more famous passage from the last chapter of the *Phenomenology*, to which the discussion of Hyppolite that follows in I.2.1.2 will inevitably direct us. Therefore extended comment on this passage is unnecessary here. But one crucial point must be made: it is obvious that Heidegger offers no support to those who wish to find *two*

³⁶ Or even *before* the beginning! Is the *Phenomenology* (i.e. the journey of Spirit described therein rather than the 1807 book itself) Logically or Chronologically Prior to the *Science of Logic*? See HARRIS, Errol E. A Reply to Philip Grier in Di Giovanni, George ed. *Essays on Hegel’s Logic*, p. 77-84. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1990; p. 79: “The beginning of the Logic (with pure Being), although it is logically presuppositionless, does at the same time necessarily imply at least the dialectical process of the *Phenomenology*, which has raised consciousness to the level of absolute knowing, below which no genuine *wissenschaftliche* beginning can be made at all.”

types of Time in Hegel: the Natural and the Historical.³⁷ Without basis in Hegel's text, notoriously sparse on the subject of Time as it is, this distinction seems to be the latest development in the attempt to outflank "the End of History." Nor must much time be spent on the last two sentences of Heidegger's paragraph:

The "excluding" that belongs to the moment of development contains a relation to nonbeing. That is time, understood in terms of the revolt of the now.

The first sentence brilliantly but obscurely links Time to the second moment of the Logic's first Triad: although his meaning is unclear, there is definitely something profound in Heidegger's suggestion that Time's role can only be understood in relation to *the second moments* of the Hegelian Dialectic, i.e. in relation to Nothing, Essence, and Nature. Perhaps Heidegger does not fully develop this promising hypothesis because he prefers to see Time *not simply as belonging to the moment of negativity*—where it is naturally susceptible to a conceptual *Tilgung* in the synthetic moment of *Begriff*—but as the negation of Space's negation: only in relation to Space can Hegel's conception of Time, no matter how radicalized, promote *the vulgar understanding of Time* which gives priority to the Present that is Heidegger's real opponent in the historical portions of *Being and Time*. This is the import of the second sentence: what he calls here "the revolt of the now" is the self-differentiation of Space's "punctuality" as Time's *this point now*. But such questions have nothing to do with Hegel.

Nevertheless, it is to be hoped that this examination of Heidegger and Kojève has helped us clarify the theoretical presuppositions for the Logical and Chronological Parallel so basic for grasping Hegel's Philosophy of History. Most importantly, this juxtaposition of Heidegger and Kojève has revealed that the true preconditions for a conception of Chronological Completeness need not be based on Kojève's superficial identification of Time and Concept: it results from the *Tilgung* of Time in the pure Concept thereof.

I.2.1.2. Hyppolite

Jean Hyppolite and H.S. Harris are the two towering Hegel scholars of the second half of the 20th century. By choosing to consider Hyppolite

³⁷ See BAEKERS, S.F. Die Zeit als Mitte der Philosophie Hegels, *Hegel-Studien* v. 30, p. 121-143, 1995. See also ARANTES, P. A., *Hegel: A ordem do tempo*. Tradução e prefácio de Rubens Rodrigues Torres. Sao Paulo: Hucitec, 2000; p. 349.

here—the work of H.S. Harris,³⁸ of course, is primarily historical-biographical and therefore not germane to the immediate question at hand—I am making no secret of the fact that I consider his views on the place of History in Hegel’s *Phenomenology* to be fundamentally sound and indeed as the basis of my own.

In his groundbreaking *Genèse et structure de la Phénoménologie de l’esprit de Hegel* (1946),³⁹ the book I will consider here, Jean Hyppolite is very cautious on the question of “the End of History.” Having posed the important question: “Are we to think that this stage [sc. absolute knowledge] is precisely the end of time and that Hegel naïvely thought that history came to end with his system?” Hyppolite thoughtfully responds, “Although this accusation has often been made, it seems unjust *in certain respects*” (emphasis mine).⁴⁰ But Hyppolite does not explain in precisely what “respects” such an “accusation” is “unjust.”⁴¹ Instead, he provides a reason, indeed the decisive reason, for thinking that it’s true:

The difficulty of the last chapter of the *Phenomenology* (“absolute Knowledge”) is not merely due to Hegel’s terminology and the manner of his exposition; it is inherent in the very nature of the problem.⁴²

Hyppolite is here politely referring to “the last chapter of the *Phenomenology*” as *the difficulty* that challenges those who reject the view “that Hegel naïvely thought that history came to end with his system.” Nor, he insists, is this a mere question of the “terminology” used in that chapter.

To surmount all transcendence and yet to preserve the life of the spirit presupposes a dialectical relation between the temporal and the supratemporal that cannot easily be thought.⁴³

³⁸ I am thinking in particular of HARRIS, H.S. *Hegel’s Development: Night Thoughts* (Jena 1801-1806), Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983 (hereafter “HARRIS”) although the first volume has been at my hand for years.

³⁹ My references will be to HYPOLITE, Jean, *Genesis and Structure of Hegel’s Phenomenology of Spirit*. Translated by Samuel Cherniak and John Heckman. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1974 (hereafter “HYPOLITE”).

⁴⁰ HYPOLITE, p. 45.

⁴¹ He was certainly aware that it was unjust when made by KOJÈVE; the two were often linked as rivals at the time.

⁴² HYPOLITE, pp. 45-46.

⁴³ HYPOLITE, p. 46. After confining himself to the past (in order to avoid the question of how GWFH regarded the future), HYPOLITE returns to this dialectic later in the paragraph. “Perhaps the problem of the past of absolute knowledge is not [as his previous distinction had suggested] entirely different from the problem of the future. There too, the solution must be dialectical” (ibid.). It is unclear to

Hyppolite puts the dilemma very well. Ceaseless and infinitely continuous dialectical change—the self-abolition that occurs along each stage of “the life of the spirit;” i.e. the journey *in time* described in the *Phenomenology*—“cannot easily be thought” (that states the case very tactfully!) alongside Hegel’s *absolute commitment* “to surmount all transcendence.” For all the movement and life *within* each dialectic, for all the one-sidedness of each apparent resolution *that drives the process on*, the simple and irreducible fact is that the *Phenomenology*, like *The Science of Logic* and the *Encyclopaedia of the Philosophical Sciences*, ends *and can only end* with the same “terminology” that always provides the very same “difficulty”—at least for the open-ended reading of Hegel favored by the Left Hegelians—whether the final topic is “Absolute Knowing,” “Absolute Knowledge,” or the “Absolute Idea.” The circle comes round and closes on itself. “The Truth is the Whole.” There is no God apart from the World; *there is not even any equally unknown and inscrutable Future transcending our knowledge.*⁴⁴ There can’t be. While there can be no question that “infinitely continuous dialectical change” is the doctrine that makes Hegel *attractive*, it is the “absolute commitment to surmount all transcendence” that makes Hegel *Hegel*.

Hyppolite knows this, but sees no reason to hit us over the head with the fact. His goal, after all, is neither *to be Hegel* nor *to make Hegel attractive*: he just wants to understand how Hegel came to think as he did. And so he tactfully sidesteps the issue:

But this is not precisely the problem that we wish to discuss here. We are less concerned here with the future that appears to consciousness that has reached absolute knowledge than we are with the past that our consciousness has used in the course of its development.⁴⁵

what extent HYPOLITE regards “cannot easily be thought” as identical with “dialectical.”

⁴⁴ The only evidence cited by HYPOLITE “contradicting the claim that he [sc. GWFH] claimed to stop time at his time” (HYPOLITE, p. 46) is a passage he quotes from the *Philosophy of Right* (p. 11) that, *if taken self-referentially* (see II.3.2) would relativize GWFH’s System to his own time. HYPOLITE avoids the issue with poetry at p. 46: “This does not mean that the conception of what exists is merely the conception of a contingent, transitory element [i.e. Time that can bring about Future Developments]; on the contrary, in the cross of the present suffering [but only from the perspective of GWFH’s Absolute Knowledge!] we must recognize the rose and rejoice in it. ¶ Let us return to the problem of the past.”

⁴⁵ HYPOLITE, p. 46. This important passage continues: “Our question [note the repetition for emphasis] is to what extent that past—which coincides only in part with [the ‘fact’ of] world history and which, properly speaking [as HYPOLITE

What the future looked like to Hegel⁴⁶ is not Hyppolite's concern: "the problem that we wish to discuss here" is not "the End of History" but rather the journey *through the past* described in Hegel's breathtakingly brilliant *Phenomenology of Spirit*. He does that very well indeed.

It is the *place* where History is found in Hyppolite's account of the *Phenomenology* that is particularly relevant to my present purpose. Like the rest of us, Kojève accords History an *objective* existence: he simply assumes that it is a "fact" and that its *locus* is "the outside world." Hyppolite takes Hegel's assault on the subject/object distinction, itself borrowed from Schelling and intrinsic to Idealism, seriously.⁴⁷ He thereby unearths the radical conception that History for Hegel does not constitute some external, empirical object: the *locus* of History is *within* "the substance that is subject as well."⁴⁸ In the chapter he calls "History and

himself has discovered], is not a philosophy of [objective and externally existing] history but the recollection of world history in an individual consciousness that is rising to [Absolute] knowledge—is determined abstractly [i.e. by its place in—and therefore relative to its—Time; this is the price incurred by reading the quotation from the *Philosophy of Right* mentioned in the previous note as self-referential] and to what extent it evinces a necessity [each step being retrospectively necessitated as the process culminating in Absolute Knowledge]" (HYPPOLITE, p. 46). For HYPPOLITE's awareness that the latter is GWFH's favored alternative, see p. 4: "He [sc. GWFH] indicates the necessity of an evolution of consciousness and, at the same time, the end point of this evolution. Finally, he specifies the technique of phenomenological development, showing how this development is the work of consciousness engaged in experience and how the {internal} necessity of this development can be thought out retrospectively by philosophy."

⁴⁶ The "consciousness that has reached absolute Knowledge" doubtless had no concern for it whatsoever; he had enough to think about by simply thinking himself!

⁴⁷ See HYPPOLITE, p. 5-7.

⁴⁸ Here again, HYPPOLITE (p. 40) emphasizes the influence of SCHELLING. "Individual consciousness [as subject] must become aware within itself of its substance, which at first—when this consciousness is still at the beginning of its philosophical and spiritual itinerary—appears to it as external. Schelling had already insisted on this immanence of history in the individual's present [this immanence will be discussed in greater detail below]: "We assert that no individual consciousness could be posed with all the determinations with which it is posed and which necessarily belong to it, if the whole of history had not preceded it—as could easily be demonstrated by examples if we were discussing works of art" [HYPPOLITE cites "Schelling, SW, III, 590"]. It will easily be seen that SCHELLING's radical subsumption of historical development to the individual as subject could easily be reversed, as it was by MARX, to become the subsumption of the individual to historical development. Between the early SCHELLING and MARX, history had become emancipated from Idealism. GWFH is the transitional

Phenomenology,” Hyppolite develops the claim that the journey described in Hegel’s *Phenomenology of Mind* is not historical because it recapitulates the history of what *our distant ancestors* have *objectively* done in the *Past* but because it contains the History that *we ourselves subjectively* are while traversing our turbulent path to, and the distinction-devouring moment of, *Absolute Knowledge* wherein we reach an eternal Present that contains both Future and Past as mere moments.⁴⁹

And thus it happens that Hyppolite’s Hegel can’t make the outrageous claim that History objectively ends because for Hegel *History never had any objective existence in the first place*: the first and last place in Hegel’s thought belongs to Idealism.⁵⁰ Like any other apparently objective thing, History *appears* to be *external* to the subject. Schelling, following Spinoza, had shown Hegel the way to collapse the distinction between *subject* and the apparently external *object* “Nature.”⁵¹ Because the *subject* at the center of Idealism is also Spinozistic⁵² *substance*, it always already contains both the apparent *object*—Nature considered as “extension”⁵³—as well as the

figure: his motives were SCHELLING’s but his comprehensive audacity—his attempt to subsume all of history, not just art—made an approach like MARX’s possible and perhaps inevitable. It is crucial to realize that History is not yet emancipated in this sense for GWFH.

⁴⁹ HYPOLITE, p. 40-1: “Thus there is a certain relation between phenomenology and the philosophy of history. Phenomenology is the concrete, explicit development and formation of the individual, the rise of his finite self to absolute self. But that elevation is possible only through the use of the moments of world history, moments which are immanent in that individual consciousness.”

⁵⁰ HYPOLITE, p. 7: “In Hegel’s philosophy, the absolute is no longer only *substance*; it is *subject* as well. Schelling’s Spinozism can be superseded only by a return to the subjectivism of Kant and Fichte. Then the absolute will not be beyond all knowledge; it will be self-knowledge in the knowledge of consciousness.”

⁵¹ HYPOLITE, p. 7: “Hegel wanted to prove that Schelling’s absolute idealism was still possible if one started, not with nature, but with consciousness, with the I, if one deepened Fichte’s subjectivism.”

⁵² “To prove the identity of God and Nature was always an essential goal for Hegel” (HARRIS, p. 82). For the relationship between SPINOZA, SCHELLING’s “Identity Philosophy” [i.e. the identity of Subject and Object], and GWFH, see HARRIS, p. 56, especially n. 2. The Spinozist reading of GWFH offered here has also been decisively influenced by Leo STRAUSS: “The philosophy of Kant’s great successors [STRAUSS means FICHTE, SCHELLING and GWFH] was consciously a synthesis of Spinoza’s and Kant’s philosophies” (STRAUSS, Leo, *Spinoza’s Critique of Religion*, New York: Schocken Books, 1965, p. 17. STRAUSS wrote his doctoral dissertation on F.H. JACOBI.

⁵³ HARRIS, p. 63 (his emphasis): “The purely bodily reality of the idea is its *extended* existence in cosmic space and time, and especially in the great clock constituted by the solar system.”

Cartesian *subject*, i.e. “thought.”⁵⁴ According to Hyppolite, Hegel’s great innovation was to do with History what Schelling had already done with Nature: History had never before been *subsumed* by Idealism.⁵⁵ This subsumption, the knowing internalization of History *as a Whole*, is what occurs in Absolute Knowledge.

In section three of the previously mentioned chapter entitled “III. The *Phenomenology*: A History of Individual Consciousness,”⁵⁶ Hyppolite introduces two radical ideas that are particularly important here: what he calls the “immanence of history in the individual’s present”⁵⁷ and “the necessity of a mediation through universal history.”⁵⁸ The first is based on the familiar proposition that ontogeny contains phylogeny⁵⁹ and thus provides a fascinating theoretical basis for the Logical and Chronological

⁵⁴ SPINOZA’s (apparent) failure to locate thought in the subject, but only in substance, is precisely what GWFH faults in him in LPH: “Spinoza’s defect is therefore this, that he takes the third moment as mode alone, as a false individuality. True individuality and subjectivity is not a mere retreat from the universal, not merely something clearly determinate; for, as clearly determinate, it is at the same time Being-for-itself, determined by itself alone. The individual, the subjective, is even in being so the return to the universal; and in that it is at home with itself, it is itself the universal. The return consists simply and solely in the fact of the particular being in itself the universal; to this return Spinoza did not attain.”

⁵⁵ See the entire paragraph beginning at HYPPOLITE, p. 30-1: “It is on the subject of history that we can best understand the differences between Schelling’s philosophy and Hegel’s.”

⁵⁶ HYPPOLITE, p. 39-45.

⁵⁷ HYPPOLITE, p. 40. He first mentions in on the previous page: “Hegel took the immanence of human history in general in the individual consciousness seriously.”

⁵⁸ HYPPOLITE, p. 42 (emphasis mine): “The empirical consciousness considered was specific consciousness, which must progressively *become aware once again of the experience of the species* and, in forming itself to knowledge, form itself to a human wisdom {*sagesse*}; it must learn its relation to other consciousness and grasp the necessity of a mediation through universal history so that it can itself become spiritual consciousness.” As the emphasized passage indicates, this second idea is dependent on the first.

⁵⁹ HYPPOLITE, p. 39 (emphasis mine) brilliantly compares Hegel’s *Phenomenology* to ROUSSEAU’s *Emile* and also gives due credit to Gustave LANSON’s insight about it. “Thus, the problem which the *Phenomenology* poses is not that of world history but that of the education of the specific individual who must, necessarily, be formed to knowledge by becoming aware of what Hegel calls his substance. This is a specifically pedagogical task not unrelated to the task Rousseau set himself in *Emile*. The “primary idea” [here HYPPOLITE begins to quote from “Gustave LANSON, *Littérature française*, 22d edition, p. 796”] of Rousseau’s book has been described as “rigorously scientific; if *the individual’s development summarily repeats the evolution of the species*, then the child’s education must largely reproduce the general movement of humanity.””

Parallel. History, *apparently* unfolding as Past Chronology, is actually *immanent* within the Present of the Individual, who—by following the path described in the *Phenomenology*⁶⁰—experiences that apparently Chronological Process as a Logical or at least a Phenomeno-logical one.⁶¹ In fact, “Phenomenology” becomes the first-fruit and *intersection* of the Logical and Chronological *Parallel*. Hyppolite’s probing reading suggests that what we are really dealing with in Hegel’s thought is a Logical and Chronological *Isomorphism* whose *locus* is Substance as Subject.

Lest “the immanence of history” be dismissed as a peculiarity of the *Phenomenology*—or worse yet, of Hyppolite’s interpretation of it—it is instructive to consider Hegel’s account of Plato’s theory of recollection in his *Lectures on the History of Philosophy*. Part II will show how and why Hegel’s antagonism towards Plato becomes highly instructive; for now, it is sufficient to point out that in his critique of Platonic recollection as expressed in *Meno* is characteristic because what is best in Plato merely points forward to a fully developed concept in Hegel:

In one sense recollection {*Erinnerung*} is certainly an unfortunate expression, in the sense, namely, than an idea is reproduced which has already existed at another time. But recollection has another sense, which is given by its [German] etymology, namely of making oneself inward, going inward, and this is the profound meaning of the word in thought. In this sense it may undoubtedly be said that knowledge of the universal is nothing but a recollection, a going within self, and that we make that which at first shows itself in external form and determined as a manifold, into an inward, a universal, because we go into ourselves and bring what is inward in us into consciousness. With Plato, however, as we cannot deny, the word recollection has constantly the first and empirical sense.⁶²

The connection to Plato’s Ideas and the related question of whether virtue can be taught is quickly severed; once broadened by Hegel, *Erinnerung* means that there is nothing that is not already contained in *Geist*.⁶³ Hegel’s evident sympathy for “the immanent nature of knowledge” is therefore

⁶⁰ HYPOLITE, p. 41: “The history of the world, which is immanent in the individual but of which he has not become aware, then becomes conceptualized and internalized history, the meaning of which he is progressively able to elaborate.”

⁶¹ A discussion of HYPOLITE’s profound speculations about the relationship between the PhG and the System as a whole (p. 62) and then (p. 17) between the PhG (the domain of which is consciousness) and the WdL (whose domain is the concept) would take us too far afield.

⁶² LHP vol. 2, p. 34.

⁶³ LHP vol. 2, p. 33 (emphasis mine): “Mind [*Geist*] is this absolute species [sc. “the Notion of the true universal in its movement”], whose process is only the continual return into itself; thus *nothing* is for it which is not in itself.”

explicitly predicated on the claim “the spirit of man contains reality in itself.”⁶⁴

But it is Hyppolite’s second idea, i.e. “the necessity of a mediation through universal history,” that is his most significant contribution to my understanding of Hegel’s Philosophy of History and, quite possibly, of his System as a Whole. The “specific I,” the *subject* that has not yet reached Absolute Knowledge,⁶⁵ can only become *substance* (what Hyppolite calls “the I of humanity”)⁶⁶ through the *necessary*⁶⁷ mediation of History.⁶⁸ And if, as Hyppolite insists, “the spirit is history for Hegel,”⁶⁹ it is *only through Spirit*, the third moment of the Hegelian System, that the Idea can think itself as having passed from Logic into Nature. It is *necessarily* Mind or Spirit conceived as the “immanence of history in the individual’s present” that is manifested in the *Phenomenology* that mediates the union, through the Concept, *not only of Nature and Logic*, but also of Thought and

⁶⁴ LHP vol. 2, p. 32 (emphases mine): “The spirit of man contains reality on itself, and in order to learn what is divine he must develop it out of himself and bring it to consciousness. With the Socratics this discussion respecting *the immanent nature of knowledge* takes the form of a question as to whether virtue can be taught or not...”

⁶⁵ HYPOLITE, p. 40-1: “Phenomenology is the concrete, explicit development and formation of the individual, the rise of his finite self to absolute self.”

⁶⁶ HYPOLITE, p. 42. It is also here that he uses the phrase “the specific I.” See also HYPOLITE, p. 41.

⁶⁷ In addition to being (externally) necessary to the process of self-realization leading to Absolute Knowledge, History was also, according to HYPOLITE, p. 28, conceived of as (internally) necessary already in SCHELLING. “We can easily grasp here the difference between Fichte’s point of view, which stops with a moral order of the world that ought to exist but does not exist necessarily [an example of what I have called “Kantianism”] and Schelling’s point of view, which sees in history an actual and necessary realization of freedom, through destiny or providence. Hegel follows Schelling on this point.”

⁶⁸ HYPOLITE, p. 31 (emphasis mine): “The [subject/object] duality which is the foundation of history and which Schelling eliminates from the absolute is an essential moment in the Phenomenology. It characterizes consciousness, but consciousness is not therefore alien to the absolute. On the contrary, the historical development of consciousness is *the reflection back on itself of the absolute*—of spirit.”

⁶⁹ Continuing the passage quoted in the previous note, HYPOLITE adds at p. 31 (his emphases): “Before asking ourselves in what way the reflection of consciousness is a history, and what kind of history it is [these are the questions he answers in “III. The *Phenomenology*: A History of Individual Consciousness”], we must define more closely Hegel’s view of the relation between spirit and history. *The spirit is history for Hegel*—this is a fundamental thesis identical to the thesis that *the absolute is subject*—“but organic nature has no history” (PE, I, 247; PG, 220; PM, 326).”

Extension, Object and Subject, Subject and Substance, and *finally* the union of Substance and “Hegel” who then become one in Absolute Knowledge. It will be noted that the word “finally” is ambiguous here: in fact this union is *Chronologically Prior* to all the other pairs.⁷⁰

In conclusion, by taking Hegel’s Idealism seriously, Hyppolite has helped us to understand the place of History in Hegel’s thought.

I.2.1.2. de Boer

In her important article “Begriff und Zeit” (2002),⁷¹ Karin de Boer brings the crucial connection between Time and Concept in Hegel’s thought into the 21st century. To the extent that she derives Time, perhaps following the clues left by Heidegger in *Sein und Zeit*,⁷² directly from the negativity of the Concept,⁷³ she offers a solid basis for recognizing the Concept a Logical Priority as so complete that it becomes the condition for

⁷⁰ In other words, GWFH is chronologically prior to his own System even if that which is embodied in his System is logically prior to GWFH. It should also be added that GWFH never states that the System could have existed before GWFH himself; his LHP suggests the opposite conclusion.

⁷¹ DE BOER, Karin, Begriff und Zeit: Die Selbstentäußerung des Begriffs und ihre Wiederholung in Hegels spekulativem System, *Hegel-Studien* v. 35, p. 11-49, 2002 (hereafter “DE BOER”).

⁷² She never cites actually HEIDEGGER. But she uses the same quotation from the *Philosophy of History* (see DE BOER, p. 46, n. 54) that we saw him use earlier just before introducing the claim that: “Deswegen versucht Hegel in der *Enzyklopädie*, die Bewegtheit des Begriffs und die Bewegtheit der Zeit als zwei Gestalten derselben negierenden Kraft zu verstehen” (DE BOER, p. 46). It will be recalled that HEIDEGGER emphasized the relationship between Time and the (negative) second moment.

⁷³ DE BOER, p. 47: “Mit diesen beiden Formen von Negativität—Begriff und Zeit—als Ausgangspunkt hat Hegel genug in Hand, um in seinem System die Bewegung zu rekonstruieren, in der der Begriff aufgrund seiner größten Entäußerung in der Natur die Macht der Zeit in zunehmenden Maße zu tilgen weiß.” DE BOER shows that the *Tilgung* of Time is a result not so much of it being grasped in its Concept but in the Concept itself: Time is the condition for the possibility the *Begriff*’s “Entäußerung in der Natur” but this is in turn the condition for the possibility of its return to itself as *Begriff*. DE BOER, p. 46 (emphasis mine): “Während der Raum als größte Selbstentäußerung des Begriffs die Bedingung der Möglichkeit jeder (Erfahrung von) Äußerlichkeit konstituiert, *ist die Zeit diejenige Form des Begriffs, die diese Äußerlichkeit nicht nur möglich macht, sondern auch das Mittel bildet, das es dem Begriff ermöglicht, sich als Idee zu vollziehen und seine Abhängigkeit von der Äußerlichkeit in immer größerem Maße aufzuheben.*”

the possibility of Chronological Priority itself.⁷⁴ Time is simply “the condition for the possibility of the self-externalization and self-actualization of the pure Concept.”⁷⁵ In helping us understand the relationship of Time and Concept in Hegel’s thought, de Boer continues the process begun by Hyppolite of helping us to see Hegel more clearly as the thoroughgoing Idealist he really was.⁷⁶ Just as History, which necessarily unfolds in Time, has no real existence apart from the Absolute Knowledge in which it is contained, so also does Time—History’s basis—itsself have no external existence apart from the Concept.

Of particular interest is de Boer’s emphasis on what she calls “*die Analogie zwischen KANT und Hegel*.”⁷⁷ It is too easy to conceive of Hegel as simply rejecting Kant: de Boer shows that in fact we are witnessing “*Hegels Radikalisierung KANTS*.”⁷⁸ Just as for Kant Space and Time are “Forms of Intuition” within which alone empirical knowledge is possible, so also for Hegel are Space and Time the “Forms of Externality”⁷⁹ through which alone Hegel’s Pure Reason can *release itself*⁸⁰ into “the external Idea” of Nature. The felicitous expression “*die Formen der Äußerlichkeit*” reminds us that that Space and Time are, according to de Boer, *no more*

⁷⁴ DE BOER, p. 43-4: “Die *Phänomenologie des Geistes* belegt aber, daß Hegel des Geschichte des Geistes versteht, in der Macht der Zeit immer mehr getilgt wird. Das bedeutet, daß die selbstbestimmende Kraft des Begriffs, die allen Formen des Lebens innewohnt, sich zunehmend in der Geschichte des Geistes verwirklicht, so daß der Geist sich in immer geringerem Maße von einer ihm äußerlichen Negativität bestimmen zu lassen braucht. Da diese Geschichte Hegel zufolge im Grunde durch den Begriff bewegt wird, ist die zunehmende Tilgung der Macht die Zeit nur möglich, wenn die Zeit selbst eine Gestalt des absoluten Begriffs ist.”

⁷⁵ She states her thesis on DE BOER, p. 11 (translation mine).

⁷⁶ Like HYPOLITE, she emphasizes (in a section called “Hegel und Schelling”) the role of SCHELLING’s Idealism in shaping GWFH’s views about Time and Concept (DE BOER, p. 13-23).

⁷⁷ DE BOER, p. 45. Hereafter I will call this “de Boer’s Kant Analogy” or simply “the Kant Analogy.”

⁷⁸ DE BOER, p. 44. Cf. HOULGATE, Stephen, *The Opening of Hegel’s Logic: From Being to Infinity*, West Lafayette, Purdue University Press, 2006, pp. 124-9.

⁷⁹ DE BOER, p. 45 (emphasis mine): “So wie, nach Hegel, die Formen der Anschauung als Momente der Bewegung gefaßt werden müssen, in der die Vernunft sich beschränkt, um diese Beschränkung letztendlich auch wieder aufzuheben, so müssen Raum und Zeit in ihrem Anundfürsichsein als *die Formen der Äußerlichkeit* gefaßt werden, die es dem reinen Begriff ermöglichen, sich in einer ersten Bewegung als äußerliche Idee [sc. in Nature] zu bestimmen.”

⁸⁰ DE BOER, p. 45-46 (emphasis mine): “Der reine Begriff, der als Prinzip der Selbstbestimmung der Natur und der Geschichte der Geistes vorangeht, kann sich also nur als Natur und Geist vollziehen, indem er sich in sich selbst unterscheidet und das Andere seiner selbst *als Raum und Zeit aus sich entläßt*.”

real to Hegel than Hegel thought they were real to Kant: Time, according to Hegel, is merely “die äußerste Voraussetzung des reinen Begriffs.”⁸¹ In other words, Hegel’s “Pure Reason” as embodied in the *Begriff* presupposes its own externalization in order to return to itself as the Whole. *Without Time, the Concept cannot be Complete*. To put it another way: Time is only a moment of the Concept’s completeness. It bears emphasis that this “moment” is logical; it is neither *temporal* nor temporary.

The Analogy described by de Boer is breathtaking in its implications. It is well known that Hegel rejects the limits that Kant had placed on Pure Reason. De Boer has shown that Hegel does something much more ingenious: he manages *to turn those apparent limitations into precisely their opposites*. But Hegel can only do this by preserving the ideality of Time and Space discovered by Kant. Perhaps this is not surprising: Kant’s approach to Space and Time is the most forward advance of his own Idealism. Therefore Hegel, a more thorough Idealist than Kant ever dreamed of being, preserves Kant’s approach on precisely this point. But the *locus* of limitation has been radicalized in Hegel. It is only on the basis of *the self-limitation of the Concept* that it can return to itself in its completeness.⁸² Space and Time, which for Kant were *actual* limitations on Pure Reason’s subjective ability to know the *Ding an sich* become for Hegel the *apparently* limiting but in fact *empowering* conditions for the possibility of Pure Reason’s *knowing itself* objectively: only through externalization in Time and Space and through them, in Nature, can the Concept, as unfolded in *Logic*, return to itself as Spirit.⁸³ As Kant’s “Forms of Intuition,” Space and Time confined Pure Reason to the empirical; as Hegel’s “Forms of Externality,” they drive Pure Reason on to the conceptual.⁸⁴ De Boer even believes she has discovered why Hegel himself

⁸¹ DE BOER, p. 44.

⁸² DE BOER, p. 46: “Durch diese Selbstbeschränkung erschafft der Begriff sich ein Element, innerhalb dessen er sich als äußerliche Idee vollziehen und im menschlichen Geist ein immer vollkommeneres Fürsichsein erlangen kann.”

⁸³ DE BOER, p. 45 (emphasis mine): “So wie die unmittelbarste Gestalt des Bewußtseins noch vollständig bestimmt ist durch die reinen Formen der Anschauung [sc. Space and Time], die es dem Denken gestatten, Dinge als neben- und nacheinander zu erkennen, und nur nach und nach zu reiner Selbstreflexion kommt, *so ist der reine Begriff zunächst vollständig in der Äußerlichkeit versunken und gewinnt nur allmählich die Kraft, sich als Begriff zu bestimmen.*”

⁸⁴ DE BOER, p. 44: “Während KANT sich auf Analyse der verschiedenen Vermögen, die der empirischen Erkenntnis zugrunde liegen, beschränkt, versteht Hegel diese Vermögen also als verschiedenen Momente der Bewegung, in der die reine Vernunft sich bestimmt, um dem Bewußtsein die Wirklichkeit zugänglich zu machen, insoweit diese erkennbar ist.”

cannot consistently make the relationship between Time and Concept in his thought explicit.⁸⁵

De Boer not only contributes to our understanding of the theoretical basis for the Logical and Chronological *Parallel*, her approach also suggests a useful way in which that *Parallel* will be embodied in the doctrine of Chronological Completeness. Her basic point is that it is only on the basis of *the Concept's self-externalization in Time* that the Concept itself becomes Complete. True to Hegel's own treatment of Time in the System, de Boer is thinking primarily of Time's relationship to the *Philosophy of Nature*. But she also applies her argument specifically to Time's relationship to the *Philosophy of Spirit*.

Sich immer mehr in dem [sc. "Geschichte des Geistes"] erkennend, was er erfährt, wird der Begriff, der sich als Philosophie verwirklicht, letztlich imstande sein, Zeit und Raum als Momente der Selbstentäußerung des absoluten Begriffs zu erkennen und sogar in diesen Formen sich selbst anzuschauen.⁸⁶

It is useful to consider the words "the Concept that actualizes itself as Philosophy" in the context of the problem Hegel discusses in the Introduction to the *Lectures on the History of Philosophy* (see Chapter 4; section I.1.2.3.).⁸⁷ By "Philosophy" de Boer means here "the History of Philosophy" considered Chronologically: it is the entire phrase—i.e. "the Concept that actualizes itself as Philosophy"—that is Philosophy itself. As Hegel pointed out, the *content* of the History of Philosophy, unfolding in Time, is "in the main...the same" as "the Concept that actualizes itself as Philosophy."

De Boer is making explicit the crucial fact that although the atemporal *Begriff* of Philosophy itself is *Logically Prior* to the possibility of "the History of Philosophy," that *the two are in fact the same*. The difference between them is not that the Concept of Philosophy is Complete while the History of Philosophy is not. The difference between them is that the Concept necessarily appears in *the Forms of Time and Space* that are themselves nothing more than necessary "moments of the self-

⁸⁵ DE BOER, p. 46: "Da diese Selbstunterscheidung des Begriffs dem unterschied zwischen Logik und Realphilosophie [sc. *Philosophy of Nature* and *Philosophy of Mind*] noch zugrunde liegt, kann diese Bewegung innerhalb des Systems kaum thematisiert werden; die Selbstentäußerung des Begriffs in Raum und Zeit einerseits und Begriff andererseits [understood as the "pure" Concept of *Logic*] geht der Konstitution des Begriffs noch voran, der als absoluter Indifferenzpunkt den Anfangs- und Endpunkt des Systems bildet."

⁸⁶ DE BOER, p. 46.

⁸⁷ DE BOER emphasizes the importance of this passage (p. 12).

externalization of the absolute Concept” in order that, by knowing *itself*, it can be what it is: Complete. The Completeness that *the Concept in Time* lacks is *the Logical Completeness* of knowing itself to be Complete.⁸⁸ it is Complete—i.e. it *is* the self-externalized Concept—but does not know itself as Complete or anything else except in Absolute Knowledge. This is why de Boer can claim that the *Begriff* merely “beholds *itself* in these forms” (emphasis mine). Whether in Time or in the Absolute Concept, Chronological Completeness is going to follow directly from the Logical Completeness of the *Begriff* itself *once it knows itself in Absolute Knowledge*.

Although de Boer does not address the subject of “the End of History” directly, she does make reference to the importance of Time in bringing Completeness to the Concept. In this context, she calls Time: “*die Bedingung der Möglichkeit der Bewegung, in der der Begriff sich als Begriff vollzieht.*”⁸⁹ Of her insight that the Concept is only Complete insofar as it “beholds itself in these forms” of Space and Time, de Boer comments:

Diese Einsicht ist es, die schließlich die Macht der Zeit tilgt, das heißt die Selbstbeschränkung der Vernunft aufhebt. Im Gegensatz zu KANT behauptet Hegel also, daß die ursprünglichste Selbstbeschränkung des Begriffs es dem Begriff ermöglicht, in der spekulativen Wissenschaft *das letzte Ziel seiner Geschichte* zu erreichen.⁹⁰

This crucial text brings together a number of loose ends. Once again, de Boer calls attention to the most remarkable aspect of “the Kant Analogy:” the limitation previously imposed by Time now makes possible, when recognized as “self-limitation,” the Hegelian triumph over Kant’s self-denying *Critique of Pure Reason*: the *Aufhebung* of the *Selbstbeschränkung der Vernunft*. Most importantly, it is only through this process of exile and return that the Concept reaches “the ultimate goal of its History.” Achieving self-knowledge by beholding itself within the “Form of Externality” constitutes the *Tilgung* of Time referred to in the

⁸⁸ PhG (A.V. Miller), p. 487: “Time, therefore, appears as the destiny and necessity of Spirit that is not yet complete within itself, the necessity to enrich the share which self-consciousness has in consciousness, to set in motion the *immediacy of the in-itself*, which is the form in which substance is present in consciousness; or conversely, to realize and reveal what is at first only *inward* (the in-itself being taken as what is *inward*), i.e. to vindicate it for Spirit’s certainty of itself.” Without Time, the Concept cannot be Complete. To put it another way: once the Concept is complete, Time has fulfilled its purpose: “Spirit’s certainty of itself.”

⁸⁹ DE BOER, p. 46.

⁹⁰ DE BOER, p. 46; emphasis mine.

Phenomenology of Spirit. De Boer shows how this *Tilgung* applies to the Hegelian System as a whole. By defining the moment in which the Idea of Logic passes over into Nature (and therefore into Time) as “*die ursprünglichste Selbstbeschränkung des Begriffs*,” she clearly explains how Absolute Knowledge, as the *Aufhebung* of this *Selbstbeschränkung*, is at once the *Tilgung* of Time and the End of History. In fact, History is completed in a double sense: it has reached its goal—i.e. fulfilled its purpose by allowing the Concept to know itself in “the Form of Externality”—and been annulled *at the same moment*. Naturally such a “moment” is logical only; this dual annulment could hardly take place, given Hegel’s conceptions, “in Time.”

Chapter 4 (I.2.2.) Logical and Chronological Completeness

As suggested in a preliminary fashion in the Introduction to Part I, Hegel's Philosophy of History should not be viewed as an instance of the Idea of Progress but rather *as the completion of a Logical Process*. It is precisely the fact that History is viewed by Hegel as the *completion* of the Process that gives the process *the appearance of Progress*: the Process achieves or completes its purpose and is realized in a final moment that Hegel misleadingly defines in terms that strongly suggest improvement based on an objective criterion of progress: "The History of the world is none other than the progress of the consciousness of freedom."¹

The Hegelian Dialectic has now been described in terms of Logical Completeness. Each Concept contains the truth *only at the end of the Process* when the moment of synthesis *aufhebt* the second moment of negativity and opposition. To put it another way, what Hegel calls a "Concept" is a three-step process where Understanding's one-sided oppositions are subject to and indeed necessitate *Aufhebung* through Reason. The Hegelian System abounds with cogent, persuasive, indeed brilliant examples of the inter-relatedness of truth expressed in these completed Concepts. The famous statement "The truth is the whole" simply means that Logical Completeness is the *alpha and omega* of the Hegelian System. Although apparently remote from History, this analysis of the Hegelian Dialectic provided the foundation for the argument that Hegel's Philosophy of History is also based on Logical Completeness.

From this foundation, the broad outlines of the developing argument contained here are obvious: the application of Logical Completeness to History depends on the Logical/Chronological Parallel. Since Hegel is committed to Logical Completeness, the Logical/Chronological Parallel is the basis for applying Logical Completeness to History. Chronological Completeness would simply be the analogue of Logical Completeness *as mediated by the Logical/Chronological Parallel*. The purpose of this

¹ *Philosophy of History*, p. 19. The fact that it is precisely "the *consciousness* of freedom" should alert the attentive reader to the Logical basis of the definition: Spirit comes to be *conscious* of itself as Spirit in the Concept. Note also that the sentence just quoted continues (emphasis mine): "...a progress *whose development according to the necessity of its nature*, it is our business to investigate." This also indicates the Logical basis of Hegelian "progress:" it is, like the self-limitation of the Concept and its subsequent recognition of itself in "the Form of Externality," a *necessary* development in (self-) consciousness. See HESPE, Franz, "Die Geschichte ist der Fortschritt im Bewußtsein der Freiheit"; Zur Entwicklung von Hegels Philosophie der Geschichte. *Hegel-Studien* v. 26, pp. 177-192, 1991.

chapter is to further develop this argument. Many of the raw materials necessary for this development have already been assembled in the previous chapter.

Demonstrating that Chronological Completeness is a feature of Hegel's Philosophy of History is by no means, then, an end in itself. My goal is not to refute Hegel on the basis of his scandalous conception of "the End of History." Nor is my goal to show that this doctrine is at the heart of Hegel's intentions. My goal is simply to reveal that Hegel's "solution" to "The Problem of Time" is the philosophical basis for Hegel's Philosophy of History. In fact, the so-called "End of History" is no less a secondary phenomenon for Hegel than it is for me. For Hegel, it is simply a product of some of his previous—earlier, that is, in the sense of Logical Priority—philosophical commitments.

As indicated in the previous chapter, this way of looking at Hegel depends decisively on the research of Jean Hyppolite. The Completion of History in Absolute Knowledge is, broadly speaking, a necessary consequence of Hegel's "Absolute Idealism," his development of Schelling's "Identity Philosophy"—i.e. the annihilation of the subject/object distinction—and his conception of Phenomenology. Having decided to use History as a defense of Idealism, he needed to show how the process of History culminated in his own position. In other words, he needed to show that his own position was the result—the culmination, consummation, and completion—of an historical process unfolding in Time. Whether regarded as the Philosophy of World History or as the History of Philosophy, this process could only be shown to be reasonable if it was a manifestation of the Concept. Since Logical Completeness of the Concept was the infallible concomitant of Reason—indeed, *is Reason itself*—History made rational could only be Complete.

The problem arises *for us* because the notions "Time" and "Completeness" are taken by common sense to be *mutually exclusive*. Time, which proverbially "marches on," cannot be thought of *by us* as Complete. Moreover, History manifestly does not and did not "end." It is the philosopher Hegel who is finite: he died—came to his end—in 1831. He cannot, we somehow feel, have conceived of anything as scandalous as the End of History because History has in fact continued after his death and Time, *as everybody knows*, is never complete.

The first crucial point to bear in mind is that Hegel agrees with us: he did not think that History *objectively* comes, came, or had come to an End in his own lifetime. But he agrees with us *for the wrong reason*. It is only because he rejects the notion of History's *objective existence* that he does not hold what most of us would regard as the scandalous notion of the End of History. We need to recognize that the only reason he does not hold *this* notion is because he holds a notion most of us would regard as even more

scandalous. Hegel is not thinking in terms of the End of History *per se* but rather of the Completion of History in Absolute Knowledge. To put it another way: it is only *for Hegel* that History is complete. Those who have not attained Absolute Knowledge believe a great many things—indeed the very basis of their thoughts *about each and every thing*—that are false in the sense that they are one-sided and consequently incomplete. For them (i.e. *for us*), there is no End of History. Only those who have attained Absolute Knowledge, or at least those who take such a thing seriously, can hope to understand what Hegel himself meant by what is called “the End of History.” In other words, Absolute Knowledge is Logically Prior to the End of History.

The purpose of this dissertation is to show that “The Problem of Time” is at the root of this claim. Hegel’s notion of Time itself is highly problematic *for us*, so problematic that some considerable philosophical archeology—i.e. Part I—is required simply to see what Hegel’s conception of Time actually was. To put it another way, most of us would regard Hegel’s notion of Time to be no less scandalous than his notion of what Hyppolite calls “the immanence of history.” I intend to show that the two are inextricably linked. It is because Hegel denies the objective existence of what we call “History”—i.e. the objective, empirically observable events that most of us regard as self-evidently existing outside of us—that he rejects our commonsense objection that Time can’t possibly be complete. In this chapter I will show that *Time has no more objective existence for Hegel than History does*. Indeed the one depends on the other: the denial of Time’s objective existence is Logically Prior to the denial of History’s objective existence.

It will therefore be seen that my argument for Chronological Completeness in Hegel’s thought depends on both Hyppolite’s discovery of “the immanence of history” and de Boer’s so-called “Kant Analogy.” The two approaches indeed fit together well: what Hyppolite calls “the necessity of a mediation through universal history” in the *Phenomenology* is simply given a more properly logical basis in de Boer’s view, as illustrated by her in the System as a whole, that the self-externalization of the Concept in Time is the necessary condition of the possibility of its return to itself. In other words, Hyppolite and de Boer provide a solid theoretical justification for the view that neither Time nor History has for Hegel what would be regarded by us as *objective existence*. It will also be seen that my argument for Chronological Completeness has nothing to do with the views of Kojève. Whether he regards Time as a “fact” that Hegel sets out to explain or whether Time has existence only in relation to Heidegger’s notion of *Sein zum Tode*, Kojève gets Hegel wrong; at best, he arrives at the right conclusion for the wrong reason.

Because Time is Logically Prior to—and indeed the condition for the possibility of—History, the most *philosophically* compelling approach to proving that Hegel’s Absolute Knowledge necessarily entails Chronological Completeness involves an investigation of Time rather than History *per se*. Such an approach has the advantage that it involves a return to first principles. But this return, so characteristic of the philosophical approach to problems, has its own risks: Hegel’s approach to Time is not only foreign to our way of looking at History but we are also repeatedly troubled by the awareness that our way of looking at History depends decisively on Hegel’s influence: only with respect to “the end of History” do we feel that something is dreadfully amiss. Considered in abstraction from the System of which it is an inseparable part, Hegel’s Philosophy of History hardly seems as unfamiliar to us as e.g. his *Tilgung* of Time in Absolute Knowledge. In Section 3 of Part I, we will be ready to examine how Logical Completeness plays out *practically* in Hegel’s Philosophy of History itself by examining it in precisely that context.

For the present, however, the emphasis will remain *theoretical* and will emphasize the archeological basis of Hegel’s Philosophy of History: his notion of Time. By showing that the commonsense notion of Time—that which ceaselessly “marches on”—has no place in Hegel’s System, it becomes possible to see *how* Hegel could have embraced a notion as scandalous as Chronological Completeness, a concept that will then be connected to his Philosophy of History in the following section (I.3). The present chapter is therefore properly viewed as a necessary but preliminary step in that direction. It also constitutes the logical center of “The Problem of Time in Hegel’s Philosophy of History.”

Although attention will be paid in this chapter to the insights of both Heidegger and de Boer about Hegel’s “Metaphysics of Time,” the emphasis will be on texts that played no part in their studies. In the first section (I.2.2.1.), the reader’s attention will be drawn to Hegel’s most explicit rejection of the actual existence of Time in his youthful *Glaube und Wissen* (1802); this should be considered the best evidence for his *negative* views on the subject. His *positive* position on Time will be considered I.2.2.2; here the mature Hegel’s systematic treatment of the Future in the *Philosophy of Nature* will be examined.² In the third section (I.2.2.3), I will show Hegel’s objections to *anything*—including Time—“that ceaselessly marches on.” This will involve an analysis of the passages in the *Science of Logic* dealing with what Hegel calls the “bad” or “spurious infinite.”

² For a recent overview of GWFH’s approach to nature, see DUDLEY, Will, *Understanding German Idealism*, Stocksfield: Acumen, 2007, pp. 165-9 (“The structure of spatiotemporal being: the *Philosophy of Nature*”).

Finally, by way of transition to the Philosophy of History, I will show—following the approach taken by Borges—how the teleological element in Hegel’s Logic constitutes the bridge by which Logical Completeness is applied to History in I.2.2.4.

I.2.2.1. Hegel’s early attack on Time

Because its last paragraph is the first place that he uses the word *das Moment* in the characteristically Hegelian sense (see Introduction), *Faith and Knowledge* proves to be of central importance for grasping Hegel’s solution to “the problem of Time” and this text will therefore receive further attention in Chapter 9. Although it is probably no accident that Hegel’s most explicit rejection of Time is likewise found here, the possible or even likely connection between these two aspects of *Glaube und Wissen* is a complicated question in its own right and therefore nothing more than the fact of the young Hegel’s attack on Time will be documented here.

Although F.H. Jacobi is the least famous of the three rivals Hegel attacks in *Faith and Knowledge*—the other two are Kant and Fichte—the section he devoted to Jacobi is by far the longest and constitutes its center. Complicating matters considerably is that Hegel’s critique of Jacobi is difficult to separate from his defense of Spinoza: the subject of the central section of *Glaube und Wissen* is best understood as a critique of Jacobi’s critique of Spinoza. Time plays a central part in this critique because Hegel devotes considerable attention to the way in which Jacobi misunderstands Spinoza’s conception of eternity.³ In fact, Hegel does little more here than follow Spinoza in regarding Time as a product of “imagination;”⁴ Jacobi’s

³ G.W.F. HEGEL, *Faith & Knowledge*. Translated by Walter Cerf and H.S. Harris. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1977, p. 105-6: “Can it possibly be that Jacobi, the commentator on Spinoza, understood Spinoza to have placed time in God, when according to Spinoza it [sc. Time] belongs only to *natura naturata* [this will become GWFH’s position as well; see I.2.2.2]? We shall in fact see in a moment that after having concluded that Spinoza must really affirm time to be nothing but appearance, Jacobi still manages to find it in Spinoza, and in the absurd form of an eternal time at that.”

⁴ After quoting SPINOZA (“Measure and time originate for us when we conceive quantity in abstraction from substance, and duration from the way it flows from the eternal things”), GWFH comments at *Faith & Knowledge*, p. 107 (emphasis mine): “In other words, it is only imagination, as Spinoza calls it, or, in general, only reflection [i.e. the *bête noire* of *Glaube und Wissen*] that posits and partially negates the finite; and this partially negated thing, which, when posited for itself and opposed to what is in itself not negated, to what is strictly affirmative [cf. “the good infinite”], turns this infinite itself [cf. “the bad infinite”] into something partially negated. The infinite, being thus brought into antithesis with the finite becomes an abstraction, the pure Reason, or the infinite of Kant. *The eternal* [sc. “the good

most serious offense is that he does not traverse Hegel's own path from Spinoza's Substance to "the good infinite"⁵ or rather to the identity of Substance and Subject:

We obtain the abstraction of time if we do not conceive thinking [i.e. Subject] as attribute of absolute substance (for as attribute it expresses the substance itself) but isolate it from its attributes, and abstract it from the substance, i.e., if we fixate thinking as empty thinking, as subjective infinity, and place this abstraction in relative connection with the particularity (*Einzelheit*) of being.⁶

From an early date, then, it is clear that Hegel is following Spinoza in rejecting the actual existence of time.⁷

I.2.2.2. Hegel's account of the Future in the *Philosophy of Nature*

Central to Hegel's exposition of Time in the *Philosophy of Nature* is the analogy he makes to the first triad of the *Logic*: Being, Nothing and Becoming. In fact, Hegel defines Time as the external and merely intuited form of *Werden*.⁸ This analogy, along with the nexus of relationships that follow from it, raises once again in a rather acute form the problem of Logical and Chronological Priority in Hegel's thought. Although Hegel no doubt wishes us to conceptualize Time in relationship to logically prior

infinite"] is to be posited as the absolute identity of both; and in the eternal the infinite on one side, and the finite on the other, are once more nullified as to the antithesis between them." For GWFH's continuing adherence to this point of view, see I.2.2.3.

⁵ G.W.F. HEGEL, *Faith & Knowledge*, p. 109: "He [sc. JACOBI] posits the abstract entity "time" and the abstract entity "single thing," which are [both] products of imagination or reflection, as existing in themselves; and then he finds that, if the absolute *simul* of the eternal substance [of SPINOZA] is [also] posited, the single thing and time, which only are in virtue of having been removed from it [sc. from "the eternal substance" of SPINOZA], are equally posited with it. He [therefore] fails to reflect on the fact that when the single thing and time are restored to the eternal substance from which they were taken, they cease to be what they only are [i.e. for JACOBI, they are "existing in themselves"] if torn away from it. So he retains time and singularity and {finite} actuality within infinity and eternity itself."

⁶ G.W.F. HEGEL, *Faith & Knowledge*, p. 110.

⁷ See the passage from SPINOZA quoted by GWFH at *Faith & Knowledge*, p. 111 n. 51.

⁸ Page references are to PETRY, Michael John (editor and translator), *Hegel's Philosophy of Nature*, London: Allen and Unwin, 1970 (hereafter "PhN"), p. 229-30. "Die Zeit, als die negative Einheit des Außersichsein, ist...das angeschaute Werden..."

Becoming, the analogy that he makes between them threatens to raise in our minds the other possibility: that it is *Time* itself that is logically prior to his conception of “Becoming.” Time, which alone makes Chronological Priority possible, is in fact the condition of the possibility of a) beginning *anything*, b) beginning the *Logic* with Being, c) describing, step-by-step, the process by which Being passes through Nothing to Becoming, d) Becoming as defined by Hegel as the result of two *previous* moments, and e) Becoming in general, whether as defined by Hegel or by anyone else. A consideration of how Hegel meets these difficulties, difficulties to which his own analogy subjects him, will contribute to conceptualizing why there is no space for the Future in Hegel’s Philosophy of History and why that exclusion is based on Hegel’s scandalous solution to “The Problem of Time.”

This approach to Hegel’s “Metaphysics of Time” draws support from the insights of de Boer and Heidegger discussed above. Those insights, in turn, find ample warrant in the text: Hegel’s very first moves in his exposition of Time provide ample evidence of the validity of de Boer’s Kant Analogy⁹ as well as Heidegger’s emphasis on the implications of Hegel’s view that Time is “the negation of a negation.”¹⁰ Rather than reiterate what they have already contributed, it is more enlightening to push forward into some unexplored territory: Hegel’s notion of the Future.

The most dangerous moment reached by Hegel in the course of applying what I will call “the *Werden-Zeit* Analogy” is when he is describing the Future. In Section §259, he introduces Past, Present and Future as “the three dimensions of Time.”

Die Dimensionen der Zeit, die *Gegenwart*, *Zukunft* und *Vergangenheit*, sind das *Werden* der Äußerlichkeit als solches und dessen Auflösung in die Unterschiede des Seins als des Übergehens in Nichts und des Nichts als des Übergehens in Sein.

Hegel intends to take the Analogy seriously: he is going to link Present, Past and Future to the two movements (“*Übergehens in Nichts*” and “*Übergehens in Sein*”) that constituted Becoming in the very first Triad of the *Logic* and which are duly repeated here now that we are dealing with “*das Werden der Äußerlichkeit als solches*.” Although he performs the

⁹ PhN, p. 230; Remark to E §258: “Die Zeit ist wie der Raum eine reine Form der Sinnlichkeit oder des Anschauens.”

¹⁰ PhN, p. 229; *Zusatz* to E §257: “Diese reine Quantität, als für sich daseiender Unterschied, ist das an sich selbst Negative, die Zeit; sie ist die Negation der Negation, die sich auf sich beziehende Negation.”

linkage between Becoming and the Present in §259 itself,¹¹ it is only in the *Zusatz* that he does this for Past and Future. It is therefore that passage which deserves careful consideration.

Die Dimensionen der Zeit machen das Bestimmte der Anschauung vollständig, indem sie den Begriff der Zeit, welcher das Werden ist, für die Anschauung in seiner Totalität oder Realität setzen, die darin besteht, daß die abstrakten Momente der Einheit, welche das Werden ist, jedes für sich als das Ganze gesetzt sind, aber unter entgegengesetzten Bestimmungen.¹²

All three temporal dimensions are required in order to make Time—as a Form of Intuition—*complete* because all three are required in order to capture an *Anschauung* of Becoming now understood as the completed *Begriff* of Time rather than as Time itself in its full richness (i.e. “*in seiner Totalität oder Realität*”). In Becoming, “*Übergehens in Nichts*” and “*Übergehens in Sein*” are not two different things: Becoming is their identity and their truth. In Time, however, they remain—as Past, Present, and Future— “*entgegengesetzten Bestimmungen*,” each understood, doubtless as a result of the negative externality that is their essence, as “*jedes für sich als das Ganze gesetzt*” instead of immediately collapsing into the unity that constitutes Becoming (i.e. “*die abstrakten Momente der Einheit, welche das Werden ist*”).

Diese beiden Bestimmungen [sc. “*Übergehens in Nichts*” and “*Übergehens in Sein*”] sind so jede selbst als Einheit des Seins und Nichts [in *Werden*]; sie sind aber auch unterschieden. Dieser Unterschied kann nur der des Entstehens und Vergehens sein.¹³

Hegel here introduces *the mediating pair* that will serve to link up the two sides of the *Werden-Zeit* Analogy: “coming to be” (*Entstehens*) and “passing away” (*Vergehens*).¹⁴ Both in their *unity* are, as we already know, parts of Becoming but now—in the “Metaphysics of Time”—each will,

¹¹ GWFH does so with the Present in Section E §259 itself (PhN, p. 233): “Das unmittelbare Verschwinden dieser Unterschiede in die *Einzelheit* ist die Gegenwart als *Jetzt*, welches als die *Einzelheit ausschließend* und zugleich schlechthin *kontinuierlich* in die anderen Momente [i.e. in Past and Future], selbst nur dies Verschwinden seines Seins in Nichts und des Nichts in sein Sein ist.”

¹² Addition to E §259; PhN, p. 235.

¹³ Addition to E §259; PhN, p. 235.

¹⁴ PhN, p. 230 (Remark to E §258): “Aber nicht *in der Zeit* entsteht und vergeht alles, sondern die Zeit selbst ist dies *Werden*, Entstehen und Vergehen, das *seiende Abstrahieren*, der alles gebärende und seine Geburten zerstörende *Kronos*.”

when considered *separately*, constitute two of the “three dimensions of time.”

Einmal, in der Vergangenheit (dem Hades), ist das Sein die Grundlage, von der angefangen wird; die Vergangenheit ist wirklich gewesen als Weltgeschichte, Naturbegebenheiten, aber gesetzt unter der Bestimmung des Nichtseins, das hinzutritt.¹⁵

Using the etymological relationship made palpable in the German word “*untergehen*,” “passing away” (*Vergehens*) now becomes the Past (*Vergangenheit*). By identifying *Sein* as the *Grundlage* of *Vergangenheit*, Hegel is showing his hand: the Past is precisely the moment of “*des Seins als des Übergehens in Nichts*.” In order to “pass away” into Hades, a thing, whether it belongs to the Natural World or *Weltgeschichte*, must first exist—hence its *Grundlage* in *Sein*—and thus as something that actually was (*wirklich gewesen*). Although identical or perhaps contemporaneous in Becoming, *Übergehens in Nichts* and *Übergehens in Sein* are now to be distinguished *in Time*, now understood as merely the externalized *Anschauung* of Becoming.

Before turning to the next sentence—as indicated by the previous “*einmal*,” it will do to the Future what has already been done to the Past—it is useful to reflect on what is actually going on here. Hegel is deriving definitions of Present, Past, and Future from his own previous account of Becoming, Being, and Nothing. *The elegance of his Analogy is striking and doubtless impressed him*. The movement of “Being into Nothing” and of “Nothing into Being” are synthesized in Becoming: they collapse into their unity and their truth; in the externality of Nature, however, each of these three moments will appear to be separate as Past, Future, and Present. But we must ask: where is *Chronological Priority* to be found here? Even without an exhaustive *Entstehungsgeschichte* of Hegel’s System, it seems likely that he developed his account of Becoming *before* he applied it to Time. In other words, the First Triad of the Hegelian System should probably be considered both Logically and Chronologically Prior *for Hegel* to his account of Time in the *Philosophy of Nature*. One wonders if the strangeness of these circumstances ever crossed his mind.

As a matter of fact, Time is unquestionably *first for us*;¹⁶ we experience Past, Present, and Future long before we develop a doctrine like “Everything is Becoming.” And most of us would also regard Time as *first*

¹⁵ Addition to E §259; PhN, p. 235.

¹⁶ TRENDLENBURG, Adolf, *Logische Untersuchungen*, v. 1, Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1862, p. 38: “Es könnte das Werden aus dem Sein und Nicht-Sein gar nicht *werden*, wenn nicht die Vorstellung des Werdens vorausginge.”

by nature: “Becoming” is a mere philosophical *reflection* on the latter. But this easy naturalism is scarcely visible in Hegel’s own time. Always suspect among Platonists and then among Christians, Time had now received the *coup de grace* from Spinoza to say nothing of Idealism’s appropriation of Kant’s Transcendental Aesthetic. The central point is as simple as it is scandalous: *Hegel regards Becoming as Logically Prior to Time*;¹⁷ Time is merely “intuited Becoming.” And it is also probably the case that, for Hegel, Becoming is Chronologically Prior as well: in the *Zusatz* we are considering, for example, he is elegantly applying his prior—both chronologically and logically—discussion of Becoming to Time. It is therefore fascinating to watch Hegel make the *Zeit-Werden* Analogy with *absolutely no awareness* of the fact that it is *Zeit* that is Logically and certainly Chrono-logically *prior* to *Werden*. Instead of attributing the facility with which he can elegantly construct the *Zeit-Werden* Analogy to the *derivation of Becoming from the Logical and Chronological Priority of Time*, he seems to delight in his own ingenuity in defining Time *in terms of Becoming*. But the underlying condition for the possibility of Hegel’s *Zeit-Werden* Analogy is precisely the opposite of what Hegel wants it to be: the Logical Priority of *Time* would explain the elegance of the Analogy just as well and far more naturally. Once again, it is easy to see why someone like Marx would burn with the desire to stand Hegel *on his feet* once again; he is clearly walking on his head!

These reflections are occasioned in no small part because of what Hegel says next about the Future:

Das andere Mal ist es umgekehrt; in der Zukunft ist das Nichtsein die erste Bestimmung, das Sein die spätere, wenngleich nicht der Zeit nach.¹⁸

This single sentence is as close as Hegel comes to betraying an awareness of the close relationship—and therefore of his own *pervasive blurring* of that relationship—between Logical and Chronological Priority. Having already described the Past, this sentence actually had a very simply job to perform: it needed to explain that the *Zukunft* has its *Grundlage* in *Nichtsein* just as *Vergangenheit* had its in *Sein*. But he neglects to use the word “*Grundlage*” on this occasion, and this omission causes him trouble. Perhaps he was hesitant to claim that *Nichtsein* could be even the logical *Grundlage* for *anything*, even a “thing” as unreal—for Hegel, that is—as the Future. Instead, he identifies *Nichtsein* as “*die erste Bestimmung*”—and

¹⁷ See the perceptive discussion of GWFH’s account of Heraclitus in LHP at ARANTES, P. A., *Hegel: A ordem do tempo*. Tradução e prefácio de Rubens Rodrigues Torres. Sao Paulo: Hucitec, 2000; p. 90-3.

¹⁸ Addition to E §259; PhN, p. 235.

therefore *Sein* as “*die spätere*”—of the Future. Because he uses these temporal expressions, he is finally forced to explain that he is not using “first” and “subsequent” in a *chronological* sense: “*nicht der Zeit nach.*” This constitutes Hegel’s sole acknowledgement of a critically important truth: *his language is hopelessly ambiguous on the question of Logical and Chronological Priority.*¹⁹ It is probably only because he is discussing *Time itself* that he feels compelled to explain that “first” and “subsequent” are to be and indeed must be taken in a Logical rather than a Chronological sense: for the most part, he has simply expected to be understood as referring exclusively to Logical Priority. He himself cannot see, much less admit, that this ambiguity in speech depends on his pervasive—and indeed *Logically Prior—ambiguity in thought.* But the ambiguity—indeed both of them—is there nonetheless. Moreover, he has betrayed the existence of this ambiguity while making the basis (*Grundlage*) of the *Zukunft*...Nothing. It is therefore this sentence that contains the most important evidence regarding “The Problem of Time” in Hegel’s thinking.

Although based in Being, the Past is no more real than the Future, however: neither Past nor Future constitutes anything distinct *except within the Form of Externality.* The *truth* of both, after all, is Becoming. Of the three temporal dimensions, it is therefore the Present that is the closest to *Werden*—understood as the *Begriff* of Time—because it, like Becoming, is the unity of its two moments, i.e. of the Past and Future:

Die Mitte [sc. the Present] ist die indifferente Einheit beider, so daß weder das eine noch das andere das Bestimmende ausmacht. Die Gegenwart ist nur dadurch, daß die Vergangenheit nicht ist; umgekehrt hat das Sein des Jetzt die Bestimmung, nicht zu sein, und das Nichtsein seines Seins ist die Zukunft; die Gegenwart ist diese negative Einheit.²⁰

Having described the Present once again, Hegel easily disposes of Past and Future along the pre-established lines:

Das Nichtsein des Seins, an dessen Stelle das Jetzt getreten ist, ist die Vergangenheit; das Sein des Nichtseins, was in der Gegenwart enthalten ist, ist die Zukunft.²¹

The self-contradiction at the heart of Hegel’s Future (“*das Sein des Nichtseins*”) seems even more vicious than is usual for Hegel.²² The self-

¹⁹ Compare ARANTES, p. 56 n. 3 on “o “gênio” especulativo da lingual.”

²⁰ Addition to E §259; PhN, p. 235.

²¹ Addition to E §259; PhN, p. 235.

²² See DÜSING, Klaus, *Dialektik und Geschichtsmetaphysik in Hegels Konzeption philosophiegeschichtlicher Entwicklung* in Hans-Christian Lucas and Guy Planty-

contradiction that is Becoming, itself the identity and truth of Being and Nothing, was easier to think precisely because it need not be—in fact, *could* not be—conceived to exist in Time: its moments were not chronologically sequential. But the Future has no existence apart from Time. And while the Future is obviously in some sense Nothing *for us*—we who are entirely ignorant of what it will bring—it is unquestionably something *by nature*. But it cannot be so for Hegel. At most, the Future is a vanishing moment of the Present.

Im positiven Sinne der Zeit kann man daher sagen: Nur die Gegenwart ist, das Vor und Nach ist nicht; aber die konkrete Gegenwart ist das Resultat der Vergangenheit, und sie ist trüchtig von der Zukunft. Die wahrhafte Gegenwart ist somit die Ewigkeit.²³

The three dimensions of Time have thus been collapsed (“as Result”) into “*die wahrhafte Gegenwart*.”²⁴ It now only remains necessary to show why Hegel’s conception of *Ewigkeit* has nothing whatsoever to do with the Future.

This he does in Section §258. It is here that he makes the distinction—blurred in the earlier reference to the Past as including both *Weltgeschichte* and *Naturbegebenheiten*—between Nature and Spirit with respect to Time.

Boujour eds., *Logik und Geschichte in Hegels System*, p. 127-145. Stuttgart-Bad Canstatt: Fromann Holzboog, 1989; p. 149 n. 16 for an illuminating connection with PLATO.

²³ Addition to E §259; PhN, p. 235.

²⁴ Note also that it is this “true present” of eternity in which World History unfolds (LPH, p. 78-9): “While we are thus concerned exclusively with the Idea of Spirit, and in the History of the World regard everything as only its manifestation, we have, in traversing the past, - however extensive its periods, - only to do with what is *present*; for philosophy, as occupying itself with the True, has to do with the *eternally present*. Nothing in the past is lost for it, for the Idea is ever present; Spirit is immortal; with it there is no past, no future [N.B.], but an essential now. This necessarily implies that the present form of Spirit comprehends within it all earlier steps [and, by analogy, *all subsequent ones as well*]. These have indeed unfolded themselves in succession independently [in their *Außerlichkeit*]; but what Spirit is it has always been essentially; distinctions are only the development of this essential nature. The life of the ever present Spirit is a circle of progressive embodiments, which looked at in one respect still exist beside each other, and only as looked at from another point of view [Time as ‘Intuited Becoming’] appear as past. The grades which Spirit seems to have left behind it, it still possesses in the depths of its present.”

Nur das Natürliche ist darum der Zeit untertan, insofern es endlich ist; das Wahre dagegen, die Idee, der Geist, ist *ewig*.²⁵

Hegel has already identified Time as the realm of the merely transient; he now exempts Spirit from this temporal transience: “it is only the Natural that is therefore subject to Time.”²⁶ But even more important than this is his insistence that Eternity—the realm of Spirit—not be taken as either an *alternative* to Time or as an *extension* of one part of it: the Future.

Der Begriff der Ewigkeit muß aber nicht negativ so gefaßt werden als die Abstraktion von der Zeit, daß sie außerhalb derselben gleichsam existiere; ohnehin nicht in dem Sinn, als ob die Ewigkeit *nach* der Zeit komme; so würde die Ewigkeit zur Zukunft, einem Momente der Zeit, gemacht.²⁷

Hegel is very careful to distinguish Eternity from Time; it is so independent of Time that it should not even be conceived as being “*außerhalb derselben*.” As Heidegger realized, Hegel’s Time is not real enough to stand in opposition to anything except the equally negative Space. And Heidegger is also right that—for all of Hegel’s radicalizing of the three dimensions of Time—Hegel still embraces the traditional priority of the Present. Only in Heidegger will the *Future* receive pride of place: in *Sein und Zeit*, it is Logically Prior to Past, Present, or even the mysterious *Augenblick*, the closest Heidegger comes to *Ewigkeit*. For Hegel, on the other hand, *Ewigkeit* is an important reality: it is the realm of the Spirit. Not surprisingly, then, it is completely independent from the Future, whose *Grundlage* is *Nichtsein*. Moreover, as we will see in the next section, the very notion of a Future extending into Eternity is, according to Hegel, erroneous and indeed ridiculous.

1.2.2.3. The Future as “Spurious Infinite” in the *Science of Logic*

The movement by which, for example, Becoming is the *unity* of “passing away” (from *Sein* to *Nichtsein*) and “coming to be” (from *Nichtsein* to *Sein*), is an example of what Hegel calls “the genuine infinite” or “Being-for-itself.”²⁸ As opposed to this Dialectical reciprocity in which

²⁵ *Zusatz* to E §258; PhN, p. 231.

²⁶ This text is very damaging to the attempt of Vittorio HÖSLE and Dieter WANDSCHNEIDER to link Time and *Geist*; see II.1.2.5.

²⁷ *Zusatz* to E §258; PhN, p. 231. See MARCUSE, Herbert, *Hegel’s Ontology and the Theory of Historicity*, translated by Seyla Benhabib, Cambridge: MIT Press, 1987, pp. 148-50.

²⁸ E §95; *Encyclopedia Logic*, p. 138-8: “What we now in point of fact have before us, is that somewhat comes to be an other, and that the other generally comes to be an other. Thus essentially relative to another, somewhat is virtually an other against

(apparently) opposite Moments are synthesized in Logical Completeness, Hegel distinguishes what he calls the “bad” or “spurious infinite.”²⁹ In the “bad” infinite, “Something becomes an other; this other is itself somewhat; therefore it likewise becomes an other, and so on *ad infinitum*.”³⁰

But such a progression to infinity is not the real infinite. That consists in being at home with itself in its other, or, if enunciated as a process, in coming to itself in its other. Much depends on rightly apprehending the notion of infinity, and not stopping short at the wrong infinity of endless progression.³¹

Although he uses the commonsense understanding of Time as an example of this “wrong infinity of endless progression” in the *Encyclopaedia Logic*,³² a more interesting discussion of this subject is found in a section

it: and since what is passed into is quite the same as what passes over, since both have one and the same attribute, viz. to be an other, it follows that something in its passage into other only joins with itself. To be thus self-related in the passage, and in the other, is the genuine Infinity.”

²⁹ It is important to remember throughout that just as the “good infinite” is characteristic of Reason, so is the “bad infinite” the result of *Understanding*. Compare WdL, p. 158 (emphasis mine): “Damit aber selbst ist das Unendliche nicht schon in der That der Beschränktheit und Endlichkeit entnommen; die Hauptsache ist, den wahrhaften Begriff der Unendlichkeit von der schlechten Unendlichkeit, das Unendliche der Vernunft *von dem Unendlichen des Verstandes* zu unterscheiden; doch Letzteres ist das verendlichte Unendliche, und es wird sich ergeben, daß eben indem das Unendliche vom Endlichen rein und entfernt gehalten werden soll, es nur verendlicht wird.”

³⁰ E §93. Compare E §94: “This **Infinity** is the wrong or negative infinity: it is only a negation of a finite: but the finite rises again the same as ever, and is never got rid of and absorbed. In other words, this infinite only expresses the *ought-to-be* elimination of the finite. The progression to infinity never gets further than a statement of the contradiction involved in the finite, viz. that it is somewhat as well as somewhat else. It sets up with endless iteration the alternation between these two terms, each of which calls up the other.” In the *Science of Logic*, this “ought-to-be” is linked to Kant in “Remark: The Ought” (133-6), beginning with: “The ought has recently played a great part in philosophy...” and concluding with: “The philosophy of Kant and Fichte sets up the ought as the highest point of the resolution of the contradictions of Reason; but the truth is that the ought is only the standpoint which clings to finitude and thus to contradiction.” See WdL, 142 (A.V. Miller): “This spurious infinity is in itself the same thing as the perennial ought; it is the negation of the finite it is true, but it cannot in truth free itself therefrom.”

³¹ E §94, p. 137

³² *Zusatz* to E §94; *Encyclopedia Logic*, p. 137-8: “When time and space, for example, are spoken of as infinite, it is in the first place the infinite progression on

called “The High Repute of the Progress to Infinity” found in the *Wissenschaft der Logik*. It is in this passage that Hegel repudiates a notion of *Ewigkeit* based on “die schlechte quantitative Unendlichkeit.”³³

This subject arises because Hegel quotes several lines of a poem by the physician and poet Albrecht von Haller:

Ich häuffe ungeheure Zahlen,
Gebürge Millionen auf,
Ich setze Zeit auf Zeit, und Welt auf Welt zu Hauf
Und wenn ich von der grausen Höh
Mit Schwindeln wieder nach dir seh,
Ist alle Macht der Zahl, vermehrt zu tausendmalen,
Noch nicht ein Theil von dir.
*Ich zieh sie ab, und du liegst ganz vor mir.*³⁴

Although praised by Kant—Hegel calls the lines the “von Kant sogenannte schauerhafte Beschreibung der Ewigkeit”³⁵—Hegel uses them instead as a refutation, indeed, as a self-refutation, of “the spurious quantitative infinite.”³⁶ As Hegel points out, it is only when Haller finally gives up the attempt to conceive of Eternity as an infinity of numerical multitude that he is vouchsafed any insight.³⁷ Thus the notion of Eternity as the infinite extension of the Future—where Time mounts up like so many Numbers, one moment after the other—is specifically rejected by Hegel and indeed ridiculed.³⁸

which our thoughts fasten. We say, Now, This time, and then we keep continually going forwards and backwards beyond this limit.”

³³ WdL, p. 276 (A.V. Miller, p. 228).

³⁴ WdL, p. 278 (A.V. Miller, p. 230).

³⁵ WdL, p. 278 (A.V. Miller, p. 229).

³⁶ WdL, p. 276 (A.V. Miller, p. 228): “Diese Unendlichkeit, welche als das Jenseits des Endlichen beharrlich bestimmt ist, ist als die schlechte quantitative Unendlichkeit zu bezeichnen.”

³⁷ WdL, p. 278-9 (A.V. Miller, p. 230): “Wenn auf jenes Aufbürgen und Aufthürmen von Zahlen und Welten als auf eine Beschreibung der Ewigkeit der Werth gelegt wird, so wird übersehen, daß der Dichter selbst dieses sogenannte schauerhafte Hinausgehen für etwas Vergebliches und Hohles erklärt, und daß er damit schließt, daß nur durch das Aufgeben dieses leeren unendlichen Progresses das wahrhafte Unendliche selbst zur Gegenwart vor ihn komme.”

³⁸ E §94, *Encyclopedia Logic*, p. 138: “In the attempt to contemplate such an infinite, our thought, we are commonly informed, must sink exhausted. It is true indeed that we must abandon the unending contemplation, not however because the occupation is too sublime, but because it is too tedious. It is tedious to expatiate in the contemplation of this infinite progression, because the same thing is constantly

But the interesting part is yet to come. Hegel continues his assault on the infinite Future in a fascinating attack on the pretensions of astronomy:

Es hat *Astronomen* gegeben, die sich auf das Erhabene ihrer Wissenschaft gern darum viel zu Gute thaten, weil sie mit einer *unermeßlichen* Menge von Sternen, mit so *unermeßlichen* Räumen und Zeiten zu thun habe, in denen Entfernungen und Perioden, die für sich schon groß sind, zu Einheiten dienen, welche noch so vielmal genommen, sich wieder zur Unbedeutenheit verkürzen.³⁹

Astronomers are inclined to pride themselves on the grounds that their science deals with a limitless number of stars existing in infinite Space and requiring an infinite amount of Time to study; Hegel rejects the grandeur of these “immeasurable multitudes.” In fact, he proceeds to ridicule the futuristic dream of space-travel as shallow and ignorant:

Das schaaale Erstaunen, dem sie sich dabei überlassen, die abgeschmackten Hoffnungen, erst noch in jenem Leben von einem Sterne zum anderen zu reisen und ins Unermeßliche fort dergleichen neue Kenntnisse zu erwerben, gaben sie für ein Hauptmoment der Vortreflichkeit ihrer Wissenschaft aus,—⁴⁰

It is only in the context of Hegel’s curious notion of the End of History—a notion required by his own commitment to the belief that it is his *Absolute Wissenschaft* that is in fact *die Vortrefliche*—that it becomes easy to see why Hegel becomes locked in a zero-sum game with Astronomy. He himself, however, seems quite blind to the causes and ramifications of this rivalry. The results of this zero-sum rivalry have already been presented in the Introduction.

It is particularly ironic that he insists that the astronomers of the future will not add to *Wissenschaft*: he claims that they can only expect “*neue Kenntnisse zu erwerben*” (emphasis mine). The irony of this claim resides in the fact, of course, that *it is Hegel’s own Science from which we can expect nothing new!* And yet he insists that even if the astronomers of his day were to live again and travel the boundless reaches of Outer Space in an equally boundless Future (*ins Unermeßliche*), that they would come to know again and again “the exact same thing” (*fort dergleichen*).⁴¹ What

recurring. We lay down a limit: then we pass it: next we have a limit once more, and so on for ever.”

³⁹ WdL, p. 279 (A.V. Miller, p. 230).

⁴⁰ WdL, p. 279 (A.V. Miller, p. 230).

⁴¹ GWFH insists on this aspect of the ‘bad quantitative infinite’ at WdL, p. 276-7; A.V. Miller, p. 228 (emphasis mine): “Der Progreß [sc. of the bad infinite] ist daher

room does his own Absolute Knowledge leave for any *new discoveries*? When Hegel ridicules astronomers for putting off the *Hauptmoment* of their science into the far-distant future, he is tacitly admitting that he himself has already had his *Hauptmoment*, a claim that seems, if anything, even more scandalous. To put it another way, Hegel must deny that there is anything yet unknown that is still worth knowing. It is no wonder, then, that he must, as it were, *refute the Future*: it is both *the unknown in itself* and *the condition of the possibility for learning something not yet known*.

For these reasons, it is not difficult to see that Hegel's rejection of "the immeasurable" is in fact the necessary consequence of the restriction of his interest to the Complete. The "genuine infinite"—the Dialectical reciprocity of *Fürsichsein*—is simply another way of describing Logical Completeness whereas "the bad infinite," explicitly applied by Hegel to the Future, is...Chronological *Incompleteness*! Not only does the Logical and Chronological Parallel imply Chronological Completeness but Hegel specifically and vividly rejects *Chronological Incompleteness*. This is what makes Hegel's application of "the bad infinite" to Haller's poem about Eternity in the *Wissenschaft der Logik* so important. Although he uses words like "law" and "measure" in the completion of the sentence fragment quoted above, it is really in the name of Completeness that he defends his own *Wissenschaft* by pointing out that it is the pride of the astronomers in their spurious infinities

...welche bewundernswürdig ist, nicht um solcher quantitativen Unendlichkeit willen, sondern im Gegenteil um der *Maaßverhältnisse* und der *Gesetze* willen, welche die Vernunft in diesen Gegenständen erkennt, und die das vernünftige Unendliche gegen jene unvernünftige Unendlichkeit sind.⁴²

What Hegel calls "the reasonable infinite" is the infinite that can be *conceptualized*—the process subject to and indeed defined by Reason's closed circle of Logical Completeness⁴³—and it is this alone that constitutes the domain of "measure" and "law."

gleichfalls nicht ein Fortgehen und Weiterkommen, sondern *ein Wiederholen von einem und eben demselben*, Setzen, Aufheben, und Wiedersetzen und Wiederaufheben; eine Ohnmacht des Negativen, dem das, was es aufhebt, durch sein Aufheben selbst als ein Kontinuirliches wiederkehrt."

⁴² WdL, p. 279 (A.V. Miller, p. 230).

⁴³ WdL, p. 173: "Das Unwahre ist das Unerreichbare; und es ist einzusehen, daß solches Unendliche das Unwahre ist.—Das Bild des Progresses ins Unendliche ist die gerade Linie, an deren beiden Grenzen nur, das Unendliche und immer nur ist, wo sie, - und sie ist Daseyn - nicht ist, und die zu diesem ihrem Nichtdaseyn, d. i. ins Unbestimmte hinaus geht; als wahrhafte Unendlichkeit, in sich zurückgebogen,

What Hegel doesn't seem to realize is that "that unreasonable infinite" of the astronomers is not lawless or immeasurable *by nature*, but only *for us*. We simply do not yet know: it will require much Time to solve the riddles of Space. For most of us, this limitation on our knowledge is tolerable. In fact, Philosophy itself would seem to be the perennial expression of mankind's comfort/anguish with this limitation; at any rate, the Greek word for "the love of wisdom" is the explicit acknowledgement that it exists. For those whose *science* does not require Chronological Completeness, the infinite Future⁴⁴ is not so much the refutation of reason as an external categorical imperative to wonder, to learn and to explore. But Hegel's System leaves no room for either of the things that filled Kant's *Gemüt* with *Bewunderung* and *Ehrfurcht*.⁴⁵

I.2.2.4. Logical and Chronological Teleology

It should be noted that neither of the two previous sections have any direct connection—within the context of the Hegelian System as understood by Hegel himself—with World History. *For us*, of course, the connection between Time—as described in the *Philosophy of Nature*—and History is obvious: it is much more evident *for us* that World History unfolds in Time than it is that World History constitutes, as it unquestionably constitutes *for Hegel*—the unfolding and return to self-recognition of Spirit. The fact remains, however, that for Hegel, Time is part of the *Philosophy of Nature* while World History is described explicitly in the context of the *Philosophy of Spirit*: for him, if not for us, *they occupy two entirely different domains*. The same disjunction—the same heterogeneity of domain—exists in the case of the "Spurious Infinite" of Hegel's *Logic*. It is all very well and good to show that a moment of the *Logic*—and a discarded moment at that—is relevant to the commonsense understanding of Time as a series of moments extending into the Future *ad infinitum* and then to suggest that this nexus of thoughts has some relevance to the role, or rather the absence of a role, of the Future in Hegel's notion of

wird deren Bild der Kreis, die sich erreicht habende Linie, die geschlossen und ganz gegenwärtig ist, ohne Anfangspunkt und Ende."

⁴⁴ Note that GWFH links the infinitude of Time only to Kant's Form of Intuition in the following passage (quoted at WdL, p. 279; A.V. Miller, p. 230) and not to its actual infinitude: "Der Unendlichkeit, die sich auf die äußere sinnliche Anschauung bezieht, setzt Kant die andere Unendlichkeit gegenüber, wenn "das Individuum auf sein unsichtbares Ich zurückgeht, und die absolute Freiheit seines Willens als ein reines Ich allen Schrecken des Schicksals und der Thyrannei entgegenstellt, von seinen nächsten Umgebungen anfangend, sie für sich verschwinden, eben so das, was als dauernd erscheint, Welten über Welten in Trümmer zusammenstürzen läßt, und einsam *sich als sich selbst gleich* erkennt."

⁴⁵ KANT, *Kritik der Praktischen Vernunft*; "Beschluß."

History. But in Hegel's universe, these connections are tenuous at best. In the third section of this Chapter, therefore, an argument for Chronological Completeness will be presented that derives neither from the *Logic* nor the *Philosophy of Nature* but arises only within the intellectual context of the *Philosophy of Spirit*.

I have had previous occasion to mention the contribution made by Maria Borges to my understanding of the Logical and Chronological Parallel in Hegel's thinking. In *História e Metafísica em Hegel: Sobre a Noção de Espírito do Mundo*, she uses this Parallel to show that Hegel's Philosophy of History is "an indirect proof" of the existence of God.⁴⁶ In other words, she takes Hegel's claim to have created a Theodicy seriously: "o tratado da *Weltgeschichte* pode também ser tomado como uma prova do domínio da razão divina no mundo."⁴⁷ In order to explain the intellectual underpinnings of this proof, she shows that Hegel has in fact invented a new form of "cosmological" proof based not on Nature, as is the version rejected by Kant,⁴⁸ but rather on Spirit. This leads her to emphasize an illuminating difference between the *Philosophy of Nature* on the one hand and the *Philosophy of Spirit* on the other: one resorts to explanation through *efficient*, the other through *final causality*.⁴⁹

Hegel sustentaria, portanto, uma doutrina que postula uma divisão entre dois níveis do desdobramento da Idéia no mundo objetivo: um primeiro, o reino da natureza, regido pela necessidade exterior, entendida como a necessidade do encadeamento dos fenômenos segunda uma causalidade eficiente; o segundo, o reino do espírito, do conceito, regido por uma necessidade interior, entendida como relação dos eventos com uma determinada finalidade.⁵⁰

Basing her discussion of the two types of causality on Hegel's own account of Aristotle in the *History of Philosophy*,⁵¹ she shows how two types of necessity—she calls them, respectively "exterior" and

⁴⁶ BORGES, p. 124-129.

⁴⁷ BORGES, p. 197.

⁴⁸ BORGES, p. 197: "Ora, essa prova aproximar-se-ia do argumento da prova físico-teológica criticada por Kant, diferenciando-se dessa ao partir da conformidade a fins do mundo espiritual, a não do mundo natural."

⁴⁹ See "Causa final e causa eficiente;" BORGES, p. 192-97.

⁵⁰ BORGES, p. 195.

⁵¹ BORGES, p. 193: "Segundo Hegel, a idéia da natureza em Aristóteles possuiria duas determinações: o conceito de finalidade (*Zweck*) e o conceito de necessidade."

“interior”⁵²—result from the distinction between *efficient* and *final causality*.⁵³ These two forms of causality are the characteristic explanatory devices in the two distinct parts of “the objective world:” the realms of Nature and of Spirit or *Concept*. In the realm of Nature, *efficient causality* offers explanations based on mere *external* connection: this neatly explains the inferiority of Nature to Spirit in *epistemological* terms.⁵⁴ A merely *external necessity* is, she suggests, entirely appropriate on an epistemological level to a realm handed over, in *metaphysical* terms, to “the self-externality of the Concept:” not only is the Idea in Nature subject to particularity, externality, and mere chance⁵⁵ *in itself* but also *for us* who would try to understand it. We can know what occurs in Nature only on the basis of a merely exterior efficient causality.

But this, according to Borges, is not the case in the realm of Spirit. The *locus* of World History in the Hegelian System is the conceptual realm of Spirit governed by a form of causality—*final causality*—that creates an *internal necessity* that leaves no room for chance. Her discussion of this point is indeed worth a more extended commentary. The section’s critical paragraph begins with the fact that although we can *only* analyze Nature in terms of efficient causality, we can use *both forms of causality* to analyze an historical event.

Ao analisarmos a causa do evento, nós podemos analisá-lo segundo sua causa eficiente ou sua causa final; a primeira nos daria o que Hegel denomina de necessidade exterior, a segunda, a necessidade interior.⁵⁶

Those who dismiss Hegel’s Philosophy of History as superficial and sloppy History fail to realize that unlike the professional historians of today, he

⁵² BORGES refers to “a noção de necessidade exterior, visto que essa é tomado como sinônimo de causa eficiente” on p. 193 and does the same for interior necessity on p. 194.

⁵³ BORGES, p. 193: “Temos, segundo o trecho citado, duas determinações, o conceito de finalidade (*Zweckmäßigkeit*) e o conceito de necessidade (*Notwendigkeit*); o primeiro corresponde à expressão latina *causae finales* e ao termo “conceito,” o segundo à expressão *causae efficientes*.”

⁵⁴ BORGES, p. 194: “As particularidades da natureza não estão a serviço de uma finalidade conceitual, na filosofia hegeliana; a natureza é sempre inferior ao espírito.”

⁵⁵ The felicitous expression of BORGES, p. 194 is (my emphasis): “as particularidades naturais são produtos de *uma irracionalidade típica da exteriorização*.”

⁵⁶ The next two passages quoted in the text are from a single paragraph at BORGES, p. 195. They will not be cited in the notes.

never intended to analyze historical events in terms of efficient causality:⁵⁷ because he was searching for the *internal necessity* of World Historical events, the causes for which he searched were *final causes*.

Visto que a necessidade exterior é tomada como sinônimo de acaso, compreendemos agora em que sentido a *Weltgeschichte* elimina o acaso: o filósofo que a narra não pretende dar conta, no seu relato, de todo momento histórico, que tem como causa, enquanto fenômeno empírico, obviamente, eventos antecedentes.

This analysis does not require Hegel to claim that *no historical event happens as a result of chance*; presumably the “exterior necessity” of efficient causality still “governs” many such events. Moreover, Hegel can defend his approach by saying that the explanatory device—i.e. efficient causality—appropriate to Nature (what *we* would call “science”) is inappropriate for explaining World History. But within the universe of Hegel’s conception of *Wissenschaft*—a universe which gives the prominent place, indeed the final and ultimate place, to “*die Absolute Wissen*”—it is only the historian of *final causality* who treats World History *scientifically*. Unlike Nature, World History unfolds according to a Spiritual purpose (*Zweck*) and can only be understood in terms of *Zweckmäßigkeit*. Naturally we can reply that Hegel himself is simply choosing what historical events to select for inclusion in World History. But Hegel himself would rebut the charge of subjecting history to his own subjective caprice by saying that it is *historians of efficient causality* (no matter how apparently *objective*) who, by virtue of the exteriority of their method *and their subject matter*, make history a matter of caprice.⁵⁸

⁵⁷ PhG, p. 23 (Miller): “As regards *historical* truths [GWFH has just given “when was Caesar born?” as an example]—to mention these briefly—it will be readily granted that so far as their purely historical aspect is considered, they are concerned with a particular existence, with the contingent and arbitrary aspects of a given content, which have no necessity.”

⁵⁸ LPH, p. 75: “It is not of the nature of the all-pervading Spirit to die this merely natural death; it does not simply sink into the senile life of mere custom [governed by efficient causality] but - as being a National Spirit belonging to Universal History - attains to the consciousness of what its work is [and therefore can be explained in terms of final causality]; it attains to a conception of itself. In fact it is world-historical only in so far as a *universal principle* has lain in its fundamental element, - in its grand aim: only so far is the work which such a spirit produces, a moral, political organization [as its end]. If it be mere desires that impel nations to activity [merely efficient causes], such deeds pass over without leaving a trace; or their traces are only ruin and destruction.”

O que é aliado dessa narrativa são os momentos que não contribuem para a realização da razão divina no mundo finito.

The question that arises so naturally *for us*—is Hegel *deriving* his conception of “the realization of divine reason” *from* events in “the finite world” or is he *imposing* that schema *on* them?—entirely misses the central point. For us, it is obvious that Hegel is imposing himself on those events as well as upon us; he is, as it were, the pseudo-scientific *imposter*. But by our decision to give this insulting answer, we show that we believe (falsely) that he would be less of an imposter if he were *deriving* his schema *from* them. Neither alternative has any basis in the Hegelian conception of World History. *World History has, for Hegel, no objective existence apart from its eternal significance in Absolute Knowledge.* It is easy to forget that Hegel was *the first great philosopher* to explain the meaning of World History as a whole. His vision of World History—his innovative decision to incorporate or rather conceptualize the past *in toto* into his System—was only made possible because *he had achieved Absolute Knowledge.*⁵⁹ To put it another way: Hegel knew full well that the final cause of *his own decision* to include World History in his System was Absolute Knowledge. The events narrated in World History are no doubt Chronologically Prior to Absolute Knowledge. But Absolute Knowledge—the only basis upon which those events could be explained *in terms of final causality*—is Logically Prior to World History. And that is why Hegel’s conception of History entails Chronological Completeness: the events treated in World History have Absolute Knowledge as their *End*.

⁵⁹ There is unquestionably a biographical and historical element to be considered here. As HYPOLITE has shown at p. 47: “Hegel’s entire youthful itinerary reappears in the *Phenomenology* in a rethought and organized form.” In other words, GWFH embodied a triumphant vision of his own intellectual development in a book organized in accordance with final causality (because that is what “a rethought and organized form” actually means). The *sheer excitement* of GWFH’s discovery *that everything made sense* (as an English speaker would say) *and fitted in to the Whole*—the *spiritual exaltation* of which the PhG is merely the *physical relic*—was never and could never be forgotten. The distinction between World History and his own “youthful itinerary” is very blurry in the PhG; that’s what makes the book one of the most fascinating ever written. The one thing that’s clear is that *both history and autobiography* (indeed the unifying “immanence of history” discovered by HYPOLITE) are cognized under the form of final causality. As for the question of whether or not GWFH had any basis for believing that his achievement deserved to be considered as the *finalidade da história*, we would do well to remember that, like GWFH, Beethoven was born in 1770. On the basis of what are we entitled to deny that Beethoven brought the Symphony to the *ne plus ultra* of its development?

It is no accident that Borges' explanation of Hegel's use of final causality in the Philosophy of History is particularly striking to an English speaker: the Portuguese word "*finalidade*" makes the crowning realization easier to grasp. The obvious English cognate is "finality;" a word that has only *chronological* (i.e. "he spoke with an air of finality") but never logical connotations. The Portuguese word "*finalidade*," on the other hand, has a strictly *logical* sense that can only be expressed in English either with vague words like "intention," "goal" or "purpose" (as in the German *Zweck* and its cognates) or in a much more technical way, by resorting to a cumbersome use of "teleology." When Borges writes, for example: "Ao dizermos que o espírito é o reino do conceito, estamos apontado para uma compensação dos seus eventos segundo uma determinada finalidade destes,"⁶⁰ the confusion inevitably arising naturally *for an English speaker* between the chronological and logical sense creates a useful hybrid word that expresses Hegel's amazing position perfectly. The Hegelian Concept, moving in accordance with the Dialectic, necessarily entails Logical Completeness. Applying the *finalidade do conceito* to historical events means that those events can only be conceptualized in terms of their *finality*. Hegel does not mean to say, or at any rate *emphasize*, that History is, as we would say, *over*; rather, as Borges points out, World History is conceptualized, i.e. it actually and only *is, under* (in the sense of "governed by") the interior necessity of *final causality*. But this requires World History's Logical Completeness and *that* it can achieve only if it has *realized*, and therefore *come to*, its End. Hegel's refusal, so useful to him in the construction and exposition of his System, to clearly distinguish between Logical and Chronological Priority *finally* has had the negative consequence that his indirection is visible in his confused reader's failure to clearly distinguish Logical and Chronological *Finality*.

The time has come to sum up the results of this Chapter and of Part I Section 2 (I.2) as a whole. The Concept, returned *full circle* in Absolute Knowledge, is Logically Prior to World History. Chronological Completeness is merely a result—and not necessarily an entirely welcome result, one would think—of the application of Logical Completeness to a temporal process. The fact that Time itself has for Hegel no objective reality and, in any case, that the Future, as a never-ending and non-existent Spurious Infinite, cannot be *conceived*, makes it easier to grasp how Hegel could have arrived at this scandalous result.

⁶⁰ BORGES, p. 195.

Part I. Section 3 (I.3) Hegel's Philosophy of History

The third and final section of Part I consists of three chapters. The Hegelian overtones of these two sets of three are intentional. In fact, I have tried to use Hegel's own methods to elucidate his ideas. Consider in retrospect the first of these two Triads:

Section 1 defined Logical Completeness as the basis of the Hegelian System. Section 2 established a theoretical basis—the Logical and Chronological Parallel—for the application of Logical Completeness to a Chronological Process (World-History). I indicated why this application would have the scandalous consequence of committing Hegel to the Chronological Completeness of World History and offered a theoretical basis for making this consequence consistent with the rest of the Hegelian System, if not with common sense. Section 3 is therefore intended to show that Hegel's Philosophy of History is simply the practical result of this application.

In Chapter 5 (I.3.1), I will show that the manner in which Hegel grafts World-History into his System demonstrates his commitment to both Logical and Chronological Completeness. This demonstration will involve an examination of Hegel's attack on Kant in the *Philosophy of Right*. It will show that the emergence of World-History in the Hegelian System can only be understood in the context of that attack. The repudiation of Kantianism necessarily commits Hegel to Chronological Completeness: Chronological *Incompleteness* leaves open the possibility of realizing *what ought to be* in the Future.

Hegel's Philosophy of History appears to be an instance of the Idea of Progress based on the expansion of Freedom. The steadily increasing number of those who are free is an unmistakable feature of Hegel's Philosophy of History. In Chapter 6 (I.3.2), I will show why Hegel's notion of Freedom is not what it appears to be. A distinction developed by Borges will show why "the steadily increasing number of those who are free" is a misleading view of Hegel's Philosophy of History and then the analysis of Ernst Tugendhat will show how Hegel manages an *Umkehrung* of Freedom that literally reverses the meaning of the word. I will also show why "Freedom" for Hegel is little more than Chronological Completeness in disguise.

Finally, in Chapter 7 (I.3.3), these elements will come together. As the Third Moment of the Triad of chapters constituting Section 3, "An Overview of Hegel's Philosophy of History" will show how Hegel achieves the appearance of Progress by means of Chronological Completeness and the *Umkehrung* of Freedom. The chapter will also complete the Triad

defined by the three sections of Part I: although mediated by the Logical and Chronological Parallel, the basis of Hegel's Philosophy of History will be shown to be Logical Completeness. The condition for the possibility of this solution is: "The Problem of Time in Hegel's Philosophy of History."

Chapter 5 (I.3.1) The Emergence of History in the *Philosophy of Right*

In his influential book *Hegel*, Charles Taylor places a chapter on Hegel's Philosophy of History—he calls it "Reason and History"—between "Ethical Substance" and "The Realized State;" together these three chapters constitute Part IV ("History and Politics").¹ It is a curious and noteworthy placement. The realized State *precedes* World History in Hegel's own System and *Sittlichkeit* ("Ethical Substance") is logically prior to the State. As an astute Hegel scholar, Taylor must be presumed to have *intentionally* inverted the correct Hegelian order. We are entitled to ask: "Why?" It should also be noted that Taylor has not only followed Hegel's order in his exposition of the *Logic* in Part III,² but returns to that order—"Art," "Religion," and "Philosophy"—when he considers "Absolute Spirit" in Part V. But this comparison points out another anomaly: Taylor does not call Part IV "Objective Spirit." Taylor's idiosyncratic procedure illustrates by means of some kind of hermeneutic *via negativa* the basic proposition of this chapter: Hegel's Philosophy of History can only be fully conceptualized if it is considered in context. Its *emergence* in the System is of crucial importance, as will here be shown.

Naturally Hegel's fullest treatment of World History is found in his *Lectures on the Philosophy of History*. But these lectures and the famous Introduction to them called "Reason and History" do not illuminate how World History is connected to the System as a whole. The first part of this chapter (I.3.1.1) will give a brief overview of the place of World History in

¹ TAYLOR, Charles, *Hegel*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975.

² Although he mysteriously inserts a brief account GWFH's *Philosophy of Nature* (ch. XIII) into Part III. Surely this is out of place in "Logic." On the other hand, TAYLOR writes well about the transition between Logic and Nature at p. 350: "Thus there is really no transition here but an equivalence." Particularly productive is TAYLOR's suggestion at p. 352 that the Philosophy of Nature stands to Logic as "a hermeneutical dialectic." "Rather it [GWFH's Philosophy of Nature] presupposes what has been proven in the *Logic*, and also what has been shown by natural science and shows how one reflects the other. Rather than a proof, it provides an exposition of the agreement of nature [i.e. "what has been shown by natural science"] with the Idea [i.e. "what has been proven in the *Logic*]." This "hermeneutical" reading has been developed in an interesting way in REDDING, Paul, *Hegel's Hermeneutics*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1996.

Hegel's System and suggest, using an observation of Bertrand Russell as a clue, why this placement is so important. The second part (I.3.1.2) will show why the emergence of World History, although treated in the *Encyclopedia* as well, is best considered in the context of the *Philosophy of Right*. Finally (in I.3.1.3), Hegel's treatment of "Interstate Relations," the moment that precedes "World History" in the *Philosophy of Right*, will be given a careful reading. The negative role of Kant's "Perpetual Peace" in the emergence of History will be emphasized in this exegetical section.

I.3.1.1. World History's Place in the Hegelian System

Like "Concept" in the *Logic*, World History is the Third Moment of one of Hegel's dialectical triads. In fact, "World History" is a Third within a Third within a Third. World History is, therefore—like "the Absolute Idea" in the *Logic*—a resolution among resolutions (see I.1.1.2). "Objective Spirit," the Second Division of the *Philosophy of Mind*, itself the Third Part of Hegel's System, is divided into "Law," "The Morality of Conscience," and "The Moral Life, or Social Ethics" (*Sittlichkeit*). The latter is then subdivided as: "The Family," "Civil Society," and "The State." Finally, the latter is considered under three headings: as "Constitutional Law," "External Public Law," and, finally, "Universal History."³

In the preface to the *Philosophy of Right*, Hegel remarks that his purpose is to provide a "science of the state."⁴ Important as the nature of the State is for Hegel, it is but the first part of the triad that is consummated by World History. The State in isolation and the analysis of its internal constitution ("Constitutional Law") is therefore only a *part* of political science. The treatment of the individual state must pass over into the domain of International Relations ("External Public Law").⁵ This transition marks the entry of that opposition which always characterizes the second moment: in this case, the opposition between individual States, the latter having already been considered *internally*, gives rise to international law and war. The third stage must then be something that while single, like the isolated and individual State, must also resolve the opposition inherent in the plurality of States. It would seem that Hegel requires, as it were, a State of States.

For Hegel, it is *World History* that provides the only resolution for the irresolvable conflicts between States. Is this not a remarkable answer? History, even when understood as that which all States do and have done,

³ All these section titles are from Wallace's translation of the *Philosophy of Mind*.

⁴ *Philosophy of Right*, p. 11.

⁵ *Philosophy of Right*, p. 212-216; see PEPERZAK, Adriaan, Hegel contra Hegel in his *Philosophy of Right: The Contradictions of International Politics*, *Journal of the History of Philosophy*, v. 32, n. 2, p. 241-263, 1994.

and thereby undoubtedly containing them as moments in a strictly Chronological sense, would seem to be a most precarious resolution of the opposition between them. Especially since History is primarily the *history of conflict*,⁶ the type of resolution and unity it affords is of a most equivocal and questionable kind.

A more consistent answer to the problem would therefore seem to be some kind of World State; something like the League of Nations or the United Nations. Like the individual nations that it contains, such a World State would possess unity and function as the resolution of opposition. By containing each individual State within itself, it would also achieve that distinct kind of unity that distinguishes the third moment of each triad from the first. Unlike World History, a World State would produce *an actual unity*, and not *an artificial and equivocal one*.

Bertrand Russell made this point in his *History of Western Philosophy* in a powerful way.⁷ Writing in 1946, Russell apparently holds Hegel's conception of the State responsible for the recent horrors of the Second World War.⁸ But this legacy is insufficient to sate Russell's *animus*: he goes on to attack Hegel on the grounds of *internal inconsistency* and not merely because of the German Philosopher's pernicious external influence:

The strength of his bias appears in the fact that his theory is largely inconsistent with his own metaphysic, and that the inconsistencies are all such as tend to the justification of cruelty and international brigandage. A man may be pardoned if logic compels him regretfully to reach conclusions which he deploras, but not for departing from logic in order to be free to advocate crimes. Hegel's logic led him to believe that there is more reality or excellence (the two for him are synonyms) in wholes than in their parts, and that a whole increases in reality and excellence as it becomes more organized. This justified him in preferring a State to an

⁶ Hence the inadequacy—to use no stronger word—of WINFIELD, Richard Dien, *The Theory and Practice of the History of Freedom: On the Right of History in Hegel's Philosophy of Right* in Robert L. Perkins ed., *History and System: Hegel's Philosophy of History*, p. 123-144. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1984; p. 126 (emphasis mine): “Paradoxically, what compels Hegel to secure a place for history within the orbit of right is the unprecedented radicalness with which *he bars historical givenness* from playing any role in determining the content of justice.”

⁷ For RUSSELL as a careful student of GWFH, see McTAGGART, John and McTAGGART, Ellis, *A Commentary on Hegel's Logic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1910; “Preface.”

⁸ RUSSELL, Bertrand, *History of Western Philosophy*, London: George Allen and Unwin, 1946; p. 768-69: “Such is Hegel's doctrine of the State; a doctrine which, if accepted, justifies every internal tyranny and every external aggression that can possibly be imagined.”

anarchic collection of individuals, but it should equally have led him to prefer a world State to an anarchic collection of States.⁹

Although Russell no doubt misses the mark with his implicit claim that Hegel departs from his own Logic “in order to be free to advocate crimes,” there is no doubt that he has put his finger on an interesting problem. We are entitled to ask: “For the sake of what End does Hegel place World History where Kant’s “Perpetual Peace” could so easily be?” The answer to this question becomes apparent by giving careful consideration to the emergence of World History in Hegel’s *Philosophy of Right*.

1.3.1.2. The *Philosophy of Right* and History

Hegel explains the relationship between the *Encyclopaedia* and the *Philosophy of Right* and in his 1820 Preface to the latter (and later) work:

The immediate occasion for publishing these outlines is the need of placing in the hands of my hearers a guide to my professional lectures upon the Philosophy of Right. Hitherto I have used as lectures that portion of the “Encyclopaedia of the Philosophic Sciences” (Heidelberg, 1817), which deals with this subject. *The present work covers the same ground in a more detailed and systematic way.*¹⁰

Although he describes his approach as in the *Philosophy of Right* as “systematic,” indeed as “more...systematic” than was the case in the *Encyclopaedia*; i.e. in exposition of the System itself, he does not spend any time elucidating his System as a whole for his readers there: he presupposes their familiarity with it. To speak more accurately, he presupposes their familiarity with the Speculative Method elucidated in his *Logic*:

In my “Science of Logic” I have developed the nature of speculative science in detail. Hence in this treatise an explanation of method will be added only here and there. In a work which is concrete, and presents such a diversity of phases, we may safely neglect to display at every turn the logical process, and may take for granted an acquaintance with the scientific procedure.¹¹

Hegel’s meaning here must be understood in terms of “the absolute Idea” as the culmination of the *Science of Logic*: he is presupposing that the

⁹ RUSSELL, p. 769.

¹⁰ *Philosophy of Right*, p. 1 (emphasis mine).

¹¹ *Philosophy of Right*, p. 2.

reader grasps what he means by “The Speculative Method.”¹² In other words, his treatment of politics is based on the Dialectic. Only on this basis can the *Philosophy of Right* be “understood and judged.”

Besides, it may readily be observed that the work as a whole, and also the construction of the parts, rest upon the logical spirit. From this standpoint, especially, is it that I would like this treatise to be understood and judged. In such a work as this we are dealing with a science, and in a science the matter must not be separated from the form.¹³

In other words, not only is the *Philosophy of Right* the more detailed of Hegel’s two accounts of the relationship between World History and the rest of the System but he specifically insists that History, like every other *Inhalt* considered in it, cannot be separated from the systematic and therefore dialectical *Form* in which that Content unfolds. Hegel’s treatment of World History can only be *understood and judged* by those who grasp that its *emergence* within and through the Speculative Method is inseparable from *what it is*.

This emergence is so important because we are watching Hegel integrate an open-ended (at least where the Future is concerned) Chronological Process into an otherwise timeless Logical System. When Space and Time were introduced at the beginning of the *Philosophy of Nature*, this only meant that the *anschauende Idee* (i.e. Nature) beholds itself as reflection of the Logical Idea in the Forms of Externality. There is no chronological progress, no proto-Darwinian evolution of natural forms in Time, in Hegel’s conception of Nature. Nor does Time emerge earlier in the *Philosophy of Spirit* except in the form of the Four Ages of Man (I.1.2.1). Hegel does not coordinate, as Heidegger later did in *Sein und Zeit*, the “Subjective Spirit” of the finite *Dasein* with *Zeitlichkeit*. It is the emergence of World History that marks the introduction of a unique and non-circular Chronological Development into a System governed by a seemingly atemporal Logical Completeness. It emerges, moreover, as a Third Moment: it brings Logical Completeness to its Triad. The earlier Moments of the Triad of which it is the synthesis (“State” and “International Relations”) are manifestly not chronologically but *logically prior* to it. But if World History contains every State, and is, moreover, the

¹² *Philosophy of Right*, p. 1-2 (emphasis mine): “This treatise differs from the ordinary compendium mainly in its method of procedure. It must be understood at the outset that the philosophic way of advancing from one matter to another, *the general speculative method*, which is the only kind of scientific proof available in philosophy, is essentially different from every other.”

¹³ *Philosophy of Right*, p. 2.

fulfillment or reality of International Relations, it is *chronologically prior* to each and every one of them and will, thanks to the Future, *survive those that presently exist*. Inserting World History into the System, therefore, raises serious questions about the way Hegel has juggled Chronological and Logical Priority. Unless, that is, World History isn't the ontologically independent and infinitely open-ended thing we assume that it is. And that's just the point: it isn't. But what exactly is it?

A valuable clue to what "World History" really is can be gleaned from the structure of the *Philosophy of Right* even before beginning a thorough investigation of Hegel's description of its emergence. The *Philosophy of Right* is the only one of Hegel's four books that does not end with a subject qualified by the dramatic adjective "absolute." It does not end with "Absolute Knowledge" (like the *Encyclopedia*), or with "Absolute Knowing" (as the *Phenomenology* did) or even "the Absolute Idea" (as was the case with *The Science of Logic*). Instead, it culminates with or rather in "World History." It turns out that World History is much more Absolute—much more like the *sich denkende Idee* of the *Wissenschaft der Logik*—than one might think.

The history of spirit is its overt deeds, for only what it does it is and its deed is to make itself as a spirit the object of its consciousness, to explain and lay hold upon itself by reference to itself.¹⁴

Like *die absolute Idee* in Logic, "the history of spirit" has *itself* as its object: it is so self-involved, so Logically Complete, that it can only "explain and lay hold upon itself by reference to itself." But how are we to imagine something like World History, even when mediated by a transitional synonym like "the history of spirit," making itself "the object of its consciousness"? How can History *make itself its own object*? Hegel is enigmatic about this although he makes it crystal clear that thinking or even "laying hold upon" itself is—as was the case with the Absolute Idea—precisely its *being and principle*.

To lay hold upon itself is its being and principle, and the completion of this act is at the same time self-renunciation and transition.¹⁵

What is to be understood as able "to lay hold of itself" in this context? And how can History be understood as being capable of anything like "self-renunciation"? Mysterious though these words seem at first, they are rendered transparent by recalling Hyppolite's important notion of "the

¹⁴ *Philosophy of Right*, p. 216 (§343).

¹⁵ *Philosophy of Right*, p. 216.

immanence of history.” World History isn’t something independent and external: its contents are *implicitly* immanent in all of us and explicitly so *in Hegel himself*.

To express the matter formally, the spirit which again apprehends what has already been grasped and actualized, or, what is the same thing, passes through self-renunciation into itself, is the spirit of a higher stage.¹⁶

Only on the basis of what might be called “an immanentist reading” of Hegel’s Philosophy of History does this passage make sense or, to put this important point another way: this passage is a crucial proof-text for Hyppolite’s immanentist reading. Hegel himself is “the spirit which apprehends what has already been grasped and realized.” Instead of *externalizing* History—by regarding “what has already been grasped and realized” as an independently existing process—the true Historian equipped with Absolute Knowledge (i.e. “the spirit of a higher stage”) knows himself *in* History because that History is really immanent or *interior* where he himself—as opposed to the merely contingent aspects of the man “Hegel”—is concerned. Because of the “immanence of history” in the fully self-conscious knower, i.e. Hegel as opposed to “Hegel,” there is nothing to fear by immersing or even submerging oneself in History: as if one would lose oneself among its vanished pageants and bygone scenes. In fact, it is precisely this process by which “Hegel” has become himself in Hegel, i.e. in Absolute Knowledge. It is precisely here that his spirit “passes through self-renunciation *into itself*.” This is how Subject and Substance become one. The recognition of the immanence of history involves both “self-renunciation,” in which “Hegel,” as particular *ego*, as particular Professor of Philosophy,¹⁷ is *left behind*, and also “transition,” in which the real Hegel *considered only as Subject*, becomes one with Substance in Absolute Knowledge. Internalized within this *transformed or rather self-actualized Hegel*, History is itself, and by the very same *deed*, transformed and therefore, having been internalized and therefore active in its great Philosopher, it accomplishes a mightier deed than Napoleon or Caesar ever thought to perform.¹⁸ “its deed is to make itself as a spirit the object of its

¹⁶ *Philosophy of Right*, p. 216.

¹⁷ In the PhG (§5), GWFH is referring to this “Hegel” when he claims that the realized *Wissenschaft* will be developed “abgesehen von der Zufälligkeit der Person und der individuellen Veranlassungen.”

¹⁸ It would seem that GWFH exempts himself from a statement like the following passage from *Philosophy of Right* §344, p. 217: “States, peoples, and individuals are established upon their own particular definite principle, which has systematized reality in their constitutions and in the entire compass of their surroundings. Of this

consciousness, to explain and lay hold upon itself by reference to itself.”¹⁹

The end of the *Philosophy of Right* is therefore not so different from the more obviously and overtly grandiose endings of Hegel’s other books. But it is unquestionably the text that will help us to grasp how Hegel conceptualizes History. And “conceptualizes” is, as it turns out, precisely the word.

1.2.1.3. The Rejection of “Perpetual Peace” in “International Relations”

The fact that Hegel didn’t propose a World State as the Third Moment of “The State” can’t be explained on the grounds that he couldn’t imagine such a thing. The rejection of this possibility is a deliberate and indeed a polemical choice on Hegel’s part. His *Philosophy of Right* contains, as we shall see, repeated negative references to Kant’s “Perpetual Peace.” Indeed the emergence of World History should be considered as having a *double* aspect. As something like the *sich denkende Idee* of Absolute Knowing, World-History can be shown to have a *positive* role to play as Spirit’s consciousness of itself as Spirit. But there is also a much more tangible *negative* aspect: it is fair to say that Hegel is *at war* with Kant’s “Perpetual Peace” and that it is only World-History’s emergence in the System that allows him to win that war. It is therefore somewhat unclear whether (a) it was Hegel’s desire to include World-History that required him to reject the Kantian ideal that it replaced *or* (b) whether Hegel incorporated World-History into his System—an act of incorporation that was hardly unproblematic—simply as a plausible way to reject and refute Kant’s “Perpetual Peace.” The second alternative should not be completely ruled out.

I would argue, however, that Hegel’s most pressing priority is expressed by neither of these alternatives. My goal has been to show that Hegel’s most important philosophical commitment is to Logical Completeness and that this, in turn, led him to the bizarre corollary of Chronological Completeness. Kant’s “Perpetual Peace” necessarily

systematized reality they are aware, and in its interests are absorbed. Yet are *they the unconscious tools and organs of the world-spirit*, through whose inner activity the lower forms pass away. Thus the spirit by its own motion and *for its own end* makes ready and works out the transition into its next higher stage.” GWFH seems to know his own end.

¹⁹ This account may lend some support to the ingenious identity between “Egoidade e Temporalidade” proposed in ARANTES, P. A., *Hegel: A ordem do tempo*. Tradução e prefácio de Rubens Rodrigues Torres. Sao Paulo: Hucitec, 2000. World History may still remain *temporal* for the pre-Absolute Knowledge “Ego,” i.e. for “Hegel.” This important book will receive further attention in Part II.

involves the Future;²⁰ this made it—like “Astronomy’s Epistemological Future” (see Introduction)—*ipso facto* unacceptable. Of course Hegel could hardly say as much; other arguments were therefore required and were easily found to make his point. But equally unacceptable was a non-conceptual account of History: a World-History that has not yet reached its End. The most peculiar feature of Hegel’s Philosophy of History, i.e. its Chronological Completeness, becomes *intelligible* both because Logical Completeness is the basis of the entire System *and* because the manner in which World-History emerges in that System inevitably makes Hegel’s enmity to Kantianism’s reliance on the Future impossible to miss. My claim is that both of these are simply aspects or rather symptoms of the same scandalous result required by his most primordial philosophical commitment. Nor, on this reading, is it accidental that the *Philosophy of Right* contains both the classic expression of the unity of the rational and the real *and* the beautiful passage about the “Owl of Minerva.” The first is the *theoretical* basis for the repudiation of that better tomorrow promised by the Idea of Progress while the latter constitutes that repudiation’s most poetic, mysterious, and quotable expression.

Hegel’s attack on “Perpetual Peace” commences with an unblushing defense of War.²¹ Although Hegel supports standing armies²² and seems to praise the willingness of the professional soldier to die for the common good,²³ he by no means confines the duty to sacrifice life and limb for the State to the military class: this duty inheres in the people as a whole.²⁴ He

²⁰ REISS, Hans (ed.), *Kant’s Political Writings*. Translated by H.B. Nisbet. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970; p. 130 (concluding paragraph of “Perpetual Peace; A Philosophical Sketch”): “If it is a duty to bring about in reality a state of public right (albeit by an infinite process of gradual approximation), and if there are also good grounds for hoping that we shall succeed, then it is not just an empty idea that *perpetual peace* will eventually replace what have hitherto been wrongly called peace treaties (which are actually only truces). On the contrary, it is a task which, as solutions are gradually found, constantly draws nearer fulfillment, for we may hope that the periods within which equal amounts of progress are made will become progressively shorter.” See also p. 108-9 and 123-4.

²¹ This defense begins in *Philosophy of Right* §324. See SMITH, Steven B. *Hegel’s Critique of Liberalism: Rights in Context*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989, pp. 156-64.

²² *Zusatz* to *Philosophy of Right*, §326.

²³ *Philosophy of Right*, p. 296 (*Zusatz* to §327): “The military class is the class of universality. To it are assigned the defence of the state and the duty of bringing into existence the ideality implicit in itself. In other words it must sacrifice itself.”

²⁴ *Philosophy of Right*, p. 210-11 (emphasis mine): “Dissensions between states may arise out of any one specific side of their relations to each other. Through these dissensions the specific part of the state devoted to defense [i.e. the professional

acknowledges the courage War engenders in the professional soldier but is generously prepared to find a new form of it even in the terrified draftee.²⁵ Thanks to modern weaponry, the older form of bravery and the personal sense of honor that accompanied it has in fact been superseded.²⁶ War is neither unethical nor evil.²⁷ Although Hegel suggests that War is inevitable²⁸—and therefore immune to the attempts of dreamers like Kant

soldiers of the standing army] receives its distinguishing character. *But if the whole state, as such, is in danger of losing its independence, duty summons all the citizens to its defense.*”

²⁵ *Philosophy of Right*, p. 296 (Zusatz to §327; emphases mine): “The courage of the animal, or the robber, the bravery due to a sense of honour, the bravery of chivalry, are not yet the true forms of it. *True bravery in civilized peoples consists in a readiness to offer up oneself in the service of the state*, so that the individual counts only as one amongst many. *Not personal fearlessness*, but the taking of one’s place in a universal cause, is the valuable feature of it.”

²⁶ *Philosophy of Right*, p. 212 (Note to §328): “The principle of the modern world, that is, the thought and the universal, have given bravery a higher form. It now seems to be mechanical in its expression, being the act not of a particular person, but of a member of the whole. As antagonism is now directed, not against separate persons, but against a hostile whole, personal courage appears as impersonal. To this change is due the invention of the gun; and this by no means chance invention has transmuted the merely personal form of bravery into the more abstract.” Note that it is nevertheless more primitive weaponry with which GWFH twits his flabby and hypocritical opponents at *Philosophy of Right*, p. 295-6; Zusatz to §324 (emphasis mine): “From the pulpit we hear much regarding the uncertainty, vanity, and instability of temporal things. At the very same time every one, no matter how much he is impressed by these utterances, thinks that he will manage to retain his own stock and store. But if the uncertainty comes in *the form of hussars with glistening sabres*, and begins to work in downright earnest, this touching edification turns right about face, and hurls curses at the invader.”

²⁷ *Philosophy of Right*, p. 209 (Zusatz to §324; emphasis mine): “It is a very distorted account of the matter when the state, in demanding sacrifices from the citizens, is taken to be simply the civic community, whose object is merely the security of life and property. Security cannot possibly be obtained by the sacrifice of what is to be secured. *Herein is to be found the ethical element in war. War is not to be regarded as an absolute evil.*” It is precisely the willingness to sacrifice one’s own life that makes war ethical. Compare *Philosophy of Right* §328: “The content of bravery as a sentiment is found in the true absolute final end, the sovereignty of the state. Bravery realizes this end, and in so doing gives up personal reality. Hence, in this feeling are found the most rigorous and direct antagonisms. There is present in it a self-sacrifice, which is yet the existence of freedom.” This last sentence alerts the reader to the peculiar sense of “freedom” found in GWFH (see I.3.2).

²⁸ *Philosophy of Right*, p. 296 (Note to §324): “In spite of this, wars arise, when they lie in the nature of the matter. The seeds spring up afresh, and words are silenced before the earnest repetitions of history.”

to abolish it²⁹—he also claims that perpetual peace, even if it were possible, would be a disaster.³⁰ Peace promotes weakness.³¹ Hegel has made all of these points even before his discussion of the State, considered internally, passes over into the relations between States. War—and the unitary leadership required to successfully prosecute it—is indeed the bridge between the two moments.³²

The eleven paragraphs that Hegel devotes to the subject scarcely lay a secure foundation for the covenants of International Law. It is the individual State whose claims, according to Hegel, are prior—one should add, as of course Hegel does not, that they are both Chronologically and Logically prior—to any international agreements and thus the theoretical

²⁹ *Philosophy of Right*, p. 295 (Note to §324): “Everlasting peace is frequently demanded as the ideal towards which mankind must move. Hence, Kant proposed an alliance of princes, which should settle the controversies of states, and the Holy Alliance was probably intended to be an institution of this kind.” GWFH’s motive for distorting of KANT’s views—it was to be a federation of Republics, not Princes—deserves further consideration. For KANT’s position on war, see *The Metaphysics of Morals* §54-§62 in REISS, *Kant’s Political Writings*, p. 165-75.

³⁰ GWFH even uses the expedient of quoting himself to make this point: this emphasizes that his opposition to KANT on “Perpetual Peace” is of long standing. *Philosophy of Right*, p. 210 (*Zusatz* to §324): “Moreover, by it [sc. War], as I have elsewhere expressed it, “finite pursuits are rendered unstable, and the ethical health of peoples is preserved. Just as the movement of the ocean prevents the corruption which would be the result of perpetual calm, so by war people escape the corruption which would be occasioned by a continuous or eternal peace.”” The reference is to “On the Scientific Ways of Treating Natural Law” (1802-03). See HEGEL, G.W.F. *Political Writings*. Edited by Laurence Dickey and H.B. Nisbet; translated by H.B. Nisbet. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999, p. 141. On this crucial text, see HARRIS, H.S. *Hegel’s Development: Night Thoughts (Jena 1801-1806)*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1984; pp. 148-50, 38-9, 108, 129, 131-2, 205, and 218.

³¹ In addition to the passage quoted in the previous note, see *Philosophy of Right*, p. 295 Addition to §324): “As a result of war peoples are strengthened, nations, which are involved in civil quarrels, winning repose at home by means of war abroad.” Cf. HARRIS, Errol E. Hegel’s Theory of Sovereignty, International Relations, and War in STEWART, Jon (ed.), *The Hegel Myths and Legends*, p. 154-180, Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1996, p. 164: “Hegel knew nothing of nuclear weapons and intercontinental ballistic missiles; and short of these, could he have foreseen high explosives, aerial bombardment, fragmentation bombs, napalm, chemical and bacteriological warfare, he might have concluded, as we should, that the patriotic virtues could be of no countervailing advantages.” It is regrettable that HARRIS saw fit to venture into such paths; unfortunately the other HARRIS fares no better in the same volume: see HARRIS, H.S. *The End of History in Hegel*, p. 223-236, especially at p. 232-3.

³² Consider the connection between *Philosophy of Right* §329 and §330.

basis for Treaties and International Law in general is expressly subordinated to the needs of the sovereign State.³³ Hegel's approach throughout repudiates "idealism" in the popular sense of that term; indeed he seems to delight in his hardheaded approach.³⁴ His attack on Kant's "Perpetual Peace" is further pressed³⁵ and War quickly reappears as the perfectly logical counterpart of International Law.³⁶ As for War, Hegel makes it clear that only the States involved are arbiters of the *casus belli*.³⁷

³³ *Philosophy of Right*, p. 212; §331: "The nation as a state is the spirit substantively realized and directly real. Hence, it is the absolute power on earth. As regards other states it exists in sovereign independence."

³⁴ Consider as an example the two sentences of *Philosophy of Right*, p. 213; §333 (emphasis mine). The first appears to validate the claims of International Law: "International law...has at its basis the proposition that treaties, as they involve the mutual obligations of states, must be kept inviolate." But in the second sentence, he corrects this false impression. "But because the relation of states to one another has sovereignty as its principle, they are so far in a condition of nature one to the other. Their rights have reality not in a general will, which is constituted as a superior power, but in their particular wills. Accordingly the fundamental proposition of international law remains a *good intention*, while in the actual situation the relation established by the treaty is being continually shifted or abrogated." Two important aspects of KANT's thinking come together here: morality as "ought" and the comparison of a better future to "the actual situation" (i.e. "Kantianism"). Only by means of Chronological Completeness can GWFH banish KANT's "ought" from the Philosophy of History. Something similar occurs in the Addition to §330 at *Philosophy of Right*, p. 297: "A relation between states ought also to be intrinsically right, and in mundane affairs that which is intrinsically right ought to have power. But as against the state there is no power to decide what is intrinsically right and to realize this decision." The first sentence appears to validate *what ought to be*; the second reasserts the omnipotence of *what is* ("there is no power").

³⁵ *Philosophy of Right*, p. 213; *Zusatz* to §333 (emphasis mine): "There is no judge over states, at most only a referee or mediator, and even the mediatorial function is only an accidental thing, being due to particular wills. *Kant's idea was that eternal peace should be secured by an alliance of states*. This alliance should settle every dispute, make impossible the resort to arms for a decision, and be recognized by every state. This idea assumes that states are in accord, an agreement which, strengthened though it might be by moral, religious, and other considerations, nevertheless always rested on the private sovereign will, and was therefore liable to be disturbed by the element of contingency." The key phrase in this passage is, as will later become clear, the opening statement: "There is no judge over states."

³⁶ The transition from *Philosophy of Right* §333 to the first sentence of §334; p. 214 ("Therefore, when the particular wills of states can come to no agreement, the controversy can be settled only by war") is almost comic in effect.

³⁷ *Philosophy of Right*, p. 214; §335: "Moreover, *the state as a spiritual whole cannot be satisfied merely with taking notice of the fact of an injury*, because injury involves a threatened danger arising from the possible action of the other state."

Even the decision to abrogate existing Treaties belongs exclusively to the sovereign State; Hegel makes it plain that he regards *raison d'état* as sufficient grounds for any such abrogation.³⁸ Although Hegel allows that the conduct of modern War is becoming more humane—it is the most idealistic remark in the section³⁹—he bases this fact only on the internal morality of the States concerned rather than in their respect for International Law.⁴⁰ In fact it is precisely this parting shot at International Law that marks the transition to World-History.⁴¹

Hegel's views on War and International Law are predicated on a hardheaded political realism that another Prussian Civil Servant—the great Otto von Bismarck—would later call “*Realpolitik*.” But it is highly significant that Hegel never mentions his predecessor Machiavelli in these passages: he defines himself—appropriately enough, given his views⁴²—by

This justifies the State's decision to make War.

³⁸ *Philosophy of Right*, p. 214-5; §337 (emphasis mine): “This particular will of the whole [State] is in its content its well-being, and well-being constitutes the highest law in its relation to another.” Consider also: “So, too, its end in relation to other states, *the principle justifying its wars and treaties*, is not a general thought, such as philanthropy, but the actually wronged or threatened weal in its definite particularity.”

³⁹ *Philosophy of Right*, p. 297; Addition to §338: “Modern wars are carried on humanely.” Note that GWFH presents this as a fact: as what *is*, in fact, the case. GWFH permits a certain amount of political idealism to enter when the modality shifts from present indicative, as at §338, p. 215: “Ambassadors, also, are to be respected. War is not to be waged against internal institutions, or the peaceable family and private life, or private persons.” But the best he can say of International Law's relation to War there is that *it makes room for the possibility of Peace*. “Hence, war, even when actively prosecuted, is understood to be temporary, and in international law is recognized as containing the possibility of peace.”

⁴⁰ *Philosophy of Right*, p. 215; §339 (emphasis mine): “For the rest, the capture of prisoners in time of war, and in time of peace the concession of rights of private intercourse to the subjects of another state, *depend principally upon the ethical observances of nations*. In them is embodied that inner universality of behaviour, which is preserved under all relations.”

⁴¹ *Philosophy of Right*, p. 297; Addition to §339: “The nations of Europe form a family by virtue of the universal principle of their legislation, their ethical observances, and their civilization. Amongst them international behaviour is ameliorated, while there prevails elsewhere a mutual infliction of evils. The relation of one state to another fluctuates; no judge is present to compose differences; the higher judge is simply the universal and absolute spirit, the spirit of the world.”

⁴² Carl SCHMITT's *Concept of the Political* (1927) seems much less original after reading a sentence like the this one: “Although a number of states may make themselves into a family, the union, because it is an individuality, must create an opposition, and so beget an enemy” (Addition to §324; *Philosophy of Right*, p. 295).

his enemies, not his friends. And his most important enemy is Kant. Kant not only opposed War and supported International Law: more importantly, Kant *looked forward to a Future in which International Law would put an end to War*. Kant argued that such a Future, a federation of pacific Republics, was a rational End towards which it was our duty to strive: “Perpetual Peace” is *what ought to be*. To paraphrase Hegel: Kant believed that “the rational *will become real*.” The *actual* form of Hegel’s dictum illustrates his best-known move against political idealism and the Idea of Progress: only the rational that is *actual* is the really *rational*.⁴³ Although this move justifies on a theoretical level the repudiation of the Future—what I have called Kantianism—it does not assert the Chronological Completeness of History.⁴⁴ But Hegel’s explicit and deliberate substitution of World-History for Kantianism’s Future—clearly visible in the *Philosophy of Right*—shows the short-term polemical benefits Hegel reaped from Chronological Completeness. World-History records what is real, not what ought to be. But if World-History leaves room for future developments, it then leaves room for Kant’s *ought*. And Hegel has no place in his System for *that* and therefore no place for the Future in which that ought, either in the realm of the moral law or the starry heavens, could someday be realized.⁴⁵

In the *Philosophy of Right*, the transition from International Law to

⁴³ *Philosophy of Right*, p. 11: “Das was ist zu begreifen, ist die Aufgabe der Philosophie, denn das was ist, ist die Vernunft.”

⁴⁴ It does, however, have other unpleasant consequences. A convincing attempt to relieve GWFH of the self-imposed “scandal” of affirming the rationality of the actual is made by FACKENHEIM, Emil L. On the Actuality of the Rational and the Rationality of the Actual, *Review of Metaphysics*, p. 690-698, 1970 by emphasizing the priority of the *actuality* of the rational. Even his spirited defense concludes with the words: “This modest essay has inquired only into the meaning of Hegel’s philosophy. Any inquiry into its truth must confront its claims with the gas chambers of Auschwitz” (p. 698). He quotes ROSENZWEIG, Franz, *Hegel und der Staat*. Oldenburg, 1920; vol. II, p. 79) as writing that the origin of the dictum is “the idea of the divine kingdom on earth” and goes on to buttress his defense of Hegel by showing its connection to Christian doctrines of divine providence (p. 694). In a way, this is the crux of the matter. In the Lord’s Prayer, “Thy Kingdom come!” is an *imperative*: it is prayed for; it has not yet come. The purpose of Hegel’s Philosophy of History is to convert this imperative into an *indicative*: the kingdom is here. He seeks to prove “...that what has happened, and is happening every day, is not only not ‘without God,’ but is essentially His Work” (*Philosophy of History*, p. 457). Despite any distinction between existence and actuality, “what has happened,” must include, on FACKENHEIM’s own tacit admission, “the gas chambers of Auschwitz.”

⁴⁵ GWFH’s hostility to KANT is particularly visible in the intersection of the Ought and the Future, i.e. “the bad infinite.”

World-History is mediated by the question—to which International Law is clearly not the answer—of whether or not there is any “judge” that stands above two quarreling States.⁴⁶ As we have seen, Hegel commenced his attack on Kant’s “Perpetual Peace” in the Addition to §324 with the words: “There is no judge over states.” In other words, Hegel decisively rejects any Ethical Ideal on the basis of which the behavior of States can be judged: neither by International Law *as it presently exists* nor by Kant’s proposal of “Perpetual Peace” *as a future towards which we ought to work*. But only if “there *is* no judge” can be converted to the much less probable proposition that “there *will be* no judge” can Hegel decisively repudiate Kantianism. Hegel’s solution is therefore to find a judge that neither stands *above* quarreling States (as does International Law) nor, as it were, *beyond* them (as the Ideal Future in Kantianism).

It is useful at this point to return to the overview of the Triad that Hegel offered the reader at the outset of the Division under consideration. Hegel outlined the three parts of the triad in the following terms:

259. The Idea of the state (a) has immediate actuality and is the individual state as a self-dependent organism: the Constitution or Constitutional Law; (b) passes over into the relation of one state to other states International Law; (c) is the universal Idea as a genus and as an absolute power over individual states the mind which gives itself its actuality in the process of World History.⁴⁷

Explaining this arrangement in the accompanying Addition, Hegel begins by stating a mechanical principle of the triad: this reminds us that Logical Completeness is the *sine qua non* of the Hegelian System.

States as such are independent of one another, and therefore their relation to one another can only be an external one, *so that there must be a third thing standing above them to bind them together*.⁴⁸

Hegel’s commitment to Logical Completeness requires the existence of this third thing. But his decision to banish from philosophy *anything* transcendent, anything that is either *above* or *beyond* (*jenseits*) the world as

⁴⁶ *Philosophy of Right*, p. 297; Addition to §339: “The relation of one state to another fluctuates; no judge is present to compose differences; the higher judge is simply the universal and absolute spirit, the spirit of the world.”

⁴⁷ §259; *Philosophy of Right*, p. 160.

⁴⁸ *Philosophy of Right*, p. 279; Addition to §259 (emphasis mine): “...*so daß ein drittes Verbindenes über ihnen sein muß*.”

it actually is or even appears to be,⁴⁹ is the basis for the emergence of Chronological Completeness in his System. This can only happen, of course, because he has introduced World-History into his System.

Now this third thing is the mind which gives itself actuality in World History and is the absolute judge of states.⁵⁰

History once again becomes active, in this case, as *judge*: this raises anew the hermeneutic power of the “immanentest reading.”⁵¹ The more important point to grasp, however, is that the only thing “standing above”; the States in order to “bind them together” is *not really above them at all*. It is not the otherworldly City of St. Augustine or Plato’s transcendent Idea of the Good. But it is no accident that Hegel does not mention those philosophers here: it is only Kant who is under attack.

And that is why World-History can have no Future: why it stands neither above *nor beyond* the quarreling States. As the context of World-

⁴⁹ PIPPEN, Robert B. *Hegel’s Idealism: The Satisfactions of Self-Consciousness*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989; p. 206: “...there is *literally* nothing “beyond” or “behind” or responsible for the human experience of the world of appearances, and certainly not an Absolute Spirit.” Apparently PIPPEN understands GWFH’s “Absolute Spirit” as (a non-human) God; an error.

⁵⁰ *Philosophy of Right*, p. 279; Addition to §259.

⁵¹ The mind that actively “gives itself actuality in World History” would, on this reading, be GWFH’s: not *qua* “Hegel” but *qua* Absolute Knower. As Philosopher of History—the source of the magisterial *Lectures on the Philosophy of History*—this transformed “Hegel” is also “the absolute judge of states:” he decides which States to include in his Lectures and what to record of them there. Guiding his actions as judge is the World-History that he himself is as Subject and Substance as well. Although this passage emphasizes the more grandiose aspect of “the immanence of history,” there is also the equally important moment of self-renunciation to be considered. This aspect is present—in fact both grandiosity and self-renunciation—in another text that is susceptible to an immanentest reading. “There is present in it [the subject is War] a self-sacrifice, which is yet the existence of freedom. In it is found the highest self-control or independence [grandiosity of Absolute Knowledge], which yet in its existence submits to the mechanism of an external order [renunciation of “Hegel” for World History] and a life of service [as Prussian Civil Servant]. An utter obedience or complete abnegation of one’s own opinion and reasonings [a key element in the self-renunciation phase], even an absence of one’s own spirit [i.e. of “Hegel”], is coupled with the most intense and comprehensive direct presence of the spirit [i.e. “the mind which gives itself its actuality in the process of World History”] and of resolution” (§328; *Philosophy of Right*, p. 211). On this reading, GWFH is a *soldier* who resolves to sacrifice himself—*qua* “Hegel”—in order to bring about “the most intense and comprehensive direct presence of the spirit.”

History's emergence makes clear, Hegel realizes that even the *possibility* of Kantianism's Future, a pacific federation of States that could actually someday become the "third thing standing above them to bind them together," must be rejected. Hegel used, in fact *needed*, the record of *what is* (World-History) to repudiate what only merely *ought to be*. But that record is *chronological* and, since Time marches on, it is open-ended towards the infinite future. *It cannot be complete*. But if it is *incomplete*, it will be impossible to conceptualize within the Speculative Method. More to the immediate point, if it admits the possibility of future development, it cannot banish Kant's ought. It is obviously no accident that Kant's Philosophy of History connects *what out to be* with the Future. Nor is it an accident that Hegel's Philosophy of History *requires* Chronological Completeness in order to reject *what ought to be* for the sake of *what is*.

There is one final point to be considered. When Hegel reveals the judge's identity to the reader,⁵² he uses a singular and revealing analogy. In §340, the last paragraph of International Law, Hegel states:

The destinies and deeds of states in their connection with one another are the visible dialectic of the finite nature of these spirits. Out of this dialectic the universal spirit, the spirit of the world, the unlimited spirit, produces itself. It has the highest right of all, and exercises its right upon the lower spirits in world-history. The history of the world is the world's court of judgment.⁵³

Both the temporal and the theological problems of Hegel's treatment of World History are made manifest in this final sentence: a line of poetry borrowed from Schiller.⁵⁴ But this translation misses the mark. "*Weltgeschichte ist Weltgericht*" has far deeper implications. In German, the word for the Last Judgment is "*Weltgericht*." The Last Judgment of the

⁵² *Philosophy of Right*, p. 279; Addition to §259: "Der alleinige Richter, der sich immer and gegen das Besondere geltend macht, ist der an sich seiende Geist, der sich als das Allgemeine and die wirkende Gattung in der Weltgeschichte darstellt."

⁵³ *Philosophy of Right*, p. 215-6; *Zusatz* to §340.

⁵⁴ For the source of this line, see Friedrich von SCHILLER, *Sämtliche Werke* (Stuttgart, 1827), Bd. I, p. 176 ("Resignation" from "Gedichte der zweiten Periode"). For the importance of this phrase in connection with Historical Relativism, see STERN, Alfred. *Philosophy of History and the Problem of Values*. The Hague: Mouton, 1962; p. 160. "In my opinion, Hegel's dictum that 'Weltgeschichte ist Weltgericht' is the keystone of Historicism. If there is no extra-historical authority above history, then history is the supreme judge of all truth and all values. We see, indeed, with what sovereignty history condemns to oblivion the truths and values it has produced. It is Chronos devouring his children."

world is no longer entrusted to God, but to its own History.⁵⁵ *God is secularized as History*.⁵⁶ This *scandalous* distortion of the theological significance of the Last Judgment—assuming, that is, that we can still recognize today any theological distortion as “scandalous”—makes perfect sense given his more evidently scandalous solution to “The Problem of Time.” History, that is, history intellectually comprehended, is the absolute judge of States only because it gives each of them a purpose and a specific place. It is only the whole drama of history that justifies the entrances and exits of the various players enacting it. But this kind of justification is possible only when the final curtain has already fallen: it can only be a *Last Judgment*. Only a poet, fully armed with the requisite poetic license, can legitimately make the claim that “*Weltgeschichte ist Weltgericht*” (emphasis mine); when a philosopher makes the same claim, we must conclude that he has deliberately and scandalously confused Logic and Chronology.

⁵⁵ This explains the gap between O’BRIEN, George, *Hegel on Reason and History*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975; p. 106: “A more appropriate interpretation of Hegel would be to specify the artificer of history as man, not God” as opposed to the equally true comment found in HYPOLITE, Jean, *Logic and Existence*. Translated by Leonard Lawlor and Amit Sen. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1997; p. 186: “Hegel indeed speaks of history having a sense, the Absolute Idea, but this idea is not man.”

⁵⁶ STRAUSS, Leo, *The Rebirth of Classical Political Rationalism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989; p. 24-5 (emphasis mine): “Hegel had reconciled “the discovery of History”—the alleged insight into the individual’s being in the most radical sense, the son or stepson of his time, or the alleged insight into the dependence of a man’s highest and purest thoughts on his time—with philosophy in the original meaning of the term by asserting that Hegel’s time was the end of meaningful time [up to this point, STRAUSS has simply been repeating KOJÈVE’s error]—the absolute religion, Christianity, had become completely reconciled with the world; *it had become completely secularized*, or the *saeculum* had become completely Christian in and through the postrevolutionary State; history as meaningful change had come to an end; all theoretical and practical problems had in principle been solved; hence the historical process was demonstrably rational.” Unfortunately, STRAUSS is not opposed in principle to this kind of “secularization;” see ALTMAN, William H.F. *The Alpine Limits of Jewish Thought: Leo Strauss, National Socialism, and Judentum ohne Gott*, *Journal of Jewish Thought and Philosophy*, v. 17, p. 1-46, 2009.

Chapter 6 (I.3.2) The *Umkehrung* of *Freiheit*

In tracing the intellectual history of the Idea of Progress, J.B. Bury notes the influence of J.G. Fichte on Hegel:

Both saw the goal of human development in the realization of “freedom,” but, while with Fichte the development never ends as the goal is unattainable, with Hegel the development is already complete, the goal is not only attainable but has now been attained. Thus Hegel’s is what we may call a closed system. History has been progressive, but no path is left open for further advance.¹

Although Bury admits that Hegel’s conception is “antagonistic to Progress as a practical doctrine”²—by which he presumably means that Hegel’s Philosophy of History offers no incentive to *practical action in the future*—he insists that, for Hegel, “History has been progressive” and that “progress there has been.” Skeptical about Hegel’s vision of Progress though he is, Bury does not, it seems to me, go far enough. In this chapter, I intend to show that once Hegel’s conception of “freedom” has been clearly understood, even the *appearance* of Progress in Hegel’s Philosophy of History begins to fall away. Bury recognizes that, for Hegel, Progress comes to an end with Completeness but he is still willing to believe that, for Hegel, Progress *has taken place*. I will show that what appears to be Progress in Hegel’s Philosophy of History was *always simply Logical Completeness*. To put it another way: Bury thinks that Progress is *Chronologically Prior* to Completeness, i.e. that Progress *has* occurred but is now Complete. I claim that Completeness is *Logically Prior* to even the *appearance* of Progress in Hegel’s Philosophy of History.

It is naïve to deny, however, that Hegel made a conscious effort to strive for the *appearance* of Progress; this is strongly suggested by his repeated use of the word itself in the classic exposition of his Philosophy of History:

¹ BURY, J.B. *The Idea of Progress: An Inquiry into its Origin and Growth*, New York: Dover Publications, 1987 (reprint of 1932 original), p. 255.

² BURY, pp. 255-56. “The spirit of Hegel’s philosophy, in its bearing on social life, was thus antagonistic to Progress as a practical doctrine. Progress there had been, but Progress had done its work; the Prussian monarchical state was the last word in history.” Note that this description suggests that GWFH promulgates “the End of History” for political and apologetic reasons (i.e. to defend “the Prussian monarchical state”).

The History of the world is none other than the progress of the consciousness of Freedom; a progress whose development according to the necessity of its nature, it is our business to investigate.³

One is tempted to discount the importance of the words with which Hegel qualifies Progress (i.e. “a progress whose development [is] according to the necessity of its nature”) and to emphasize instead the quantifiable progression he has already introduced:

The general statement given above, of the various grades in the consciousness of Freedom—and which we applied in the first instance to the fact that the Eastern nations knew only that *one* is free; the Greek and Roman world only that *some* are free; whilst *we* know that all men absolutely (man *as man*) are free,—supplies us with the natural division of Universal History, and suggests the mode of its discussion.⁴

The appearance of Progress rests, to begin with, on the *arithmetical* expression of “the various grades in the consciousness of freedom.” One would tend to think that “consciousness of freedom” is a *timeless standard of measurement*—an evaluative criterion—of which an increasingly large number of people have become conscious over an extended chronological process; progress occurs over time, it is quantifiable and can therefore be measured in terms of Freedom.

The three sections of this Chapter will chip away at this misconception step by step. In Section I.3.2.1, the distinction introduced by Borges between *intensive* and *extensive* Freedom will be used as basis for the claim that Hegel’s arithmetical expression of Progress is highly misleading. Next, attention will be turned to Hegel’s conception of Freedom itself. In Section I.3.2.2, the results of Ernst Tugendhat’s thoughtful comparison of Hegel’s notion of Truth with Hegel’s concept of Freedom will be considered; this analysis will reveal what Tugendhat means by Hegel’s “*Umkehrung des Sinns von Freiheit*.” Taking Tugendhat’s more radical suggestions seriously, I will then show (in Section I.3.2.3) that there is no hyperbole involved in equating Hegel’s Freedom with its exact opposite: Necessity (*Notwendigkeit*). In short: what *appears to be* a progressive Philosophy of History based on the arithmetical increase of (the consciousness of) Freedom will be shown to be the necessarily closed circle of Logical Completeness where “Freedom” becomes nothing more than the self-consciousness of this very Necessity.

³ *Philosophy of History*, p. 19.

⁴ *Philosophy of History*, p. 19.

I.3.2.1. Extensive and Intensive Freedom

As already mentioned, the appearance of Progress in Hegel's Philosophy of History depends, to begin with, on the arithmetical expression of "the various grades in the consciousness of freedom." A useful distinction introduced by Borges helps us to see things more clearly. It will be remembered that a central element in her project is to demonstrate what I am calling "the Logical and Chronological Parallel." In her own words, she is showing that "...a articulação historico do espírito será visto que a ordem desse desenvolvimento não é uma ordem qualquer, regida pelo acaso, mas que é a expressão temporal de uma necessidade conceitual."⁵ When she discusses the political articulation of this development, she immediately points out that the progress of Freedom involves not only an *extensive* (i.e. quantifiable) aspect but an *intensive* aspect as well.⁶ In other words, the arithmetical progression from the East, through Greece and Rome, to the German World emphasizes the *extensive* aspect of Freedom.⁷ But it is the *intensive* aspect of Freedom that is responsible for its universality (considered extensively) in the German World.

Na passagem do mundo antigo ao mundo moderno, há também um desenvolvimento intensivo da idéia de liberdade, pois o Estado moderno contém em si o princípio da moralidade subjetiva, princípio surgido historicamente com o cristianismo.⁸

Although Hegel chooses to represent the attractive concept of the extensive progress of Freedom as the essence of his Philosophy of History, it is in fact his idiosyncratic interpretation of the Incarnation that explains the progress of Freedom. It is Christianity's subjective principle—the

⁵ BORGES, p. 141: "Por sua vez, ao mostarmos a articulação historico do espírito será visto que a ordem desse desenvolvimento não é uma ordem qualquer, regida pelo acaso, mas que é a expressão temporal de uma necessidade conceitual, o que sera observado na relação entre política e religião [see I.1.2.2]—que vai desde a identidade imediata destas, no mundo oriental, até uma complementaridade no mundo germânico—bem como nos momentos de desenvolvimento histórico da política e da religião, tomados isoladamente."

⁶ BORGES, p. 141: "A primera (a política) segue uma ordem crescente no que diz respeito ao desenvolvimento da liberdade, na qual há um maior desenvolvimento, tanto intensivo quanto extensivo dessa." Cf. BOURGEOIS, Bernard, *Éternité et Historicité de L'Esprit selon Hegel*. Paris: J. Vrin, 1991; p. 35.

⁷ BORGES. P. 141: "Por desenvolvimento extensivo, entendo a atribuição de "homen livre" a um maior número de indivíduos. A liberdade dos antigos, nesse sentido, não era plena no seu aspecto extensivo, pois não abarcava todos os seres humanos."

⁸ BORGES, p. 141.

abrogation of the division between human being and God that characterized the one-sided “Religions of Essence” (see I.1.2.2)—that all are free. In other words, *his emphasis on the extensive aspect is highly misleading*: there is no gradual (extensive) accretion in the number of those who are free: there is a sudden and unique (intensive) explosion that locates the divine essence within Subjectivity.⁹ Although Hegel naturally does not emphasize the fact, the intensive transformation of Freedom caused by the Incarnation—as interpreted by Hegel, of course—means that *no one was Free*, in that intensive sense of the word, before Christ. In other words, it is an imposture to say that in the Eastern World, for example, *one* was Free. The divine with which the Pharaoh was one, for example, was not really the divine.¹⁰ Hence, Hegel is forced to make statements like the following:

The Orientals have not attained the knowledge that Spirit—Man *as such*—is free; and because they do not know this they are not free. They only know that *one is free*. But on this very account, the freedom of that one is only caprice; ferocity—brutal recklessness or passion, or a mildness and tameness of the desires, which is itself only an accident of Nature—mere caprice like the former. —That *one* is therefore only a Despot; not a *free* man.¹¹

⁹ BORGES, p. 170: “Esse espírito superior [‘revealed in the Christian religion’] significa o irromper de uma dimensão central para o homem moderno, exatamente aquela que o diferencia do homem antigo: a capacidade subjetiva de julgar o que é moralmente correto.”

¹⁰ *Philosophy of History*, p. 112: “The Constitution generally is a Theocracy [sc. in “The Oriental World”], and the Kingdom of God is to the same extent also a secular Kingdom as the secular Kingdom is also divine. What we call God has not yet in the East been realized in [subjective] consciousness, for our idea of God involves an elevation of the soul to the supersensual. While *we* [sc. in the German World] obey, because what we are required to do is confirmed by an *internal* sanction [the fact that the *requirement* is internal makes us free!], there [sc. in the Oriental World] the Law is regarded as inherently and absolutely valid without a sense of the want of this subjective confirmation [note that it is no longer the inadequacy of Eastern Man’s conception of God that GWFH now emphasizes but the inadequacy of their conception of their own subjective power; thanks to the Incarnation, the two are actually the same for GWFH]. In the law [as understood in the Oriental World] men recognize not their own will [as they do in the German World], but in entirely foreign.”

¹¹ *Philosophy of History*, p. 18.

The involuntary self-contradiction¹² contained in this passage (“one is free” vs. “that one is therefore...not a free man”) clearly shows that it is the *intensive*, not the *extensive sense of Freedom* that Hegel takes seriously.

Moreover, once Freedom is understood in this intensive sense, Hegel’s claim that “the History of the world is none other than the progress of the consciousness of Freedom,” reveals that the *end* of that process, whether understood in a Logical or Chronological sense, is once again revealed to be the *sich denkende Idee* described in the closing pages of the *Logic*.¹³ Progress is the actualization, through self-consciousness, of what has been potential (*an sich*) in Spirit from the beginning.¹⁴ In fact, Hegel deliberately distinguishes and rejects “perfectability,” defined as “change...for the better,”¹⁵ from his own Aristotelian conception of Development.¹⁶ Nor is Spirit’s development merely formal, as in Nature.

¹² This self-contradiction must be sharply distinguished from Hegelian Dialectic: it is neither logical nor conscious. GWFH requires “one to be free” in order to give the appearance of progress and this creates a problem for him because true “freedom” will only emerge with “the death of God.”

¹³ It is only when making the parallel between Logic and the Philosophy of History explicit that GWFH feels forced to deny—and it is the only time he does so—Chronological Completeness. “The Union of Universal Abstract Existence generally [sc. “*die absolute Idee*”] with the Individual,—the Subjective—that this alone is Truth, belongs to the department of speculation, and is treated in this general form in Logic.—But in the process of the World’s History itself,—*as still incomplete*,—the abstract final aim of history *is not yet made the distinct object of desire and interest*. While these limited sentiments are still unconscious of the purpose they are fulfilling, the universal principle is implicit in them, and is realizing itself through them” (*Philosophy of History*, pp. 25-26; emphases mine). When GWFH claims that “the abstract final aim of history is not yet made the distinct object of desire and interest” he is *excluding himself*: he is, by virtue of what he is saying, *not* “still unconscious of the purpose” that he, and he alone, knows that “they are fulfilling.” It is only here that GWFH seems to take the extensive sense of Freedom seriously: he alone is self-conscious of his universal Freedom. But Chronological Completeness is, as I stated in I.2.2, only achieved in Absolute Knowledge.

¹⁴ *Philosophy of History*, p. 54: “The principle of *Development* involves also the existence of a latent germ of being—a capacity or potentiality striving to realise itself. This formal conception finds actual existence in Spirit; which has the History of the World for its theatre, its possession, and the sphere of its realization.”

¹⁵ *Philosophy of History*, p. 54: “This peculiarity in the world of mind has indicated in the case of man an altogether different destiny from that of merely natural objects—in which we find always one and the same stable character, to which all change reverts;—namely, a real capacity for change, and that for the, better,—an impulse of *perfectibility*.”

¹⁶ *Philosophy of History*, p. 54 (emphasis mine): “The principle of Perfectibility indeed is almost as indefinite a term as mutability in general; it is without scope or

Its expansion, therefore, does not present the harmless tranquility of mere growth, as does that of organic life, but a stern reluctant working against itself. It exhibits, moreover, not the mere formal conception of development, but the attainment of a definite result. The goal of attainment we determined at the outset: it is Spirit in its *Completeness*, in its essential nature, *i.e.*, Freedom.¹⁷

Having raised the possibility that Hegel's "Freedom" may be Logical Completeness in disguise, the time is ripe to show that whatever else it may turn out to be, it unquestionably *isn't* what most of us think that it is.

I.3.2.2. Tugendhat on Hegelian *Freiheit*

Ernst Tugendhat places his exposition of Hegel's conception of Freedom only at the very end of *Selbstbewußtsein und Selbstbestimmung; Sprachanalytische Interpretationen*.¹⁸ It is not altogether clear whether or not Hegel was really his secret target from the beginning; certainly both Hegel and Tugendhat's interpretation of Hegel are important enough to justify such an intention. Fortunately, however, an analysis of his book as a whole is hardly unnecessary here. But his Hegel interpretation can be connected with the book's central theme by beginning with what he writes about Hegel's treatment of "*Das allgemeine Selbstbewußtsein*" in paragraph §436 of the *Encyclopedia*.¹⁹ Tugendhat comments as follows:

goal, and has *no standard* by which to estimate the changes in question: the improved, more perfect, state of things towards which it professedly tends is altogether undetermined." It is interesting that GWFH fails to recognize that Perfectability may well have *no goal*, *i.e.* it continues into the indefinite future without a specific τέλος.

¹⁷ *Philosophy of History*, p. 55; emphasis in original.

¹⁸ TUGENDHAT, Ernst, *Selbstbewußtsein und Selbstbestimmung; Sprachanalytische Interpretationen*, Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1979 (hereafter "TUGENDHAT").

¹⁹ "Universal self-consciousness [*Selbstbewußtsein*] is the affirmative awareness [*affirmative Wissen*] of self in an other self: each self as a free individuality has his own absolute independence [*absolute Selbständigkeit*] ...without distinguishing itself from that other. Each is thus universal self-consciousness and objective; each has 'real' universality in the shape of reciprocity, so far as each knows itself recognized in the other freeman, and is aware of this in so far as it recognizes the other and knows him to be free" (Wallace translation, deletion as found in TUGENDHAT, p. 344). The sentence with the deletion reads as a whole: *Das allgemeine Selbstbewußtsein* ist das affirmative Wissen seiner selbst im anderen Selbst, deren jedes als freie Einzelheit *absolute Selbständigkeit* hat, aber, vermöge der Negation seiner Unmittelbarkeit oder Begierde, sich nicht vom anderen unterscheidet, allgemeines [*Selbstbewußtsein*] und objektiv ist und die reelle

Wichtig ist aber das Stichwort vom »affirmative Wissen«. Denn diese Rede des Affirmativen läßt sich nun von den bejahenden Beziehung eines Individuums zu einem anderen Individuum im Sinn des Anerkennens ausdehnen auf die bejahende Beziehung jedes der Individuen zu der Gemeinschaft, deren Teil sie sind, eine Übertragung, die für Hegel ohnehin sehr leicht zu vollziehen ist, weil er auf beide seine Rede von der Identität im Unterschied anwenden kann, während man, wenn man diese Bejahung als Zustimmung zu den in den »Gesetzen und Einrichtungen« (*Rechtsphilosophie* §144) der Gemeinschaft enthaltenen allgemeinen Imperativen oder Normen verstehen muß.²⁰

This passage forms a bridge between self-determination in general, i.e. the book's central concern, and Hegel's politics. Tugendhat is showing that the relationship between two individuals ("*das affirmative Wissen seiner selbst im anderen Selbst*") is analogous by extension (*Ausdehnung*) to the relationship between Individual and State; it is within the latter context that Hegel's *Umkehrung* of Freedom is going to take place. Tugendhat is preparing us to realize that, when this reasoning about self-determination's affirmative recognition of another is *extended*, the Individual will be affirming herself in the "*Gesetzen und Einrichtungen*" of the State. Moreover, this passage indicates the crucial bridge between the two types of "*bejahende Beziehung*;" i.e Freedom.

Aber Hegel betont in dem zitierten §436 nicht nur das affirmative Verhältnis, sondern auch die Freiheit und »absolute Selbständigkeit« des Einzelnen *in* diesem affirmative Verhältnis.²¹

It is at this point that Tugendhat points out there are two different "stages" in what he call's Hegel's *Freiheitsbegriff*.²² The sense of Freedom Hegel rejects is mere *Willkür*, usually translated by the English "caprice." This capacity to do whatever you are inclined to do is regarded by Hegel as the merely "formal" Freedom of e.g. the Eastern despot; Tugendhat has no difficulty in finding the appropriate texts.²³ But Tugendhat breaks some

Allgemeinheit als Gegenseitigkeit so hat, als es im freien anderen sich anerkannt weiß und dies weiß, insofern es das andere anerkennt und es frei weiß (§436).

²⁰ TUGENDHAT, p. 344.

²¹ TUGENDHAT, p. 345.

²² TUGENDHAT, p. 153 and p. 345.

²³ TUGENDHAT, p. 345-46: "Dieser Wille ist nach Hegel nur formell frei (Rph §§ 14, 21), weil er zwar beschließt (§ 12), wählt (§ 14), aber zwischen Inhalten, die ihm äußerlich (bzw. innerlich) vorgegeben sind—>es sind die Triebe, Begierden, Neigungen, durch sie sich der Wille von Natur bestimmt findet« (§ 11)—, und ohne daß er ein Maß für die Entscheidung in sich selbst hat (§ 17). Dann ist er aber in

new ground by pointing to an analogy—a most ironic one, as it turns out—between Hegel and Kant. For the latter, heteronomy in ethical decision involved deriving morality *ab extra*; only by reliance on the (internal) categorical imperative was the moral agent truly independent and therefore moral. Hegel uses this Kantian language to justify his own sense of true Freedom (as opposed to *Willkür*) as “die *bejahende Beziehung jedes der Individuen zu der Gemeinschaft*.” Moreover, the transition between the two is going to be self-determination.

Hegel sagt: der formelle Wille ist noch abhängig. Damit ist Kants Begriff der Heteronomie aufgenommen. Die höherstufige Freiheit wird also als Autonomie verstanden; der Maßstab ist Selbstbestimmung, Autonomie. Auch darin unterschieden sich die beiden Konzeptionen [i.e. Hegel's and Kant's] also nicht. Aber nun kommt die Frage: was heißt Selbstbestimmung?²⁴

The beauty of Tugendhat's approach is that he elucidates Freedom within the wider context of Hegel's thought as a whole. Instead of resting on the analogy between *Selbstbestimmung* and true Freedom, he takes a step back into Hegel's epistemology: what he calls Hegel's *Wahrheitsbegriff*. “*Nach dieser aber ist sie dadurch ermöglicht, daß Hegel die eigentliche Freiheit—die Selbstbestimmung—als Beisichselbstsein bestimmt und dieses im Sinn seines spekulativen Wahrheitsbegriffs expandiert hat.*”²⁵ For this move, the entire book has prepared his reader.²⁶

Alle diese zusätzlichen Bestimmungen der Wahrheit: daß sie Resultat sei, daß sie die ganze Bewegung sei, daß sie nur als System sei und daß sie das Ganze sei, sind bloße Folgen der Bestimmung der Wahrheit als Idee—als Identität des Subjekts mit der Realität—, Folgen, die sich dann ergeben müssen, wenn die Identität a) als Bewegung konzipiert wird und wenn diese Bewegung b) allumfassend ist.²⁷

My reader, on the other hand, will recognize in Tugendhat's description what I have been calling “Logical Completeness.” But Tugendhat has been

Wirklichkeit von seinen Inhalten abhängig (§ 15) und deswegen nicht eigentlich, sondern nur formell frei.”

²⁴ TUGENDHAT, p. 346.

²⁵ TUGENDHAT, p. 350.

²⁶ TUGENDHAT, p. 348: “Sie sehen, die Freiheit im eigentlichen Sinn von Selbstbestimmung ist für Hegel nichts anderes als die Realisierung der Struktur des spekulativen Wahrheitsbegriff...Wir haben bisher diesen spekulativen Wahrheitsbegriff nur nach seiner theoretischen Seite kennengelernt. Wie ist er zu verstehen, wenn er praktisch verstanden wird, als Freiheit?”

²⁷ TUGENDHAT, p. 308.

more interested throughout in Hegel's epistemology rather than in his System: for him, therefore, Logical Completeness and the System as a whole are "*bloße Folgen*" from Hegel's *Wahrheitsbegriff*: the "identity of thinking subject with reality." There can certainly be no doubt that Hegel's "Absolute Idealism" constitutes the basis for his solution to "The Problem of Time."

With this foundation, Tugendhat simply quotes §514 of the *Encyclopedia*—the second paragraph on *Sittlichkeit*—and let's Hegel hang himself with his own words.

Die frei sich wissende Substanz, in welcher das absolute Sollen ebensosehr Sein ist, hat als Geist eines Volkes Wirklichkeit. Die abstrakte Direktion dieses Geistes ist die Vereinzelnung in Personen, von deren Selbständigkeit er die innere Macht und Notwendigkeit ist. Die Person aber weiß als denkende Intelligenz jene Substanz als ihr eigenes Wesen, hört in dieser Gesinnung auf, Akzidenz derselben zu sein, schaut sie als ihren absoluten Endzweck in der Wirklichkeit sowohl als erreichtes *Diesselts* an, als sie denselben durch ihre Tätigkeit hervorbringt, aber als etwas, das vielmehr schlechthin ist; so vollbringt sie ohne die wählende Reflexion ihre Pflicht als das *Ihrige* und als *Seiendes* und hat in dieser Notwendigkeit sich selbst und ihre wirkliche Freiheit.²⁸

In a single masterly paragraph, Tugendhat then reveals the authoritarian monster lurking in the shadows of Hegel's abstract philosophemes. He explains the implications of *Sein* replacing *Sollen*,²⁹ he draws attention to the words "*ohne die wählende Reflexion*"³⁰ (as well as alerting the reader to

²⁸ E §514. "The consciously free substance, in which the absolute *ought* [Sollen] is no less an *is* [ebensosehr Sein], has actuality as the spirit of a nation. The abstract disruption of this spirit singles it out into *persons*, whose independence it, however, controls and entirely dominates from within. But the person, as an intelligent being, feels that underlying essence to be his own very being—ceases when so minded to be a mere accident of it—looks upon it as his absolute final aim. In its actuality he sees not less an achieved present, than somewhat he brings about by his action - yet somewhat which without all question *is*. Thus, without any selective reflection, the person performs his duty as *his own* and as something which *is*; and in this necessity he has himself and his actual freedom" (Wallace translation).

²⁹ TUGENDHAT, p. 348: "Das Sollen, sagt Hegel, ist »ebensosehr Sein«: das Gesollte wird also nicht mehr, wie in Moralität, von der Subjektivität der Objektivität entgegengehalten, sondern es hat Sein, es sind, wie Hegel in der *Rph* erläutert, »die an und für sich seienden Gesetze und Einrichtungen« (§ 144) des bestehenden Gemeinwesen, »eine absolute, unendlich festere Autorität und Macht als das Sein von Natur« (§ 146)."

³⁰ TUGENDHAT, p. 348: "Diese sind für das Individuum, wie Hegel weiter in unserem Stück der *Enz.* Ausführt, »Pflicht«, und zwar eine Pflicht, die es »ohne die

Hegelian *Vertrauen* as the sinister alternative),³¹ and uses a text from the *Philosophy of Right* to illustrate how conscience is submerged in Hegel's State.³² After summarizing his findings in a closing *tour de force*,³³ he asks: "Inwiefern kann denn dann aber Hegel überhaupt noch von Freiheit sprechen?"³⁴ That turns out to be a very good question.

Perhaps only a German born in 1930 could have written about Hegelian "Freedom" with such righteous indignation.³⁵ In any case, it is in this context that Tugendhat introduces the useful phrase *Umkehrung*³⁶ and mentions the interesting idea, an idea that will be amplified in the next section, that what Hegel means by *Freiheit* is really its opposite: *Notwendigkeit*.³⁷ To complete his damning indictment of Hegel's *Machtidolotrie*,³⁸ he leaves the reader in no doubt that the individual's unquestioning loyalty is owed to "the powers that be;" "für das gegenwärtig Bestehende."³⁹ In fact, Tugendhat presents Hegel's achievement as "die Philosophie der Rechtfertigung des Bestehenden."⁴⁰ This emphasis on the justification of the Present is not without connection to what I have called "Chronological Completeness." But neither is it

wählende Reflexion«, also ohne die Freiheit im subjektiven, wählend reflektierend Sinn vollbringt, denn sie sind, wie ich wiederum aus der Rph ergänze (§ 148), »für einen Willen bindend.«"

³¹ TUGENDHAT, p. 349.

³² TUGENDHAT quotes *Philosophy of Right* §152 on the disappearance of "das eigene Gewissen" in "die sittliche Substantialität" (p. 349).

³³ TUGENDHAT, p. 349: "Die Möglichkeit eines selbstverantwortlichen, kritischen Verhältnisses zum Gemeinwesen, zum Staat wird von Hegel nicht zugelassen, vielmehr hören wir: die bestehenden Gesetze haben eine absolute Autorität; was vom Individuum zu tun ist, steht in einem Gemeinwesen fest; das eigene Gewissen des Einzelnen hat zu verschwinden, und an die Stelle der Reflexion tritt das Vertrauen; das ist es, was Hegel mit der Aufhebung der Moralität meint."

³⁴ TUGENDHAT, p. 349.

³⁵ TUGENDHAT, p. 349-50: "Damit ist der nicht einmal mehr von Hegel zu überbietende Gipfel der Perversion erreicht, einer gewiß nicht mehr nur begrifflichen, sondern moralischen Perversion, so daß man Mühe hat, sie nur nach ihrer begrifflichen Seite zu betrachten."

³⁶ TUGENDHAT, p. 349 (emphasis mine): "Der Sinn dieser *Umkehrung der Freiheit* in das, was normalerweise für ihr Gegenteil gehalten wird, ist, wie aus dem Zusammenhang sowohl des § 484 wie vor allem des vorhin zitierten § 514 hervorgeht, der, daß das Individuum sich gerade darin frei fühlen soll, daß es die von der Macht des Bestehenden ausgehenden Pflichten erfüllt."

³⁷ TUGENDHAT, p. 349: "...die »wirkliche Freiheit« wird als »Notwendigkeit« verstanden..."

³⁸ TUGENDHAT, p. 355.

³⁹ TUGENDHAT, p. 354; emphasis mine.

⁴⁰ TUGENDHAT, p. 351; see the sources cited there.

unconnected with what Tugendhat calls “*Hegels Grundkonzeption*.”⁴¹ his *Wahrheitsbegriff*.

Dieser Aspekt folgt aus Hegels Grundkonzeption, der Wahrheit als Einheit des Begriffs mit der Realität, nur dann, wenn man die Realität, das ›Wirkliche‹ mit dem *Gegenwärtigen* gleichsetzt.”⁴²

And thus it happens that “Freedom” is not the only word that is *twisted round* in a masterful *Umkehrung*.⁴³ Due to the fact that Tugendhat has successfully embedded Freedom with Hegel’s *Grundkonzeption*,⁴⁴ it is the meaning of “Truth” that is transformed as well: there is no *correspondence between conception and object* to be achieved but rather an identity to be asserted.⁴⁵ There can be no doubt that Tugendhat achieves some masterful *Sprachanalytische Interpretationen*⁴⁶ (the sub-title of his book) and it is his

⁴¹ TUGENDHAT, p. 354.

⁴² TUGENDHAT, p. 354; emphasis in original.

⁴³ TUGENDHAT, p. 350 (emphasis mine): “...den Sinn des Wortes »Freiheit« *umgebogen* hat.” The formula I used above (“der Umkehrung des Sinns von Freiheit”) is found on the same page.

⁴⁴ For the record, I cannot accept TUGENDHAT’s claim that the Absolute Identity of Subject and Object is GWFH’s *Grundkonzeption*; it is SCHELLING’s. One might, with better right, say that the Subject and Substance Identity deserves this place. But the fact of the matter is that the characteristic and defining move in GWFH’s thought is not any particular Identity—no matter how *gründlich* it may be—but a new *means* towards the *end* of Identity. In other words, it would probably be more accurate to say that GWFH’s *Grundkonzeption* is the Logical Completeness of the Dialectic. In the sense that the end is always Logically Prior to the means, TUGENDHAT is correct. But this new means was so fertile, so flexible and applicable—above all, so brilliantly innovative—that it will always have pride of place when GWFH is discussed. While it is therefore true that GWFH’s intentions cannot be understood without reference to SCHELLING (but see TUGENDHAT, pp. 316-17) and SPINOZA, his Dialectical *means* to the Monistic *end* will remain his greatest achievement. Unfortunately, *it was precisely the confusion of Logical and Chronological Priority in the Dialectic that made it so powerful*. It was only on the basis of this scandalous confusion that Time in general and World-History in particular were integrated into GWFH’s oxymoronic *Chronological Monism*.

⁴⁵ TUGENDHAT, p. 350: “Natürlich kann sie das nur sein, weil Hegel unter »Wahrheit« gar nicht Wahrheit versteht, sondern etwas ganz anderes, nämlich die Einheit von Subjekt und Realität, und jetzt können wir sehen, daß das konkret bedeutet: das affirmative Verhältnis der Einzelnen zu ihrem Gemeinwesen.”

⁴⁶ TUGENDHAT, p. 350-51: “Denn solange wir uns in Hegels Terminologie bewegen, wissen wir gar nicht, was es heißen könnte, nach Wahrheit zu fragen: und eine Forderung nach Freiheit kann gar nicht mehr aufkommen, erstens weil jede Forderung einen Rückfall in die Eitelkeit der Subjektivität darstellen würde,

insight that “indem er [sc. Hegel] den Sinn dieser Wörter umkehrt, vertritt er nicht nur eine *andere* Konzeption sondern die genau *entgegengesetzte*...”⁴⁷ that will guide my steps in the following section.

I.3.2.3. The Necessity of Freedom

In his *Hegel's Grand Synthesis: A Study of Being, Thought, and History*—an honest and interesting attempt to absolve Hegel of his commitment to Chronological Completeness, as we shall see in Part II—Daniel Berthold-Bond uses the relationship between Freedom and Necessity to show that “dialectic sets up an “equilibrium” of opposite determinations, so that every opposing determination has equal value.”⁴⁸ His clearly written description of this relationship is worth quoting in full:

An example may help. Hegel views it as a mistake to regard freedom and necessity as polar opposites and as equally legitimate but exclusionary alternatives. If they were equal in this way—as the Kantian antinomy has it, and as the sceptic has it—the only options for viewing human action would be the result of completely canceling one term (by arbitrary fiat) [70] and thus seeing oneself either as free in Hegel's sense of negative freedom (= nihilism), [n. 71] or doomed to necessity in Hegel's sense of “merely external necessity” (= tychism, fatalism, “the irrational void of necessity” [PhS 443]).⁴⁹

It will be seen that Berthold-Bond is *sympathetic* to Hegel's refusal to consider Freedom and Necessity “as polar opposites and as equally legitimate but exclusionary alternatives.” But he is honest enough to admit that this refusal is predicated precisely on *Hegel's sense* of what an “exclusionary” understanding of both Freedom and Necessity would look like. And it will be seen—although Berthold-Bond does not call our attention to the fact, for which omission he can be justly faulted—that *the common sense understanding of Freedom* gets lost between Hegel's *own* “exclusionary alternatives:”⁵⁰ negative freedom as *nihilism* on the one hand

zweitens weil, da die Unfreiheit als Freiheit bezeichnet wird, die Freiheit ohnehin schon in vollendeter Weise in der Unfreiheit realisiert scheint, und es gar nicht mehr zu fordern gibt.”

⁴⁷ TUGENDHAT, p. 351; emphasis in original.

⁴⁸ BERTHOLD-BOND, Daniel, *Hegel's Grand Synthesis: A Study of Being, Thought, and History*, Albany: State University of New York Press, 1989 (hereafter “BERTHOLD-BOND”).

⁴⁹ BERTHOLD-BOND, p. 88.

⁵⁰ It would be interesting to investigate the possibility that there is what might be called *a metalogical use of Understanding* in GWFH where alternatives to be subsequently synthesized in Concept are first distinguished in a highly exaggerated

and a more positive conception, with which necessity will be fully integrated, on the other. Oblivious to this omission, Berthold-Bond continues:

For these are the only senses of freedom and necessity which are left when we disallow any “reciprocal dependence” of the one on the other. On the other hand, by seeing that the opposition of freedom and necessity is not a polar equilibrium of exclusionary terms, but involves the two terms negating each other in a positive way—so that (positive) freedom negates *external* necessity (fate), and (rational) necessity negates *negative* freedom (nihilism)—we arrive at the completer notion of freedom which is self-limited by the “real, inward necessity” (SL §35 *Zusatz*) of duty, and of necessity which is the autonomous expression of self-determination.⁵¹

It will be noted that Berthold-Bond requires the bogey of nihilism—apparently the more Hegelian *Willkür* was not objectionable enough for his apologetic purposes—in order to sustain this sympathetic reading.⁵² But the essential point is that Berthold-Bond is nevertheless honest enough to draw the reader’s attention to a text where Tugendhat’s outlandish suggestion (“*die »wirkliche Freiheit« wird als »Notwendigkeit« verstanden*”)⁵³ is confirmed by Hegel’s own words. This text is §35 of the *Encyclopedia*:

way so as to justify their synthesis. In other words, GWFH requires that the notions of commonsense (i.e. what most of us mean by Freedom; e.g. “the power to make up our own minds within the context of an externally regulated universe of man-made or natural law”) *be much more one-sided than they in fact are*. Only by this *metalogical one-sidedness* can the conceptualized products of dialectical logic be justified.

⁵¹ BERTHOLD-BOND, p. 88.

⁵² Therefore n. 71 (BERTHOLD-BOND, p. 191-92) is not one of the best moments in his book. He can’t find the word “nihilism” in GWFH so he is forced to derive it (*via* a discussion of irony in the *Lectures on Aesthetics*) from KIERKEGAARD’s use of the word in *Concept of Irony*! But BERTHOLD-BOND recovers somewhat with the valid and important claim that it was the French Revolution that led GWFH to take such a dim view of “negative freedom” (BERTHOLD-BOND, p. 192). Since the French Revolution was the great world-historical event of their lifetimes, it may not be too much to say that the central difference between KANT and GWFH—more important than all the distinctions familiar to students of philosophy—was that the latter kept faith with the Revolution’s ideas while the latter lost hope. The enduring faith of the older man is, from my point of view, infinitely more beautiful—sublime in KANT’s sense—than the creation of GWFH’s truly beautiful justification for abandoning that faith.

⁵³ TUGENDHAT, p. 349.

what Berthold-Bond (the abbreviation stands for “Shorter Logic”) cited as “SL §35 *Zusatz*.”

Hegel is discussing the old-style Cosmology⁵⁴ and, in §35 itself—as opposed to the *Zusatz*—he provides a long list of the “polar opposites and...equally legitimate but exclusionary alternatives” (to use Berthold-Bond’s felicitous expression) that form the standard subject matter of this discipline.⁵⁵ In the *Addition*, Hegel puts it this way: “But to give them a satisfactory answer, it is above all things necessary not to claim finality for the abstract formulae of understanding, or to suppose that each of the two terms in an antithesis has an independent subsistence or can be treated in its isolation as a complete and self-centered truth.”⁵⁶ It is to illustrate this general statement with an example that Hegel reveals what his “Freedom” really is.

So wurde z. B. der Unterschied von Freiheit und Notwendigkeit in Betrachtung gezogen und wurden diese Bestimmungen in der Art auf die Natur und auf den Geist angewendet, daß man jene in ihren Wirkungen als der Notwendigkeit unterworfen, diesen aber als frei betrachtete.⁵⁷

Hegel’s first move is to undermine the distinction between Nature, governed by *Notwendigkeit*, and Spirit, where Freedom reigns. Since the Hegelian System depends on the Dialectical Synthesis of Logic, Nature, and Spirit, it is obvious that this kind of distinction cannot hold. In other words, the traditional *locus* of Freedom in Spirit—in the human being’s freedom of choice—is no longer logically distinct from Nature in Hegel’s System. It is on the basis of this collapsed distinction that Hegel will collapse the distinction between Freedom and Necessity.⁵⁸

⁵⁴ E §35: “Der dritte Teil, die *Kosmologie*, handelte von der *Welt*, ihrer Zufälligkeit, Notwendigkeit, Ewigkeit, Begrenztsein in Raum und Zeit, den formellen Gesetzen in ihren Veränderungen, ferner von der Freiheit des Menschen und dem Ursprunge des Bösen.” In this context, “old-style” really means (as the *Zusatz* makes explicit) “pre-Critical;” i.e. pre-KANT.

⁵⁵ E §35 (emphasis mine): “Als *absolute Gegensätze* gelten hierbei vornehmlich: Zufälligkeit und Notwendigkeit; äußerliche und innerliche Notwendigkeit; wirkende und Endursachen, oder die Kausalität überhaupt und Zweck; Wesen oder Substanz und Erscheinung; Form und Materie; *Freiheit und Notwendigkeit*; Glückseligkeit und Schmerz; Gutes und Böses.”

⁵⁶ *Encyclopedia Logic*, p. 55; *Zusatz* to E §35.

⁵⁷ *Zusatz* to E §35.

⁵⁸ Indeed the roots of Hegel’s synthesis of Freedom and Necessity are, as Shlomo Avineri has pointed out, are to be found in SPINOZA. See AVINERI, Shlomo, *Hegel Revisited* in Alasdair MacIntyre ed., *Hegel: A Collection of Critical Essays*, New York: Doubleday, 1972.

Dieser Unterschied ist nun allerdings wesentlich und im Innersten des Geistes selbst begründet; Freiheit jedoch und Notwendigkeit, als einander abstrakt gegenüberstehend, gehören nur der Endlichkeit an und gelten nur auf ihrem Boden.⁵⁹

Hegel here uses the word “*wesentlich*” in the technical sense: the distinction between Spirit and Nature, from which, suggests Hegel, the distinction between Freedom and Necessity is derived, is grounded in the Concept’s *Second Moment*; the moment of *Endlichkeit*. In *Reflexion*—the essence, as it were, of *Wesen*—two actually identical things always appear as mirror image opposites of each other, as is now the case with Spirit and Nature. Therefore one appears to be the *locus* of Freedom, the other of Necessity. But although the independence of Spirit depends on this appearance—this is why Hegel says the difference is “*im Innersten des Geistes selbst begründet*”—it is only independent *wesentlich*; we must beware of thinking that this means what we would call “essentially.” *Only by first distinguishing itself from Nature can Spirit come to recognize itself in the Form of Externality (i.e. Nature) and therefore—mediated by the Logical Idea that both Spirit and Nature actually are—achieve consciousness of itself as the entire process.* It is no accident that Hegel’s conception Freedom as Necessity cannot be understood apart from Logic, Nature, and Spirit and *Sein, Wesen, and Begriff*. The Logical Completeness that binds these Triads together is, as we shall see, indistinguishable from Freedom as Necessity.

For now, however, Hegel is content to show that Freedom and Necessity are only aspects of one Logically Complete whole.

Eine Freiheit, die keine Notwendigkeit in sich hätte, und eine bloße Notwendigkeit ohne Freiheit, dies sind abstrakte und somit unwahre Bestimmungen. Die Freiheit ist wesentlich konkret, auf ewige Weise in sich bestimmt und somit zugleich notwendig.⁶⁰

It seems to me that Hegel is exploiting the usual sense of “*wesentlich*” here; he is, after all, only using Freedom and Necessity as an example.⁶¹

⁵⁹ *Zusatz* to E §35.

⁶⁰ *Zusatz* to E §35.

⁶¹ In the technical sense, Freedom is only concrete as Concept and therefore enriched by being the whole of its moments. It should be kept in mind that in E §35, GWFH has not yet introduced the reader to his *Logic*, and therefore to *Wesen*. He himself, of course, presupposes his own System in every sentence he writes. But—and this is especially true in the *Zusätze*—he allows himself a terminological flexibility not found elsewhere.

But even though he is no longer going to discuss *Freiheit* and *Notwendigkeit* in relation to Nature and Spirit—it was this relation, it must be remembered, that required him to invoke the logical moment of *Wesen*—it is important for us that he began as he did. Freedom must not be understood merely as *political* Freedom; this is the basic problem with an approach like Alan Patten's.⁶² Nor is it enough for Ernst Tugendhat to show that the *Umkehrung* of Freedom into its opposite is grounded only in Hegel's albeit related collapsing of opposites like *subject* and *reality*. For the present, it is enough to listen to Hegel bring his discussion to its conclusion, bearing in mind that Freedom is no more restricted to the moving bodies of Nature than it is to the political structures of Objective Spirit.

Wenn von Notwendigkeit gesprochen wird, so pflegt man darunter zunächst nur Determination von außen zu verstehen, wie z. B. in der endlichen Mechanik ein Körper sich nur bewegt, wenn er durch einen anderen Körper gestoßen wird, und zwar in der Richtung, welche ihm durch diesen Stoß erteilt wird. Dies ist jedoch eine bloß äußerliche Notwendigkeit, nicht die wahrhaft innere, denn diese ist die Freiheit.⁶³

In fact, this text fits in particularly well with Tugendhat's analysis of the relationship between Individual and *Gemeinschaft*. If the State is looked at as an *other*, obedience to its *Gesetzen* and *Einrichten* is compelled by "*eine bloß äußerliche Notwendigkeit*." But as Spirit's objective reflection of *itself*, the State is not external to the Individual. Hegel has thus given us what we needed: a definition that confirms Tugendhat's suggestion. Freedom is "true inner necessity" ("*Dies ist jedoch eine bloß äußerliche Notwendigkeit, nicht die wahrhaft innere, denn diese ist die Freiheit*").

It is therefore as "inner necessity" that Freedom must be conceived. One aspect of this conception is that Freedom can only be understood as a Concept—i.e. as a concrete whole—in which its opposition to Necessity, an opposition that is *wesentlich* in the technical sense, is merely a moment. It is therefore precisely a *necessary* moment: as Concept, every moment of Freedom, and everything else, is Necessary. And this is a crucial point. But more important to grasp is the fact that Freedom is not merely a Concept. The most important words in the *Zusatz* are easy to miss: as concrete, Freedom is "*...auf ewige Weise in sich bestimmt und somit zugleich notwendig*" (emphasis mine). It will be remembered from I.1.1.2 that in the

⁶² PATTEN, Alan, *Hegel's Idea of Freedom*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999. Compare GUYER, Paul, *Kant on Freedom, Law, and Happiness*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000; esp. pp. 408-434.

⁶³ *Zusatz* to E §35.

sich denkende Idee, the dialectical *Bestimmungen* it contains are self-consciously recognized as *in sich bestimmt*.⁶⁴ Its progressive unfolding—even or rather particularly when appearing under the guise of timelessness (“*auf ewige Weise*”) is *necessary*. The reason that Freedom resembles the Absolute Idea is not simply because it too is a Concept and is therefore susceptible to the Speculative Method. As Hegel claims in the *Wissenschaft der Logik*, it is the Speculative Method itself that that unfolds with what might be called “free necessity.”⁶⁵

Nor is it only in Logic that this kind of thing occurs: the most important application of “Freedom” is, of course, to be found in Hegel’s *Philosophy of History*. Nor does he conceal there from the attentive reader that his version of Freedom is—to considerably understate the case—*closely connected* with Necessity.⁶⁶ Lest it be thought that it is *my* intention to conceal in a footnote⁶⁷ the closest Hegel comes to an explicit denial of Chronological Completeness, I will return to the passage in question; it can now be explained in full. It reads as follows:

But in the process of the World’s History itself,—as still incomplete,—the abstract final aim of history is not yet made the distinct object of desire and interest. While these limited sentiments are still unconscious of the purpose they are fulfilling, the universal principle is implicit in them, and is realizing itself through them.⁶⁸

What makes the process of World-History incomplete is *not* that it has not already achieved its “abstract final aim” but that *all of those*

⁶⁴ *Zusatz* to E §237 (Wallace, p. 293): “Es kann hiernach auch gesagt werden, die absolute Idee sei das Allgemeine, aber das Allgemeine nicht bloß als abstrakte Form, welchem der besondere Inhalt als ein Anderes gegenübersteht, sondern als die absolute Form, in welche alle Bestimmungen, die ganze Fülle des durch dieselbe gesetzten Inhalts zurückgegangen ist.”

⁶⁵ *WdL*, p. 29: “No subject matter is so absolutely capable of being expounded with a strict immanent plasticity as is thought *in its own necessary development*; no other brings with it this demand in such a degree; in this respect the Science of Logic must surpass even mathematics, *for no subject matter has in its own self this freedom and independence.*”

⁶⁶ Even on the crudest level this is visible: of the 41 times that GWFH uses cognates of “necessity” (including e.g. “the necessities of life”) in his Introduction to the *Philosophy of History*, the word “freedom” is found either in the same sentence (or conjoined with it in an adjacent one; this happens twice) 14 times: about a third of the cases.

⁶⁷ See n. 13 above.

⁶⁸ All of the remaining block quotations in this section are continuously quoted with no deletions from *Philosophy of History*, p. 25-7. They will not therefore be cited *singulatim*.

participating in that process—as distinct from Hegel himself—have “not yet made” this τέλος “the distinct object of [their] desire and interest.” Guided by their own “limited sentiments”—it is noteworthy that Hegel’s grammar does not bestow upon “them” any independent agency—they are unconscious of the purposive process that “is realizing itself through them.” When considered in context, this passage reveals that this “not yet” of their unconsciousness is merely the last remains of a merely formal and therefore purely illusory Freedom; of a Freedom that has not yet become one with Necessity. The passage continues:

The question also assumes the form of the union of *Freedom* and *Necessity*; the latent abstract process of Spirit being regarded as *Necessity*, while that which exhibits itself in the conscious will of men, as their interest, belongs to the domain of *Freedom*.

Hegel explains that Necessity is the domain of the purpose that is realizing itself through those who are its unconscious instruments. At this stage—where Freedom and Necessity are still distinct—the mass of mankind conceives of itself as freely following its own subjective purposes. As long, therefore, as Freedom and Necessity are separate, there still exists a chronological “not yet” in which “the abstract final aim of history is not yet made the distinct object of desire and interest.” But Hegel not only exempts himself from this unconsciousness: he also knows that Freedom and Necessity *in general* are in fact not distinct at all. Nor does he omit to tell us *how* he knows this:

As the metaphysical connection (i.e. the connection in the Idea) of these forms of thought, belongs to Logic, it would be out of place to analyze it here. The chief and cardinal points only shall be mentioned.

“In the Idea,” there exists between forms of thought a “metaphysical connection” revealed in the *Logic*. Hegel is prepared to summarize the “chief and cardinal points” whereby the distinction between Freedom and Necessity, a distinction on which the proposition that World-History is “still incomplete” depends, is illusory. With this introduction, Hegel prepares the reader for perhaps the richest and most revealing paragraph in the famous Introduction to the *Lectures on the Philosophy of History*. In this paragraph, we will watch the sole basis of Chronological Incompleteness, the precarious “not yet” of a merely formal and unconscious sense of Freedom, extinguish itself in the Logical Completeness of Freedom and Necessity.

Hegel begins by calling attention to the Second Moment of the Dialectic: although Spirit and e.g. the Logical Idea—or “God,” as Hegel

prefers to call it in the passage—are one and the same, the moment of Reflection makes them appear, to the subjective Mind, at least, to be separate.

Philosophy shows that the Idea advances to an infinite antithesis; that, viz. between the Idea in its free, universal form—in which it exists for itself—and the contrasted form of abstract introversion, reflection on itself, which is formal existence-for-self, personality, formal freedom, such as belongs to Spirit only.

In other words, Subject as “formal existence-for-self, personality, formal freedom,” has *not yet* become self-conscious of itself as Substance as well where “the Idea in its free, universal form...exists for itself.” This “infinite antithesis” is the condition for the possibility of what most of us falsely call “freedom.”

The universal Idea exists thus as the substantial totality of things on the one side, and as the abstract essence of free volition on the other side. This reflection of the mind on itself is individual self-consciousness—the polar opposite of the Idea in its general form, and therefore existing in absolute Limitation.

As the “substantial totality of things,” Substance in fact contains the Subject as well. But at the stage of Reflection, this “universal idea” is perceived by the finite mind only as “individual self-consciousness” on the one hand and its mirror-like opposite, i.e. “the Idea in its general form,” on the other. Because “individual self-consciousness”—the *locus* of “the abstract essence of free volition”—distinguishes itself from the Idea in general (i.e. God), it is by definition *limited*.⁶⁹

This polar opposite is consequently limitation, particularization, for the universal absolute being; it is the side of its *definite existence*; the sphere of its formal reality, the sphere of the reverence paid to God.

In truth, of course, this opposition is illusory. The only “truth” of this moment of particularization and limitation is that it is a necessary moment in the process by which “the universal absolute being” *can return to and therefore know itself*. In the “not yet” of merely formal Freedom, God is still revered by the vulgar as something external. As Hegel knows, this

⁶⁹ An able explication of GWFH’s claim that God is limited by not being e.g. GWFH is WALLACE, Robert M. *Hegel’s Philosophy of Reality, Freedom, and God*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

external reverence is predicated on the *temporary* self-limitation of Spirit.⁷⁰ But this polar opposition is extinguished in the Logical Completeness of the Concept.

To comprehend the absolute connection of this antithesis, is the profound task of metaphysics. This Limitation originates all forms of particularity of whatever kind.

As the profound metaphysician that he is—and, in any case, in strict accordance with Spinoza’s *omnis determinatio est negatio*—Hegel knows that *all particularity*, predicated on the limitation of the Second Moment’s “infinite antithesis,” is subject to *Aufhebung* in “the absolute connection of this antithesis.” But before he announces the *conceptualization* of opposition, whether made possible by his metaphysical Logic or his logical Metaphysics, he reminds us that his purpose here is merely to account for the fact that most of mankind have not yet become conscious of their true end.

The formal volition [of which we have spoken] wills itself; desires to make its own personality valid in all that it purposes and does: even the pious individual wishes to be saved and happy. This pole of the antithesis, existing for itself, is—in contrast with the Absolute Universal Being—a special separate existence, taking cognizance of speciality only, and willing that alone.

In short, ignorance of the End is identical with merely formal Freedom. But even while that End, as “the Absolute Universal Being,” is actually realizing itself, its unconscious and self-limited agents cling to the illusion that they are “a special separate existence, taking cognizance of speciality only, and willing that alone.” It is only in this illusory world that *the Freedom that is not yet Necessity* preserves its existence.

⁷⁰ The italicized “temporarily” is intended to remind the reader of GWFH’s failure to distinguish between Logical and Chronological Priority. When applied to World-History, it can *only* be temporarily. But in Logic, it *cannot* be. The problem arises because this passage as a whole depends on the *isomorphism* between a Logical development—the necessary reconciliation between the Idea’s necessity and subjective Spirit’s merely formal Freedom (see *Philosophy of History*, p. 27; the passage in question is discussed below)—and a Chronological one. This explains why he must write of the latter at *Philosophy of History*, p. 19 (emphases mine): “the History of the world is none other than the progress of the *consciousness* of Freedom; a progress whose development according to the *necessity* of its nature.”

In short it plays its part in the region of mere phenomena. This is the sphere of particular purposes, in effecting which individuals exert themselves on behalf of their individuality—give it full play and objective realization. This is also the sphere of happiness and its opposite. He is happy who finds his condition suited to his special character, will, and fancy, and so enjoys himself in that condition.

By defining “happiness” as nothing more than finding a “condition suited to his special character,” the individual, at least in times of peace and prosperity, eliminates the antithesis on a purely subjective level. But that path to overcoming antithesis is merely phenomenal, as World-History clearly shows.

The History of the World is not the theatre of happiness. Periods of happiness are blank pages in it, for they are periods of harmony,—periods when the antithesis is in abeyance.

Logical Completeness requires the antithesis of the Second Moment; *negativity's opposition* is the lifeblood of the Dialectic. According to Hegel, it is fortunate, or rather necessary, that moments of Peace are rare. If they were not, the merely formal Freedom of the individual's will, guided by nothing more than its limited desire for conditions in which to enjoy harmony by the grace of God, would never give way to “the absolute Idea.”

Reflection on self,—the Freedom above described—is abstractly defined as the formal element of the activity of the absolute Idea.

Hegel's only use for *the subjective volition of the individual's merely formal freedom*, the condition for the possibility of the chronological “not yet” of History's End, is that it is the Middle Term of the Syllogism by which the Absolute Idea is self-realized. Deluded by the belief that they are freely pursuing their own individual ends, the unconscious individuals are in reality the instruments by which a Necessary End is accomplished.

The realizing activity of which we have spoken is the middle term of the Syllogism, one of whose extremes is the Universal essence, the Idea, which reposes in the penetralia of Spirit; and the other, the complex of external things, objective matter. That activity is the medium by which the universal latent principle is translated into the domain of objectivity.

World-History is “the complex of external things, objective matter” in which “the Universal essence, the Idea” is being realized. It is being realized thanks to that Idea's reflection into subjectivity: this makes possible the purposive activity of unconscious individuals. *But reflection is*

not reality. As the synthesis of the Idea's Necessity (the major premise) and subjectivity's formal Freedom (the minor), World History as a whole is *the Syllogism in which Freedom becomes Necessity*. And that "becomes" is only for the unconscious ones: those whose merely abstract and formal Freedom remains compatible with a "not yet." For Hegel, as for World-History itself, true Freedom *is* and always already was Necessity.

Chapter 6 (I.3.2) The *Umkehrung* of *Freiheit*

In tracing the intellectual history of the Idea of Progress, J.B. Bury notes the influence of J.G. Fichte on Hegel:

Both saw the goal of human development in the realization of “freedom,” but, while with Fichte the development never ends as the goal is unattainable, with Hegel the development is already complete, the goal is not only attainable but has now been attained. Thus Hegel’s is what we may call a closed system. History has been progressive, but no path is left open for further advance.¹

Although Bury admits that Hegel’s conception is “antagonistic to Progress as a practical doctrine”²—by which he presumably means that Hegel’s Philosophy of History offers no incentive to *practical action in the future*—he insists that, for Hegel, “History has been progressive” and that “progress there has been.” Skeptical about Hegel’s vision of Progress though he is, Bury does not, it seems to me, go far enough. In this chapter, I intend to show that once Hegel’s conception of “freedom” has been clearly understood, even the *appearance* of Progress in Hegel’s Philosophy of History begins to fall away. Bury recognizes that, for Hegel, Progress comes to an end with Completeness but he is still willing to believe that, for Hegel, Progress *has taken place*. I will show that what appears to be Progress in Hegel’s Philosophy of History was *always simply Logical Completeness*. To put it another way: Bury thinks that Progress is *Chronologically Prior* to Completeness, i.e. that Progress *has* occurred but is now Complete. I claim that Completeness is *Logically Prior* to even the *appearance* of Progress in Hegel’s Philosophy of History.

It is naïve to deny, however, that Hegel made a conscious effort to strive for the *appearance* of Progress; this is strongly suggested by his repeated use of the word itself in the classic exposition of his Philosophy of History:

¹ BURY, J.B. *The Idea of Progress: An Inquiry into its Origin and Growth*, New York: Dover Publications, 1987 (reprint of 1932 original), p. 255.

² BURY, pp. 255-56. “The spirit of Hegel’s philosophy, in its bearing on social life, was thus antagonistic to Progress as a practical doctrine. Progress there had been, but Progress had done its work; the Prussian monarchical state was the last word in history.” Note that this description suggests that GWFH promulgates “the End of History” for political and apologetic reasons (i.e. to defend “the Prussian monarchical state”).

The History of the world is none other than the progress of the consciousness of Freedom; a progress whose development according to the necessity of its nature, it is our business to investigate.³

One is tempted to discount the importance of the words with which Hegel qualifies Progress (i.e. “a progress whose development [is] according to the necessity of its nature”) and to emphasize instead the quantifiable progression he has already introduced:

The general statement given above, of the various grades in the consciousness of Freedom—and which we applied in the first instance to the fact that the Eastern nations knew only that *one* is free; the Greek and Roman world only that *some* are free; whilst *we* know that all men absolutely (man *as man*) are free,—supplies us with the natural division of Universal History, and suggests the mode of its discussion.⁴

The appearance of Progress rests, to begin with, on the *arithmetical* expression of “the various grades in the consciousness of freedom.” One would tend to think that “consciousness of freedom” is a *timeless standard of measurement*—an evaluative criterion—of which an increasingly large number of people have become conscious over an extended chronological process; progress occurs over time, it is quantifiable and can therefore be measured in terms of Freedom.

The three sections of this Chapter will chip away at this misconception step by step. In Section I.3.2.1, the distinction introduced by Borges between *intensive* and *extensive* Freedom will be used as basis for the claim that Hegel’s arithmetical expression of Progress is highly misleading. Next, attention will be turned to Hegel’s conception of Freedom itself. In Section I.3.2.2, the results of Ernst Tugendhat’s thoughtful comparison of Hegel’s notion of Truth with Hegel’s concept of Freedom will be considered; this analysis will reveal what Tugendhat means by Hegel’s “*Umkehrung des Sinns von Freiheit*.” Taking Tugendhat’s more radical suggestions seriously, I will then show (in Section I.3.2.3) that there is no hyperbole involved in equating Hegel’s Freedom with its exact opposite: Necessity (*Notwendigkeit*). In short: what *appears to be* a progressive Philosophy of History based on the arithmetical increase of (the consciousness of) Freedom will be shown to be the necessarily closed circle of Logical Completeness where “Freedom” becomes nothing more than the self-consciousness of this very Necessity.

³ *Philosophy of History*, p. 19.

⁴ *Philosophy of History*, p. 19.

I.3.2.1. Extensive and Intensive Freedom

As already mentioned, the appearance of Progress in Hegel's Philosophy of History depends, to begin with, on the arithmetical expression of "the various grades in the consciousness of freedom." A useful distinction introduced by Borges helps us to see things more clearly. It will be remembered that a central element in her project is to demonstrate what I am calling "the Logical and Chronological Parallel." In her own words, she is showing that "...a articulação historico do espírito será visto que a ordem desse desenvolvimento não é uma ordem qualquer, regida pelo acaso, mas que é a expressão temporal de uma necessidade conceitual."⁵ When she discusses the political articulation of this development, she immediately points out that the progress of Freedom involves not only an *extensive* (i.e. quantifiable) aspect but an *intensive* aspect as well.⁶ In other words, the arithmetical progression from the East, through Greece and Rome, to the German World emphasizes the *extensive* aspect of Freedom.⁷ But it is the *intensive* aspect of Freedom that is responsible for its universality (considered extensively) in the German World.

Na passagem do mundo antigo ao mundo moderno, há também um desenvolvimento intensivo da idéia de liberdade, pois o Estado moderno contém em si o princípio da moralidade subjetiva, princípio surgido historicamente com o cristianismo.⁸

Although Hegel chooses to represent the attractive concept of the extensive progress of Freedom as the essence of his Philosophy of History, it is in fact his idiosyncratic interpretation of the Incarnation that explains the progress of Freedom. It is Christianity's subjective principle—the

⁵ BORGES, p. 141: "Por sua vez, ao mostarmos a articulação historico do espírito será visto que a ordem desse desenvolvimento não é uma ordem qualquer, regida pelo acaso, mas que é a expressão temporal de uma necessidade conceitual, o que sera observado na relação entre política e religião [see I.1.2.2]—que vai desde a identidade imediata destas, no mundo oriental, até uma complementaridade no mundo germânico—bem como nos momentos de desenvolvimento histórico da política e da religião, tomados isoladamente."

⁶ BORGES, p. 141: "A primera (a política) segue uma ordem crescente no que diz respeito ao desenvolvimento da liberdade, na qual há um maior desenvolvimento, tanto intensivo quanto extensivo dessa." Cf. BOURGEOIS, Bernard, *Éternité et Historicité de L'Esprit selon Hegel*. Paris: J. Vrin, 1991; p. 35.

⁷ BORGES. P. 141: "Por desenvolvimento extensivo, entendo a atribuição de "homen livre" a um maior número de indivíduos. A liberdade dos antigos, nesse sentido, não era plena no seu aspecto extensivo, pois não abarcava todos os seres humanos."

⁸ BORGES, p. 141.

abrogation of the division between human being and God that characterized the one-sided “Religions of Essence” (see I.1.2.2)—that all are free. In other words, *his emphasis on the extensive aspect is highly misleading*: there is no gradual (extensive) accretion in the number of those who are free: there is a sudden and unique (intensive) explosion that locates the divine essence within Subjectivity.⁹ Although Hegel naturally does not emphasize the fact, the intensive transformation of Freedom caused by the Incarnation—as interpreted by Hegel, of course—means that *no one was Free*, in that intensive sense of the word, before Christ. In other words, it is an imposture to say that in the Eastern World, for example, *one* was Free. The divine with which the Pharaoh was one, for example, was not really the divine.¹⁰ Hence, Hegel is forced to make statements like the following:

The Orientals have not attained the knowledge that Spirit—Man *as such*—is free; and because they do not know this they are not free. They only know that *one is free*. But on this very account, the freedom of that one is only caprice; ferocity—brutal recklessness or passion, or a mildness and tameness of the desires, which is itself only an accident of Nature—mere caprice like the former. —That *one* is therefore only a Despot; not a *free* man.¹¹

⁹ BORGES, p. 170: “Esse espírito superior [‘revealed in the Christian religion’] significa o irromper de uma dimensão central para o homem moderno, exatamente aquela que o diferencia do homem antigo: a capacidade subjetiva de julgar o que é moralmente correto.”

¹⁰ *Philosophy of History*, p. 112: “The Constitution generally is a Theocracy [sc. in “The Oriental World”], and the Kingdom of God is to the same extent also a secular Kingdom as the secular Kingdom is also divine. What we call God has not yet in the East been realized in [subjective] consciousness, for our idea of God involves an elevation of the soul to the supersensual. While *we* [sc. in the German World] obey, because what we are required to do is confirmed by an *internal* sanction [the fact that the *requirement* is internal makes us free!], there [sc. in the Oriental World] the Law is regarded as inherently and absolutely valid without a sense of the want of this subjective confirmation [note that it is no longer the inadequacy of Eastern Man’s conception of God that GWFH now emphasizes but the inadequacy of their conception of their own subjective power; thanks to the Incarnation, the two are actually the same for GWFH]. In the law [as understood in the Oriental World] men recognize not their own will [as they do in the German World], but in entirely foreign.”

¹¹ *Philosophy of History*, p. 18.

The involuntary self-contradiction¹² contained in this passage (“one is free” vs. “that one is therefore...not a free man”) clearly shows that it is the *intensive*, not the *extensive sense of Freedom* that Hegel takes seriously.

Moreover, once Freedom is understood in this intensive sense, Hegel’s claim that “the History of the world is none other than the progress of the consciousness of Freedom,” reveals that the *end* of that process, whether understood in a Logical or Chronological sense, is once again revealed to be the *sich denkende Idee* described in the closing pages of the *Logic*.¹³ Progress is the actualization, through self-consciousness, of what has been potential (*an sich*) in Spirit from the beginning.¹⁴ In fact, Hegel deliberately distinguishes and rejects “perfectability,” defined as “change...for the better,”¹⁵ from his own Aristotelian conception of Development.¹⁶ Nor is Spirit’s development merely formal, as in Nature.

¹² This self-contradiction must be sharply distinguished from Hegelian Dialectic: it is neither logical nor conscious. GWFH requires “one to be free” in order to give the appearance of progress and this creates a problem for him because true “freedom” will only emerge with “the death of God.”

¹³ It is only when making the parallel between Logic and the Philosophy of History explicit that GWFH feels forced to deny—and it is the only time he does so—Chronological Completeness. “The Union of Universal Abstract Existence generally [sc. “*die absolute Idee*”] with the Individual,—the Subjective—that this alone is Truth, belongs to the department of speculation, and is treated in this general form in Logic.—But in the process of the World’s History itself,—*as still incomplete*,—the abstract final aim of history *is not yet made the distinct object of desire and interest*. While these limited sentiments are still unconscious of the purpose they are fulfilling, the universal principle is implicit in them, and is realizing itself through them” (*Philosophy of History*, pp. 25-26; emphases mine). When GWFH claims that “the abstract final aim of history is not yet made the distinct object of desire and interest” he is *excluding himself*: he is, by virtue of what he is saying, *not* “still unconscious of the purpose” that he, and he alone, knows that “they are fulfilling.” It is only here that GWFH seems to take the extensive sense of Freedom seriously: he alone is self-conscious of his universal Freedom. But Chronological Completeness is, as I stated in I.2.2, only achieved in Absolute Knowledge.

¹⁴ *Philosophy of History*, p. 54: “The principle of *Development* involves also the existence of a latent germ of being—a capacity or potentiality striving to realise itself. This formal conception finds actual existence in Spirit; which has the History of the World for its theatre, its possession, and the sphere of its realization.”

¹⁵ *Philosophy of History*, p. 54: “This peculiarity in the world of mind has indicated in the case of man an altogether different destiny from that of merely natural objects—in which we find always one and the same stable character, to which all change reverts;—namely, a real capacity for change, and that for the, better,—an impulse of *perfectibility*.”

¹⁶ *Philosophy of History*, p. 54 (emphasis mine): “The principle of Perfectibility indeed is almost as indefinite a term as mutability in general; it is without scope or

Its expansion, therefore, does not present the harmless tranquility of mere growth, as does that of organic life, but a stern reluctant working against itself. It exhibits, moreover, not the mere formal conception of development, but the attainment of a definite result. The goal of attainment we determined at the outset: it is Spirit in its *Completeness*, in its essential nature, *i.e.*, Freedom.¹⁷

Having raised the possibility that Hegel's "Freedom" may be Logical Completeness in disguise, the time is ripe to show that whatever else it may turn out to be, it unquestionably *isn't* what most of us think that it is.

I.3.2.2. Tugendhat on Hegelian *Freiheit*

Ernst Tugendhat places his exposition of Hegel's conception of Freedom only at the very end of *Selbstbewußtsein und Selbstbestimmung; Sprachanalytische Interpretationen*.¹⁸ It is not altogether clear whether or not Hegel was really his secret target from the beginning; certainly both Hegel and Tugendhat's interpretation of Hegel are important enough to justify such an intention. Fortunately, however, an analysis of his book as a whole is hardly unnecessary here. But his Hegel interpretation can be connected with the book's central theme by beginning with what he writes about Hegel's treatment of "*Das allgemeine Selbstbewußtsein*" in paragraph §436 of the *Encyclopedia*.¹⁹ Tugendhat comments as follows:

goal, and has *no standard* by which to estimate the changes in question: the improved, more perfect, state of things towards which it professedly tends is altogether undetermined." It is interesting that GWFH fails to recognize that Perfectability may well have *no goal*, *i.e.* it continues into the indefinite future without a specific τέλος.

¹⁷ *Philosophy of History*, p. 55; emphasis in original.

¹⁸ TUGENDHAT, Ernst, *Selbstbewußtsein und Selbstbestimmung; Sprachanalytische Interpretationen*, Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1979 (hereafter "TUGENDHAT").

¹⁹ "Universal self-consciousness [*Selbstbewußtsein*] is the affirmative awareness [*affirmative Wissen*] of self in an other self: each self as a free individuality has his own absolute independence [*absolute Selbständigkeit*] ...without distinguishing itself from that other. Each is thus universal self-consciousness and objective; each has 'real' universality in the shape of reciprocity, so far as each knows itself recognized in the other freeman, and is aware of this in so far as it recognizes the other and knows him to be free" (Wallace translation, deletion as found in TUGENDHAT, p. 344). The sentence with the deletion reads as a whole: *Das allgemeine Selbstbewußtsein* ist das affirmative Wissen seiner selbst im anderen Selbst, deren jedes als freie Einzelheit *absolute Selbständigkeit* hat, aber, vermöge der Negation seiner Unmittelbarkeit oder Begierde, sich nicht vom anderen unterscheidet, allgemeines [*Selbstbewußtsein*] und objektiv ist und die reelle

Wichtig ist aber das Stichwort vom »affirmative Wissen«. Denn diese Rede des Affirmativen läßt sich nun von den bejahenden Beziehung eines Individuums zu einem anderen Individuum im Sinn des Anerkennens ausdehnen auf die bejahende Beziehung jedes der Individuen zu der Gemeinschaft, deren Teil sie sind, eine Übertragung, die für Hegel ohnehin sehr leicht zu vollziehen ist, weil er auf beide seine Rede von der Identität im Unterschied anwenden kann, während man, wenn man diese Bejahung als Zustimmung zu den in den »Gesetzen und Einrichtungen« (*Rechtsphilosophie* §144) der Gemeinschaft enthaltenen allgemeinen Imperativen oder Normen verstehen muß.²⁰

This passage forms a bridge between self-determination in general, i.e. the book's central concern, and Hegel's politics. Tugendhat is showing that the relationship between two individuals ("*das affirmative Wissen seiner selbst im anderen Selbst*") is analogous by extension (*Ausdehnung*) to the relationship between Individual and State; it is within the latter context that Hegel's *Umkehrung* of Freedom is going to take place. Tugendhat is preparing us to realize that, when this reasoning about self-determination's affirmative recognition of another is *extended*, the Individual will be affirming herself in the "*Gesetzen und Einrichtungen*" of the State. Moreover, this passage indicates the crucial bridge between the two types of "*bejahende Beziehung*;" i.e Freedom.

Aber Hegel betont in dem zitierten §436 nicht nur das affirmative Verhältnis, sondern auch die Freiheit und »absolute Selbständigkeit« des Einzelnen *in* diesem affirmative Verhältnis.²¹

It is at this point that Tugendhat points out there are two different "stages" in what he call's Hegel's *Freiheitsbegriff*.²² The sense of Freedom Hegel rejects is mere *Willkür*, usually translated by the English "caprice." This capacity to do whatever you are inclined to do is regarded by Hegel as the merely "formal" Freedom of e.g. the Eastern despot; Tugendhat has no difficulty in finding the appropriate texts.²³ But Tugendhat breaks some

Allgemeinheit als Gegenseitigkeit so hat, als es im freien anderen sich anerkannt weiß und dies weiß, insofern es das andere anerkennt und es frei weiß (§436).

²⁰ TUGENDHAT, p. 344.

²¹ TUGENDHAT, p. 345.

²² TUGENDHAT, p. 153 and p. 345.

²³ TUGENDHAT, p. 345-46: "Dieser Wille ist nach Hegel nur formell frei (Rph §§ 14, 21), weil er zwar beschließt (§ 12), wählt (§ 14), aber zwischen Inhalten, die ihm äußerlich (bzw. innerlich) vorgegeben sind—»es sind die Triebe, Begierden, Neigungen, durch sie sich der Wille von Natur bestimmt findet« (§ 11)—, und ohne daß er ein Maß für die Entscheidung in sich selbst hat (§ 17). Dann ist er aber in

new ground by pointing to an analogy—a most ironic one, as it turns out—between Hegel and Kant. For the latter, heteronomy in ethical decision involved deriving morality *ab extra*; only by reliance on the (internal) categorical imperative was the moral agent truly independent and therefore moral. Hegel uses this Kantian language to justify his own sense of true Freedom (as opposed to *Willkür*) as “die *bejahende Beziehung jedes der Individuen zu der Gemeinschaft*.” Moreover, the transition between the two is going to be self-determination.

Hegel sagt: der formelle Wille ist noch abhängig. Damit ist Kants Begriff der Heteronomie aufgenommen. Die höherstufige Freiheit wird also als Autonomie verstanden; der Maßstab ist Selbstbestimmung, Autonomie. Auch darin unterschieden sich die beiden Konzeptionen [i.e. Hegel’s and Kant’s] also nicht. Aber nun kommt die Frage: was heißt Selbstbestimmung?²⁴

The beauty of Tugendhat’s approach is that he elucidates Freedom within the wider context of Hegel’s thought as a whole. Instead of resting on the analogy between *Selbstbestimmung* and true Freedom, he takes a step back into Hegel’s epistemology: what he calls Hegel’s *Wahrheitsbegriff*. “*Nach dieser aber ist sie dadurch ermöglicht, daß Hegel die eigentliche Freiheit—die Selbstbestimmung—als Beisichselbstsein bestimmt und dieses im Sinn seines spekulativen Wahrheitsbegriffs expandiert hat.*”²⁵ For this move, the entire book has prepared his reader.²⁶

Alle diese zusätzlichen Bestimmungen der Wahrheit: daß sie Resultat sei, daß sie die ganze Bewegung sei, daß sie nur als System sei und daß sie das Ganze sei, sind bloße Folgen der Bestimmung der Wahrheit als Idee—als Identität des Subjekts mit der Realität—, Folgen, die sich dann ergeben müssen, wenn die Identität a) als Bewegung konzipiert wird und wenn diese Bewegung b) allumfassend ist.²⁷

My reader, on the other hand, will recognize in Tugendhat’s description what I have been calling “Logical Completeness.” But Tugendhat has been

Wirklichkeit von seinen Inhalten abhängig (§ 15) und deswegen nicht eigentlich, sondern nur formell frei.”

²⁴ TUGENDHAT, p. 346.

²⁵ TUGENDHAT, p. 350.

²⁶ TUGENDHAT, p. 348: “Sie sehen, die Freiheit im eigentlichen Sinn von Selbstbestimmung ist für Hegel nichts anderes als die Realisierung der Struktur des spekulativen Wahrheitsbegriff...Wir haben bisher diesen spekulativen Wahrheitsbegriff nur nach seiner theoretischen Seite kennengelernt. Wie ist er zu verstehen, wenn er praktisch verstanden wird, als Freiheit?”

²⁷ TUGENDHAT, p. 308.

more interested throughout in Hegel's epistemology rather than in his System: for him, therefore, Logical Completeness and the System as a whole are "*bloße Folgen*" from Hegel's *Wahrheitsbegriff*: the "identity of thinking subject with reality." There can certainly be no doubt that Hegel's "Absolute Idealism" constitutes the basis for his solution to "The Problem of Time."

With this foundation, Tugendhat simply quotes §514 of the *Encyclopedia*—the second paragraph on *Sittlichkeit*—and let's Hegel hang himself with his own words.

Die frei sich wissende Substanz, in welcher das absolute Sollen ebensosehr Sein ist, hat als Geist eines Volkes Wirklichkeit. Die abstrakte Direktion dieses Geistes ist die Vereinzelnung in Personen, von deren Selbständigkeit er die innere Macht und Notwendigkeit ist. Die Person aber weiß als denkende Intelligenz jene Substanz als ihr eigenes Wesen, hört in dieser Gesinnung auf, Akzidenz derselben zu sein, schaut sie als ihren absoluten Endzweck in der Wirklichkeit sowohl als erreichtes *Diesselts* an, als sie denselben durch ihre Tätigkeit hervorbringt, aber als etwas, das vielmehr schlechthin ist; so vollbringt sie ohne die wählende Reflexion ihre Pflicht als das *Ihrige* und als *Seiendes* und hat in dieser Notwendigkeit sich selbst und ihre wirkliche Freiheit.²⁸

In a single masterly paragraph, Tugendhat then reveals the authoritarian monster lurking in the shadows of Hegel's abstract philosophemes. He explains the implications of *Sein* replacing *Sollen*,²⁹ he draws attention to the words "*ohne die wählende Reflexion*"³⁰ (as well as alerting the reader to

²⁸ E §514. "The consciously free substance, in which the absolute *ought* [Sollen] is no less an *is* [ebensosehr Sein], has actuality as the spirit of a nation. The abstract disruption of this spirit singles it out into *persons*, whose independence it, however, controls and entirely dominates from within. But the person, as an intelligent being, feels that underlying essence to be his own very being—ceases when so minded to be a mere accident of it—looks upon it as his absolute final aim. In its actuality he sees not less an achieved present, than somewhat he brings about by his action - yet somewhat which without all question *is*. Thus, without any selective reflection, the person performs his duty as *his own* and as something which *is*; and in this necessity he has himself and his actual freedom" (Wallace translation).

²⁹ TUGENDHAT, p. 348: "Das Sollen, sagt Hegel, ist »ebensosehr Sein«: das Gesollte wird also nicht mehr, wie in Moralität, von der Subjektivität der Objektivität entgegengehalten, sondern es hat Sein, es sind, wie Hegel in der *Rph* erläutert, »die an und für sich seienden Gesetze und Einrichtungen« (§ 144) des bestehenden Gemeinwesen, »eine absolute, unendlich festere Autorität und Macht als das Sein von Natur« (§ 146)."

³⁰ TUGENDHAT, p. 348: "Diese sind für das Individuum, wie Hegel weiter in unserem Stück der *Enz.* Ausführt, »Pflicht«, und zwar eine Pflicht, die es »ohne die

Hegelian *Vertrauen* as the sinister alternative),³¹ and uses a text from the *Philosophy of Right* to illustrate how conscience is submerged in Hegel's State.³² After summarizing his findings in a closing *tour de force*,³³ he asks: "Inwiefern kann denn dann aber Hegel überhaupt noch von Freiheit sprechen?"³⁴ That turns out to be a very good question.

Perhaps only a German born in 1930 could have written about Hegelian "Freedom" with such righteous indignation.³⁵ In any case, it is in this context that Tugendhat introduces the useful phrase *Umkehrung*³⁶ and mentions the interesting idea, an idea that will be amplified in the next section, that what Hegel means by *Freiheit* is really its opposite: *Notwendigkeit*.³⁷ To complete his damning indictment of Hegel's *Machtidolotrie*,³⁸ he leaves the reader in no doubt that the individual's unquestioning loyalty is owed to "the powers that be;" "für das gegenwärtig Bestehende."³⁹ In fact, Tugendhat presents Hegel's achievement as "die Philosophie der Rechtfertigung des Bestehenden."⁴⁰ This emphasis on the justification of the Present is not without connection to what I have called "Chronological Completeness." But neither is it

wählende Reflexion«, also ohne die Freiheit im subjektiven, wählend reflektierend Sinn vollbringt, denn sie sind, wie ich wiederum aus der Rph ergänze (§ 148), »für einen Willen bindend«."

³¹ TUGENDHAT, p. 349.

³² TUGENDHAT quotes *Philosophy of Right* §152 on the disappearance of "das eigene Gewissen" in "die sittliche Substantialität" (p. 349).

³³ TUGENDHAT, p. 349: "Die Möglichkeit eines selbstverantwortlichen, kritischen Verhältnisses zum Gemeinwesen, zum Staat wird von Hegel nicht zugelassen, vielmehr hören wir: die bestehenden Gesetze haben eine absolute Autorität; was vom Individuum zu tun ist, steht in einem Gemeinwesen fest; das eigene Gewissen des Einzelnen hat zu verschwinden, und an die Stelle der Reflexion tritt das Vertrauen; das ist es, was Hegel mit der Aufhebung der Moralität meint."

³⁴ TUGENDHAT, p. 349.

³⁵ TUGENDHAT, p. 349-50: "Damit ist der nicht einmal mehr von Hegel zu überbietende Gipfel der Perversion erreicht, einer gewiß nicht mehr nur begrifflichen, sondern moralischen Perversion, so daß man Mühe hat, sie nur nach ihrer begrifflichen Seite zu betrachten."

³⁶ TUGENDHAT, p. 349 (emphasis mine): "Der Sinn dieser *Umkehrung der Freiheit* in das, was normalerweise für ihr Gegenteil gehalten wird, ist, wie aus dem Zusammenhang sowohl des § 484 wie vor allem des vorhin zitierten § 514 hervorgeht, der, daß das Individuum sich gerade darin frei fühlen soll, daß es die von der Macht des Bestehenden ausgehenden Pflichten erfüllt."

³⁷ TUGENDHAT, p. 349: "...die »wirkliche Freiheit« wird als »Notwendigkeit« verstanden..."

³⁸ TUGENDHAT, p. 355.

³⁹ TUGENDHAT, p. 354; emphasis mine.

⁴⁰ TUGENDHAT, p. 351; see the sources cited there.

unconnected with what Tugendhat calls “*Hegels Grundkonzeption*.”⁴¹ his *Wahrheitsbegriff*.

Dieser Aspekt folgt aus Hegels Grundkonzeption, der Wahrheit als Einheit des Begriffs mit der Realität, nur dann, wenn man die Realität, das ›Wirkliche‹ mit dem *Gegenwärtigen* gleichsetzt.”⁴²

And thus it happens that “Freedom” is not the only word that is *twisted round* in a masterful *Umkehrung*.⁴³ Due to the fact that Tugendhat has successfully embedded Freedom with Hegel’s *Grundkonzeption*,⁴⁴ it is the meaning of “Truth” that is transformed as well: there is no *correspondence between conception and object* to be achieved but rather an identity to be asserted.⁴⁵ There can be no doubt that Tugendhat achieves some masterful *Sprachanalytische Interpretationen*⁴⁶ (the sub-title of his book) and it is his

⁴¹ TUGENDHAT, p. 354.

⁴² TUGENDHAT, p. 354; emphasis in original.

⁴³ TUGENDHAT, p. 350 (emphasis mine): “...den Sinn des Wortes »Freiheit« *umgebogen* hat.” The formula I used above (“der Umkehrung des Sinns von Freiheit”) is found on the same page.

⁴⁴ For the record, I cannot accept TUGENDHAT’s claim that the Absolute Identity of Subject and Object is GWFH’s *Grundkonzeption*; it is SCHELLING’s. One might, with better right, say that the Subject and Substance Identity deserves this place. But the fact of the matter is that the characteristic and defining move in GWFH’s thought is not any particular Identity—no matter how *gründlich* it may be—but a new *means* towards the *end* of Identity. In other words, it would probably be more accurate to say that GWFH’s *Grundkonzeption* is the Logical Completeness of the Dialectic. In the sense that the end is always Logically Prior to the means, TUGENDHAT is correct. But this new means was so fertile, so flexible and applicable—above all, so brilliantly innovative—that it will always have pride of place when GWFH is discussed. While it is therefore true that GWFH’s intentions cannot be understood without reference to SCHELLING (but see TUGENDHAT, pp. 316-17) and SPINOZA, his Dialectical *means* to the Monistic *end* will remain his greatest achievement. Unfortunately, *it was precisely the confusion of Logical and Chronological Priority in the Dialectic that made it so powerful*. It was only on the basis of this scandalous confusion that Time in general and World-History in particular were integrated into GWFH’s oxymoronic *Chronological Monism*.

⁴⁵ TUGENDHAT, p. 350: “Natürlich kann sie das nur sein, weil Hegel unter »Wahrheit« gar nicht Wahrheit versteht, sondern etwas ganz anderes, nämlich die Einheit von Subjekt und Realität, und jetzt können wir sehen, daß das konkret bedeutet: das affirmative Verhältnis der Einzelnen zu ihrem Gemeinwesen.”

⁴⁶ TUGENDHAT, p. 350-51: “Denn solange wir uns in Hegels Terminologie bewegen, wissen wir gar nicht, was es heißen könnte, nach Wahrheit zu fragen: und eine Forderung nach Freiheit kann gar nicht mehr aufkommen, erstens weil jede Forderung einen Rückfall in die Eitelkeit der Subjektivität darstellen würde,

insight that “indem er [sc. Hegel] den Sinn dieser Wörter umkehrt, vertritt er nicht nur eine *andere* Konzeption sondern die genau *entgegengesetzte*...”⁴⁷ that will guide my steps in the following section.

I.3.2.3. The Necessity of Freedom

In his *Hegel's Grand Synthesis: A Study of Being, Thought, and History*—an honest and interesting attempt to absolve Hegel of his commitment to Chronological Completeness, as we shall see in Part II—Daniel Berthold-Bond uses the relationship between Freedom and Necessity to show that “dialectic sets up an “equilibrium” of opposite determinations, so that every opposing determination has equal value.”⁴⁸ His clearly written description of this relationship is worth quoting in full:

An example may help. Hegel views it as a mistake to regard freedom and necessity as polar opposites and as equally legitimate but exclusionary alternatives. If they were equal in this way—as the Kantian antinomy has it, and as the sceptic has it—the only options for viewing human action would be the result of completely canceling one term (by arbitrary fiat) [70] and thus seeing oneself either as free in Hegel's sense of negative freedom (= nihilism), [n. 71] or doomed to necessity in Hegel's sense of “merely external necessity” (= tychism, fatalism, “the irrational void of necessity” [PhS 443]).⁴⁹

It will be seen that Berthold-Bond is *sympathetic* to Hegel's refusal to consider Freedom and Necessity “as polar opposites and as equally legitimate but exclusionary alternatives.” But he is honest enough to admit that this refusal is predicated precisely on *Hegel's sense* of what an “exclusionary” understanding of both Freedom and Necessity would look like. And it will be seen—although Berthold-Bond does not call our attention to the fact, for which omission he can be justly faulted—that *the common sense understanding of Freedom* gets lost between Hegel's *own* “exclusionary alternatives:”⁵⁰ negative freedom as *nihilism* on the one hand

zweitens weil, da die Unfreiheit als Freiheit bezeichnet wird, die Freiheit ohnehin schon in vollendeter Weise in der Unfreiheit realisiert scheint, und es gar nicht mehr zu fordern gibt.”

⁴⁷ TUGENDHAT, p. 351; emphasis in original.

⁴⁸ BERTHOLD-BOND, Daniel, *Hegel's Grand Synthesis: A Study of Being, Thought, and History*, Albany: State University of New York Press, 1989 (hereafter “BERTHOLD-BOND”).

⁴⁹ BERTHOLD-BOND, p. 88.

⁵⁰ It would be interesting to investigate the possibility that there is what might be called *a metalogical use of Understanding* in GWFH where alternatives to be subsequently synthesized in Concept are first distinguished in a highly exaggerated

and a more positive conception, with which necessity will be fully integrated, on the other. Oblivious to this omission, Berthold-Bond continues:

For these are the only senses of freedom and necessity which are left when we disallow any “reciprocal dependence” of the one on the other. On the other hand, by seeing that the opposition of freedom and necessity is not a polar equilibrium of exclusionary terms, but involves the two terms negating each other in a positive way—so that (positive) freedom negates *external* necessity (fate), and (rational) necessity negates *negative* freedom (nihilism)—we arrive at the completer notion of freedom which is self-limited by the “real, inward necessity” (SL §35 *Zusatz*) of duty, and of necessity which is the autonomous expression of self-determination.⁵¹

It will be noted that Berthold-Bond requires the bogey of nihilism—apparently the more Hegelian *Willkür* was not objectionable enough for his apologetic purposes—in order to sustain this sympathetic reading.⁵² But the essential point is that Berthold-Bond is nevertheless honest enough to draw the reader’s attention to a text where Tugendhat’s outlandish suggestion (“*die »wirkliche Freiheit« wird als »Notwendigkeit« verstanden*”)⁵³ is confirmed by Hegel’s own words. This text is §35 of the *Encyclopedia*:

way so as to justify their synthesis. In other words, GWFH requires that the notions of commonsense (i.e. what most of us mean by Freedom; e.g. “the power to make up our own minds within the context of an externally regulated universe of man-made or natural law”) *be much more one-sided than they in fact are*. Only by this *metalogical one-sidedness* can the conceptualized products of dialectical logic be justified.

⁵¹ BERTHOLD-BOND, p. 88.

⁵² Therefore n. 71 (BERTHOLD-BOND, p. 191-92) is not one of the best moments in his book. He can’t find the word “nihilism” in GWFH so he is forced to derive it (*via* a discussion of irony in the *Lectures on Aesthetics*) from KIERKEGAARD’s use of the word in *Concept of Irony*! But BERTHOLD-BOND recovers somewhat with the valid and important claim that it was the French Revolution that led GWFH to take such a dim view of “negative freedom” (BERTHOLD-BOND, p. 192). Since the French Revolution was the great world-historical event of their lifetimes, it may not be too much to say that the central difference between KANT and GWFH—more important than all the distinctions familiar to students of philosophy—was that the latter kept faith with the Revolution’s ideas while the latter lost hope. The enduring faith of the older man is, from my point of view, infinitely more beautiful—sublime in KANT’s sense—than the creation of GWFH’s truly beautiful justification for abandoning that faith.

⁵³ TUGENDHAT, p. 349.

what Berthold-Bond (the abbreviation stands for “Shorter Logic”) cited as “SL §35 *Zusatz*.”

Hegel is discussing the old-style Cosmology⁵⁴ and, in §35 itself—as opposed to the *Zusatz*—he provides a long list of the “polar opposites and...equally legitimate but exclusionary alternatives” (to use Berthold-Bond’s felicitous expression) that form the standard subject matter of this discipline.⁵⁵ In the *Addition*, Hegel puts it this way: “But to give them a satisfactory answer, it is above all things necessary not to claim finality for the abstract formulae of understanding, or to suppose that each of the two terms in an antithesis has an independent subsistence or can be treated in its isolation as a complete and self-centered truth.”⁵⁶ It is to illustrate this general statement with an example that Hegel reveals what his “Freedom” really is.

So wurde z. B. der Unterschied von Freiheit und Notwendigkeit in Betrachtung gezogen und wurden diese Bestimmungen in der Art auf die Natur und auf den Geist angewendet, daß man jene in ihren Wirkungen als der Notwendigkeit unterworfen, diesen aber als frei betrachtete.⁵⁷

Hegel’s first move is to undermine the distinction between Nature, governed by *Notwendigkeit*, and Spirit, where Freedom reigns. Since the Hegelian System depends on the Dialectical Synthesis of Logic, Nature, and Spirit, it is obvious that this kind of distinction cannot hold. In other words, the traditional *locus* of Freedom in Spirit—in the human being’s freedom of choice—is no longer logically distinct from Nature in Hegel’s System. It is on the basis of this collapsed distinction that Hegel will collapse the distinction between Freedom and Necessity.⁵⁸

⁵⁴ E §35: “Der dritte Teil, die *Kosmologie*, handelte von der *Welt*, ihrer Zufälligkeit, Notwendigkeit, Ewigkeit, Begrenztsein in Raum und Zeit, den formellen Gesetzen in ihren Veränderungen, ferner von der Freiheit des Menschen und dem Ursprunge des Bösen.” In this context, “old-style” really means (as the *Zusatz* makes explicit) “pre-Critical;” i.e. pre-KANT.

⁵⁵ E §35 (emphasis mine): “Als *absolute Gegensätze* gelten hierbei vornehmlich: Zufälligkeit und Notwendigkeit; äußerliche und innerliche Notwendigkeit; wirkende und Endursachen, oder die Kausalität überhaupt und Zweck; Wesen oder Substanz und Erscheinung; Form und Materie; *Freiheit und Notwendigkeit*; Glückseligkeit und Schmerz; Gutes und Böses.”

⁵⁶ *Encyclopedia Logic*, p. 55; *Zusatz* to E §35.

⁵⁷ *Zusatz* to E §35.

⁵⁸ Indeed the roots of Hegel’s synthesis of Freedom and Necessity are, as Shlomo Avineri has pointed out, are to be found in SPINOZA. See AVINERI, Shlomo, Hegel Revisited in Alasdair MacIntyre ed., *Hegel: A Collection of Critical Essays*, New York: Doubleday, 1972.

Dieser Unterschied ist nun allerdings wesentlich und im Innersten des Geistes selbst begründet; Freiheit jedoch und Notwendigkeit, als einander abstrakt gegenüberstehend, gehören nur der Endlichkeit an und gelten nur auf ihrem Boden.⁵⁹

Hegel here uses the word “*wesentlich*” in the technical sense: the distinction between Spirit and Nature, from which, suggests Hegel, the distinction between Freedom and Necessity is derived, is grounded in the Concept’s *Second Moment*; the moment of *Endlichkeit*. In *Reflexion*—the essence, as it were, of *Wesen*—two actually identical things always appear as mirror image opposites of each other, as is now the case with Spirit and Nature. Therefore one appears to be the *locus* of Freedom, the other of Necessity. But although the independence of Spirit depends on this appearance—this is why Hegel says the difference is “*im Innersten des Geistes selbst begründet*”—it is only independent *wesentlich*; we must beware of thinking that this means what we would call “essentially.” *Only by first distinguishing itself from Nature can Spirit come to recognize itself in the Form of Externality (i.e. Nature) and therefore—mediated by the Logical Idea that both Spirit and Nature actually are—achieve consciousness of itself as the entire process.* It is no accident that Hegel’s conception Freedom as Necessity cannot be understood apart from Logic, Nature, and Spirit and *Sein, Wesen, and Begriff*. The Logical Completeness that binds these Triads together is, as we shall see, indistinguishable from Freedom as Necessity.

For now, however, Hegel is content to show that Freedom and Necessity are only aspects of one Logically Complete whole.

Eine Freiheit, die keine Notwendigkeit in sich hätte, und eine bloße Notwendigkeit ohne Freiheit, dies sind abstrakte und somit unwahre Bestimmungen. Die Freiheit ist wesentlich konkret, auf ewige Weise in sich bestimmt und somit zugleich notwendig.⁶⁰

It seems to me that Hegel is exploiting the usual sense of “*wesentlich*” here; he is, after all, only using Freedom and Necessity as an example.⁶¹

⁵⁹ *Zusatz* to E §35.

⁶⁰ *Zusatz* to E §35.

⁶¹ In the technical sense, Freedom is only concrete as Concept and therefore enriched by being the whole of its moments. It should be kept in mind that in E §35, GWFH has not yet introduced the reader to his *Logic*, and therefore to *Wesen*. He himself, of course, presupposes his own System in every sentence he writes. But—and this is especially true in the *Zusätze*—he allows himself a terminological flexibility not found elsewhere.

But even though he is no longer going to discuss *Freiheit* and *Notwendigkeit* in relation to Nature and Spirit—it was this relation, it must be remembered, that required him to invoke the logical moment of *Wesen*—it is important for us that he began as he did. Freedom must not be understood merely as *political* Freedom; this is the basic problem with an approach like Alan Patten's.⁶² Nor is it enough for Ernst Tugendhat to show that the *Umkehrung* of Freedom into its opposite is grounded only in Hegel's albeit related collapsing of opposites like *subject* and *reality*. For the present, it is enough to listen to Hegel bring his discussion to its conclusion, bearing in mind that Freedom is no more restricted to the moving bodies of Nature than it is to the political structures of Objective Spirit.

Wenn von Notwendigkeit gesprochen wird, so pflegt man darunter zunächst nur Determination von außen zu verstehen, wie z. B. in der endlichen Mechanik ein Körper sich nur bewegt, wenn er durch einen anderen Körper gestoßen wird, und zwar in der Richtung, welche ihm durch diesen Stoß erteilt wird. Dies ist jedoch eine bloß äußerliche Notwendigkeit, nicht die wahrhaft innere, denn diese ist die Freiheit.⁶³

In fact, this text fits in particularly well with Tugendhat's analysis of the relationship between Individual and *Gemeinschaft*. If the State is looked at as an *other*, obedience to its *Gesetzen* and *Einrichten* is compelled by "*eine bloß äußerliche Notwendigkeit*." But as Spirit's objective reflection of *itself*, the State is not external to the Individual. Hegel has thus given us what we needed: a definition that confirms Tugendhat's suggestion. Freedom is "true inner necessity" ("*Dies ist jedoch eine bloß äußerliche Notwendigkeit, nicht die wahrhaft innere, denn diese ist die Freiheit*").

It is therefore as "inner necessity" that Freedom must be conceived. One aspect of this conception is that Freedom can only be understood as a Concept—i.e. as a concrete whole—in which its opposition to Necessity, an opposition that is *wesentlich* in the technical sense, is merely a moment. It is therefore precisely a *necessary* moment: as Concept, every moment of Freedom, and everything else, is Necessary. And this is a crucial point. But more important to grasp is the fact that Freedom is not merely a Concept. The most important words in the *Zusatz* are easy to miss: as concrete, Freedom is "...*auf ewige Weise* in sich bestimmt und somit zugleich *notwendig*" (emphasis mine). It will be remembered from I.1.1.2 that in the

⁶² PATTEN, Alan, *Hegel's Idea of Freedom*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999. Compare GUYER, Paul, *Kant on Freedom, Law, and Happiness*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000; esp. pp. 408-434.

⁶³ *Zusatz* to E §35.

sich denkende Idee, the dialectical *Bestimmungen* it contains are self-consciously recognized as *in sich bestimmt*.⁶⁴ Its progressive unfolding—even or rather particularly when appearing under the guise of timelessness (“*auf ewige Weise*”) is *necessary*. The reason that Freedom resembles the Absolute Idea is not simply because it too is a Concept and is therefore susceptible to the Speculative Method. As Hegel claims in the *Wissenschaft der Logik*, it is the Speculative Method itself that that unfolds with what might be called “free necessity.”⁶⁵

Nor is it only in Logic that this kind of thing occurs: the most important application of “Freedom” is, of course, to be found in Hegel’s *Philosophy of History*. Nor does he conceal there from the attentive reader that his version of Freedom is—to considerably understate the case—*closely connected* with Necessity.⁶⁶ Lest it be thought that it is *my* intention to conceal in a footnote⁶⁷ the closest Hegel comes to an explicit denial of Chronological Completeness, I will return to the passage in question; it can now be explained in full. It reads as follows:

But in the process of the World’s History itself,—as still incomplete,—the abstract final aim of history is not yet made the distinct object of desire and interest. While these limited sentiments are still unconscious of the purpose they are fulfilling, the universal principle is implicit in them, and is realizing itself through them.⁶⁸

What makes the process of World-History incomplete is *not* that it has not already achieved its “abstract final aim” but that *all of those*

⁶⁴ *Zusatz* to E §237 (Wallace, p. 293): “Es kann hiernach auch gesagt werden, die absolute Idee sei das Allgemeine, aber das Allgemeine nicht bloß als abstrakte Form, welchem der besondere Inhalt als ein Anderes gegenübersteht, sondern als die absolute Form, in welche alle Bestimmungen, die ganze Fülle des durch dieselbe gesetzten Inhalts zurückgegangen ist.”

⁶⁵ *WdL*, p. 29: “No subject matter is so absolutely capable of being expounded with a strict immanent plasticity as is thought *in its own necessary development*; no other brings with it this demand in such a degree; in this respect the Science of Logic must surpass even mathematics, *for no subject matter has in its own self this freedom and independence.*”

⁶⁶ Even on the crudest level this is visible: of the 41 times that GWFH uses cognates of “necessity” (including e.g. “the necessities of life”) in his Introduction to the *Philosophy of History*, the word “freedom” is found either in the same sentence (or conjoined with it in an adjacent one; this happens twice) 14 times: about a third of the cases.

⁶⁷ See n. 13 above.

⁶⁸ All of the remaining block quotations in this section are continuously quoted with no deletions from *Philosophy of History*, p. 25-7. They will not therefore be cited *singulatim*.

participating in that process—as distinct from Hegel himself—have “not yet made” this τέλος “the distinct object of [their] desire and interest.” Guided by their own “limited sentiments”—it is noteworthy that Hegel’s grammar does not bestow upon “them” any independent agency—they are unconscious of the purposive process that “is realizing itself through them.” When considered in context, this passage reveals that this “not yet” of their unconsciousness is merely the last remains of a merely formal and therefore purely illusory Freedom; of a Freedom that has not yet become one with Necessity. The passage continues:

The question also assumes the form of the union of *Freedom* and *Necessity*; the latent abstract process of Spirit being regarded as *Necessity*, while that which exhibits itself in the conscious will of men, as their interest, belongs to the domain of *Freedom*.

Hegel explains that Necessity is the domain of the purpose that is realizing itself through those who are its unconscious instruments. At this stage—where Freedom and Necessity are still distinct—the mass of mankind conceives of itself as freely following its own subjective purposes. As long, therefore, as Freedom and Necessity are separate, there still exists a chronological “not yet” in which “the abstract final aim of history is not yet made the distinct object of desire and interest.” But Hegel not only exempts himself from this unconsciousness: he also knows that Freedom and Necessity *in general* are in fact not distinct at all. Nor does he omit to tell us *how* he knows this:

As the metaphysical connection (i.e. the connection in the Idea) of these forms of thought, belongs to Logic, it would be out of place to analyze it here. The chief and cardinal points only shall be mentioned.

“In the Idea,” there exists between forms of thought a “metaphysical connection” revealed in the *Logic*. Hegel is prepared to summarize the “chief and cardinal points” whereby the distinction between Freedom and Necessity, a distinction on which the proposition that World-History is “still incomplete” depends, is illusory. With this introduction, Hegel prepares the reader for perhaps the richest and most revealing paragraph in the famous Introduction to the *Lectures on the Philosophy of History*. In this paragraph, we will watch the sole basis of Chronological Incompleteness, the precarious “not yet” of a merely formal and unconscious sense of Freedom, extinguish itself in the Logical Completeness of Freedom and Necessity.

Hegel begins by calling attention to the Second Moment of the Dialectic: although Spirit and e.g. the Logical Idea—or “God,” as Hegel

prefers to call it in the passage—are one and the same, the moment of Reflection makes them appear, to the subjective Mind, at least, to be separate.

Philosophy shows that the Idea advances to an infinite antithesis; that, viz. between the Idea in its free, universal form—in which it exists for itself—and the contrasted form of abstract introversion, reflection on itself, which is formal existence-for-self, personality, formal freedom, such as belongs to Spirit only.

In other words, Subject as “formal existence-for-self, personality, formal freedom,” has *not yet* become self-conscious of itself as Substance as well where “the Idea in its free, universal form...exists for itself.” This “infinite antithesis” is the condition for the possibility of what most of us falsely call “freedom.”

The universal Idea exists thus as the substantial totality of things on the one side, and as the abstract essence of free volition on the other side. This reflection of the mind on itself is individual self-consciousness—the polar opposite of the Idea in its general form, and therefore existing in absolute Limitation.

As the “substantial totality of things,” Substance in fact contains the Subject as well. But at the stage of Reflection, this “universal idea” is perceived by the finite mind only as “individual self-consciousness” on the one hand and its mirror-like opposite, i.e. “the Idea in its general form,” on the other. Because “individual self-consciousness”—the *locus* of “the abstract essence of free volition”—distinguishes itself from the Idea in general (i.e. God), it is by definition *limited*.⁶⁹

This polar opposite is consequently limitation, particularization, for the universal absolute being; it is the side of its *definite existence*; the sphere of its formal reality, the sphere of the reverence paid to God.

In truth, of course, this opposition is illusory. The only “truth” of this moment of particularization and limitation is that it is a necessary moment in the process by which “the universal absolute being” *can return to and therefore know itself*. In the “not yet” of merely formal Freedom, God is still revered by the vulgar as something external. As Hegel knows, this

⁶⁹ An able explication of GWFH’s claim that God is limited by not being e.g. GWFH is WALLACE, Robert M. *Hegel’s Philosophy of Reality, Freedom, and God*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

external reverence is predicated on the *temporary* self-limitation of Spirit.⁷⁰ But this polar opposition is extinguished in the Logical Completeness of the Concept.

To comprehend the absolute connection of this antithesis, is the profound task of metaphysics. This Limitation originates all forms of particularity of whatever kind.

As the profound metaphysician that he is—and, in any case, in strict accordance with Spinoza’s *omnis determinatio est negatio*—Hegel knows that *all particularity*, predicated on the limitation of the Second Moment’s “infinite antithesis,” is subject to *Aufhebung* in “the absolute connection of this antithesis.” But before he announces the *conceptualization* of opposition, whether made possible by his metaphysical Logic or his logical Metaphysics, he reminds us that his purpose here is merely to account for the fact that most of mankind have not yet become conscious of their true end.

The formal volition [of which we have spoken] wills itself; desires to make its own personality valid in all that it purposes and does: even the pious individual wishes to be saved and happy. This pole of the antithesis, existing for itself, is—in contrast with the Absolute Universal Being—a special separate existence, taking cognizance of speciality only, and willing that alone.

In short, ignorance of the End is identical with merely formal Freedom. But even while that End, as “the Absolute Universal Being,” is actually realizing itself, its unconscious and self-limited agents cling to the illusion that they are “a special separate existence, taking cognizance of speciality only, and willing that alone.” It is only in this illusory world that *the Freedom that is not yet Necessity* preserves its existence.

⁷⁰ The italicized “temporarily” is intended to remind the reader of GWFH’s failure to distinguish between Logical and Chronological Priority. When applied to World-History, it can *only* be temporarily. But in Logic, it *cannot* be. The problem arises because this passage as a whole depends on the *isomorphism* between a Logical development—the necessary reconciliation between the Idea’s necessity and subjective Spirit’s merely formal Freedom (see *Philosophy of History*, p. 27; the passage in question is discussed below)—and a Chronological one. This explains why he must write of the latter at *Philosophy of History*, p. 19 (emphases mine): “the History of the world is none other than the progress of the *consciousness* of Freedom; a progress whose development according to the *necessity* of its nature.”

In short it plays its part in the region of mere phenomena. This is the sphere of particular purposes, in effecting which individuals exert themselves on behalf of their individuality—give it full play and objective realization. This is also the sphere of happiness and its opposite. He is happy who finds his condition suited to his special character, will, and fancy, and so enjoys himself in that condition.

By defining “happiness” as nothing more than finding a “condition suited to his special character,” the individual, at least in times of peace and prosperity, eliminates the antithesis on a purely subjective level. But that path to overcoming antithesis is merely phenomenal, as World-History clearly shows.

The History of the World is not the theatre of happiness. Periods of happiness are blank pages in it, for they are periods of harmony,—periods when the antithesis is in abeyance.

Logical Completeness requires the antithesis of the Second Moment; *negativity's opposition* is the lifeblood of the Dialectic. According to Hegel, it is fortunate, or rather necessary, that moments of Peace are rare. If they were not, the merely formal Freedom of the individual's will, guided by nothing more than its limited desire for conditions in which to enjoy harmony by the grace of God, would never give way to “the absolute Idea.”

Reflection on self,—the Freedom above described—is abstractly defined as the formal element of the activity of the absolute Idea.

Hegel's only use for *the subjective volition of the individual's merely formal freedom*, the condition for the possibility of the chronological “not yet” of History's End, is that it is the Middle Term of the Syllogism by which the Absolute Idea is self-realized. Deluded by the belief that they are freely pursuing their own individual ends, the unconscious individuals are in reality the instruments by which a Necessary End is accomplished.

The realizing activity of which we have spoken is the middle term of the Syllogism, one of whose extremes is the Universal essence, the Idea, which reposes in the penetralia of Spirit; and the other, the complex of external things, objective matter. That activity is the medium by which the universal latent principle is translated into the domain of objectivity.

World-History is “the complex of external things, objective matter” in which “the Universal essence, the Idea” is being realized. It is being realized thanks to that Idea's reflection into subjectivity: this makes possible the purposive activity of unconscious individuals. *But reflection is*

not reality. As the synthesis of the Idea's Necessity (the major premise) and subjectivity's formal Freedom (the minor), World History as a whole is *the Syllogism in which Freedom becomes Necessity*. And that "becomes" is only for the unconscious ones: those whose merely abstract and formal Freedom remains compatible with a "not yet." For Hegel, as for World-History itself, true Freedom *is* and always already was Necessity.

Chapter 7 (I.3.3) Hegel's Philosophy of History

In this chapter, the broad outlines of Hegel's Philosophy of History will be considered in the context of two specialized problems that determine those outlines. In I.3.3.1, I will consider Hegel's decision to divide his account of World-History into *four* parts as opposed to the more typically Hegelian Triad. This will involve taking a last look at the relationship between Logical and Chronological Priority. In I.3.3.2, an architectonic feature of his Philosophy of History that is frequently overlooked, the triadic cycle of governments ending with Monarchy, will receive consideration. This topic will provide additional support to what I have called "an immanentist reading" of Hegel's Philosophy of History.

I.3.3.1. The Four-fold Division of Hegel's *Philosophy of History*

It has been shown that when Hegel claims "the History of the world is none other than the progress of the consciousness of Freedom; a progress whose development according to the necessity of its nature," his words are carefully chosen. The progress of *freedom* is itself a *necessity* and that it is not even in terms of *freedom* that this apparent progress occurs: it is "the *consciousness* of Freedom."

In the process before us, the essential nature of freedom—which involves in it absolute necessity—is to be displayed as coming to a consciousness of itself (for it is in its very nature, self-consciousness) and thereby realising its existence.¹

In other words, Freedom—once purged of "an infinity of misunderstandings, confusions, and errors"²—is revealed to be *the necessary process by which self-consciousness comes to be conscious of itself*. It has been easy to show that the word "Freedom" does not mean what the French Revolutionaries meant by it.³ But it is not enough to point out that *Freiheit* has suffered an *Umkehrung* in which it has come to mean its opposite. *It has, in fact, disappeared altogether*. It is simply a

¹ *Philosophy of History*, p. 19.

² *Philosophy of History*, p. 19: "But that this term "Freedom," without further qualification, is an indefinite, and incalculable ambiguous term; and that while that which it represents is the *ne plus ultra* of attainment, it is liable to an infinity of misunderstandings, confusions and errors, and to become the occasion for all imaginable excesses,—has never been more clearly known and felt than in modern times."

³ See RITTER, Joachim, *Hegel and the French Revolution*. Translated by Richard Dien Winfield. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1982.

Dialectical Development masquerading in political-ethical garb: it is merely the Logical Completeness of the Concept.

Since the Concept only becomes the *sich denkende Idee* at the very end of an apparently timeless and thoroughly circular process,⁴ Hegel's only remaining problem is to apply the Logical self-determination of the Concept, i.e. "the necessary process by which self-consciousness comes to be conscious of itself," to the Chronological process of World-History. This he can only do only by temporarily making us believe that "Freedom" actually means something that it doesn't. *Successive grades of self-consciousness* must now be Chronologically distinguished, as he insisted that the Logical moments of the Concept never were or could be, and this is why he needs the arithmetical imagery of the Freedom of One, Few, and All and the division of World History into four Ages or Worlds.⁵ *These gradations are needed in order to convert a Logical Process into a Chronological one.* Nor does he completely conceal the fact that this is precisely what he is doing when he takes the time to justify the existence of these divisions.

Universal history—as already demonstrated—shows the development of the consciousness of Freedom on the part of Spirit, and of the consequent realization of that Freedom. This development implies a gradation—a series of increasingly adequate expressions or manifestations of Freedom, which result from its Idea.⁶

Having made this point, Hegel is completely honest about the fact that his readers have already encountered something similar before. The necessary self-unfolding of an Idea until it reaches its actualization in self-consciousness is also the proper domain of Logic.

The logical, and—as still more prominent—the *dialectical* nature of the Idea in general, viz. that it is self-determined—that it assumes successive forms which it successively transcends; and by this very process of transcending its earlier stages, gains an affirmative, and, in fact, a richer and more concrete shape;—this necessity of its nature, and the necessary

⁴ See ABOULAFIA, Mitchell. *The Self-Winding Circle: A Study of Hegel's System*. St. Louis: Warren Green, 1982.

⁵ *Philosophy of History*, p. 19: "The general statement given above, of the various grades in the consciousness of Freedom—and which we applied in the first instance to the fact that the Eastern nations knew only that *one* is free; the Greek and Roman world only that *some* are free; whilst *we* know that all men absolutely (*man as man*) are free,—supplies us with the natural division of Universal History, and suggests the mode of its discussion."

⁶ *Philosophy of History*, p. 63.

series of pure abstract forms which the Idea successively assumes—is exhibited in the department of *Logic*. Here we need adopt only one of its results, viz. that every step in the process, as differing from any other, has its determinate peculiar principle. In history this principle is idiosyncrasy of Spirit—peculiar National Genius.⁷

A certain amount of dishonesty enters when Hegel claims that in the Philosophy of History he is adopting only *one* of Logic's results; in fact, he is going well beyond that. He is in fact imposing the “the *dialectical* nature of the Idea in general” on a Chronological process. By virtue of the fact that the Logical Idea “assumes successive forms which it successively transcends,” it looks enough like the Idea of Progress to fulfill Hegel's pedagogical or political needs despite the fact that it involves the deliberate and scandalous confusion of Logical and Chronological Priority. There are, of course, compensations. The fact that this Logical process is “self-determined” makes it look enough like Freedom to satisfy the hopes of Hegel's readers, especially those who forget that the philosopher is in deadly earnest when he says that the result constitutes a “progress whose development” is “according to the necessity of its nature.”

But there is another aspect of this imposture. It is certainly ironic that the one result Hegel admits he is taking from Logic, i.e. the notion that “every step in the process, as differing from any other, has its determinate peculiar principle,” is closely related to the most important difference between his Logic and Philosophy of History. This brings us to the subject at hand: given Hegel's evident affection for Triads, why does he divide World-History into *four* phases and not three?⁸

Others have explained this division solely in terms of Hegel's Nationalism. It is certainly true that his approach is predicated on the great importance of *Volksgeist* in his thinking. My goal, however, is to show how this four-fold division is related to the Logical and Chronological Parallel. A four-fold division, already visible in Hegel's Anthropology (I.1.2.1), is well adapted to solving the central problem that arises when applying a timeless Logical structure to a Chronological process.

This problem relates specifically to the Second Moment of the Triad. In Logical terms, the antithetical mirror images of Reflection are simultaneous. But logical simultaneity does not translate well into a chronological process. Naturally Hegel does not explain his translation

⁷ *Philosophy of History*, p. 63.

⁸ This is particularly remarkable because the threefold division into Ancient, Medieval, and Modern History was ready at hand. But such a partition gives pride of place to Time; GWFH has no intention of allowing this.

technique: blurring the distinction between Logical and Chronological succession is crucial for constructing Hegel's elaborate cathedral of thought. But a valuable clue to the structure of Hegel's Philosophy of History can nevertheless be found in the *Science of Logic*. Hegel is explaining why it is difficult to understand the Second Moment:

But formal thinking makes identity its law, and allows the contradictory content before it to sink into the sphere of ordinary conception, into space and time, in which the contradictories are held asunder in juxtaposition and temporal succession and so come before consciousness without reciprocal contact.⁹

Although Hegel is describing the difficulties formal thinking encounters when it confronts the Concept, his words can also be applied to what happens when a "temporal succession" like World-History is conceptualized. In the case of World-History, it is not the fault of "ordinary conception" that the content "sinks...into...time:" *it is the Idea itself that has done so*. The "contradictory content" of the Second Moment, appearing in the Form of Externality (i.e. in Time) can only "come before consciousness" as "held asunder in juxtaposition and temporal succession." Although Hegel is describing the difficulties that arise for *formal* thinking when considering a *Logical* process, the same structural difficulty arises for *conceptual* thinking when contemplating a *Chronological* process. As long as Hegel can treat the Greek and Roman Worlds as *one* from a Logical perspective, i.e. as together constituting the Second Moment, he can "save the phenomena," in this case, the given material of World-History, by acknowledging that these two Worlds are distinct in space and time, as indeed they are, and thus that there are *four* grades of the Spirit's development instead of the anticipated three.

In fact, Hegel lays the foundations for this approach only a few pages after the passage cited above in the *Science of Logic*. He is trying to show that the triadic structure of the Concept is not its essential feature. Having given a canonical definition of the Third Moment ("as self-sublating contradiction this negativity is the *restoration* of the *first immediacy*, of simple universality; for the other of the other, the negative of the negative, is immediately the *positive*, the *identical*, the *universal*"), he adds:

If one insists on *counting*, this *second* immediate is, in the course of the method as a whole, the *third* term to the first immediate and the mediated.¹⁰

⁹ WdL, §1798.

¹⁰ WdL, §1801.

This is simply another way of stating what we have heard before: the Third Moment, as “the negative of the negative,” is the “second immediate” simply because the First Moment was the first. The Second Moment, on the other hand, was mediated by the First. Thus the Third is a return to the immediacy of the First. But there are, says Hegel, other ways of counting:

It is also, however, the third term to the first or formal negative and to absolute negativity or the second negative;¹¹

Hegel intends to show that the Third Moment is also the Fourth. The “first or formal negative” is *the negative other* to the First Moment. Considered as such, it is only *the first half* of the Second Moment. The second half of that Second Moment emerges in the infinite antithesis of the dialectic itself: “the absolute negativity” of Reflection engenders a mirror image *of the merely first and formal negative* and that “second negative” is also logically distinct from the First Moment. Once the moment of antithesis (or “absolute negativity”) arises, *both parts of that dialectic are mediated by each other*. In other words, the dialectical opposite of the first negative is no longer the immediate First Moment, in response to which it arose in the first place, but a new and mediated *second* negative that can only be the other of that first negative. The sentence continues:

...now as the first negative is already the second term, the term reckoned as *third* can also be reckoned as *fourth*, and instead of a *triplicity*, the abstract form may be taken as a quadruplicity; in this way, the negative or the difference is counted as a *duality*.¹²

In other words, when the Second Moment is conceived of as *containing a duality*, there are actually *four* moments in the process and not three. Although Hegel does not link this way of counting to the “formal thinking” that “makes identity its law,” it does introduce a *distinction* where before there was infinite contradiction. It also suggests how a conceptualized Chronological process could easily be presented as a *quadruplicity*.

Unfortunately, Hegel does not choose to explain these matters to us with any clarity when discussing the four-part structure of World-History. He is only willing to state the matter with apodictic certainty:

¹¹ WdL, §1801.

¹² WdL, §1801.

Since it is, as spirit, only the movement of its activity in order to know itself absolutely, to free its consciousness from mere direct naturalness, and to come to itself, as they appear in the process of liberation, are four.¹³

Why Spirit's movement "to free its consciousness from mere direct naturalness" necessarily involve precisely *four* different "principles of the different forms of its self-consciousness" Hegel does not tell us. But he offers a clue. This occurs when he explains why the Nation is the means through which this process is accomplished.

§347. To the nation, whose natural principle is one of these stages, is assigned the accomplishment of it through the process characteristic of the self-developing self-consciousness of the world-spirit. In the history of the world this nation is for a given epoch dominant, although it can make an epoch but once (§346).¹⁴

It would seem that Hegel's motive in saying this is simply to justify the actions of the particular World-Historical Nation while it holds center stage.¹⁵ But two words catch our attention: it is its "*natural principle*" that explains why each of the four Nations constitutes the stages "of the self-developing self-consciousness of the world-spirit." The importance of these words is apparent in the text Hegel cites here (§346).

Since history is the embodiment of spirit in the form of events, that is, of direct natural reality, the stages of development are present as direct natural principles. Because they are natural, they conform to the nature of a multiplicity, and exist one outside the other.¹⁶

While it is only the sentence that comes next that applies to §347,¹⁷ it is this passage that sheds some light on our present problem. Hegel has made it clear that Nations are "direct natural principles." His justification for the claim that History consists of "stages of development" is that it constitutes "the embodiment of spirit" in "direct natural reality." It seems likely that

¹³ *Philosophy of Right*, p. 219; §352.

¹⁴ *Philosophy of Right*, p. 217-8; §347.

¹⁵ In contrast with the absolute right of this nation to be the bearer of the current phase in the development of the world-spirit, the spirits of other existing nations are void of right, and they, like those whose epochs are gone, count no longer in the history of the world.

¹⁶ *Philosophy of Right*, p. 217; §346.

¹⁷ *Philosophy of Right*, p. 217: "Hence, to each nation is to be ascribed a single principle, comprised under its geographical and anthropological existence."

this *natural* setting for a *spiritual* process is analogous to the Chronological and Logical Parallel. *It is only in Nature that the Idea appears in Time.* Because the chronological element in World-History is inescapable, Hegel uses the “natural principle” of the Nation to mediate¹⁸ between timeless Spirit and Nature’s externalized multiplicity dispersed discretely in Time and Space.¹⁹ On this account, it is because a *spiritual* process is being embodied in a *natural* reality that causes the logically simultaneous dialectic of the Second Moment to “exist one outside the other” in chronological succession. To put it another way: it is in accordance with Nature that each of the “natural principles” of the four Nations sees itself as distinct.²⁰ But from a higher Spiritual perspective, neither Nature nor History, existing necessarily in Time, can confer particularity and discreteness to the Nations.

Der denkende Geist der Weltgeschichte aber, indem er zugleich jene Beschränktheiten der besonderen Volksgeister und seine eigene Weltlichkeit abstreift, erfaßt seine konkrete Allgemeinheit und erhebt sich zum *Wissen des absoluten Geistes*, als der ewig wirklichen Wahrheit, in welcher die wissende Vernunft frei für sich ist und die Notwendigkeit, Natur und Geschichte nur seiner Offenbarung dienend und Gefäße seiner Ehre sind.²¹

Only as embodied in a Chronological process do the *Beschränktheiten der besonderen Volksgeister* have any existence: only in Nature, as the domain of Time, and History is there the necessity of *quadruplicity*. But Nature and History merely minister to Spirit’s Revelation: they are only handmaidens. A conceptualized World-History, or rather the *denkende Geist der Weltgeschichte* that actively conceptualizes it, abstracts from the spatio-

¹⁸ As in E §548: “Der bestimmte Volksgeist, da er wirklich und seine Freiheit als Natur ist, hat nach dieser Naturseite das Moment geographischer und klimatischer Bestimmtheit; er ist in der *Zeit* und hat dem Inhalte nach wesentlich ein *besonderes* Prinzip und eine dadurch bestimmte Entwicklung seines Bewußtseins und seiner Wirklichkeit zu durchlaufen;—er hat eine *Geschichte* innerhalb seiner.

¹⁹ See E §552: “Der Volksgeist enthält Naturnotwendigkeit und steht in äußerlichem Dasein (§483); die in sich unendliche sittliche Substanz ist für sich eine besondere und beschränkte (§549 u. 550) und ihre subjektive Seite mit Zufälligkeit behaftet, bewußtlose Sitte, und Bewußtsein ihres Inhaltes als eines zeitlich Vorhandenen und im Verhältnisse gegen eine äußerliche Natur und Welt.”

²⁰ E §552: “Aber es ist der in der Sittlichkeit denkende *Geist*, welcher die Endlichkeit, die er als Volksgeist in seinem Staate und dessen zeitlichen Interessen, dem Systeme der Gesetze und der Sitten hat, in sich aufhebt und sich zum Wissen seiner in seiner Wesentlichkeit erhebt, ein Wissen, das jedoch selbst die immanente Beschränktheit des Volksgeistes hat.”

²¹ E §552. This passage immediately follows the one quoted in the previous note.

temporal limitations of *Weltlichkeit* and thereby achieves *Wissen des absoluten Geistes*. And it is only here that the real Revelation occurs. The real *Offenbarung* is not temporal, as History and Nature necessarily are, but manifests itself in accordance with the Logical Completeness of *Vernunft*: it is the *ewig wirkliche Wahrheit*. And as such it is a Triad. In this way, the universally recognized distinction between Greeks and Romans gains its logical justification.

I.3.3.2. Putting Monarchy Last: Substance as Subject

The East knew and to the present day knows only that *One* is Free; the Greek and Roman world that *some* are free; the German World knows that *All* are free. The first political form therefore which we observe in History, is *Despotism*, the second *Democracy* and *Aristocracy*, the third *Monarchy*.²²

In addition to showing how Hegel collapses, not once but twice,²³ the Greek and Roman Worlds into one, this passage emphasizes an aspect of Hegel's Philosophy of History that his apologists prefer to ignore.²⁴ But unlike the decision to divide his account of World-History into four Nations, Hegel expends some considerable effort—especially in the *Philosophy of Right*—to justifying the placement of Monarchy at the end of the historical process. Although his critics have always enjoyed emphasizing Hegel's monarchist sympathies,²⁵ they seldom bother to explain its philosophical basis. I would like to offer such an explanation here, an explanation that will connect the End of History, Hegel's

²² *Philosophy of History*, p. 104.

²³ For GWFH's emphasis on Rome as Aristocracy, see *Philosophy of Right*, p. 221; §357. "THE ROMAN EMPIRE:—In this empire the distinctions of spirit are carried to the length of an infinite rupture of the ethical life into two extremes, personal private self-consciousness, and abstract universality [Notice that the this description contains within itself the Greek moment of democracy and individuality but locked in conflict with its opposite]. The antagonism, arising between the substantive intuition of an aristocracy and the principle of free personality in democratic form, developed on the side of the aristocracy into superstition and the retention of cold self-seeking power [this analysis is another example of GWFH's Caesarian sympathies], and on the side of the democracy into the corrupt mass."

²⁴ See, for example, Alan PATTEN.

²⁵ Leading the way was an ardent German nationalist: see HAYM, Rudolf, *Hegel und seine Zeit*, Berlin: Rudolf Gärtner, 1857. See also TUNICK, Mark. Hegel's Justification of Hereditary Monarchy, *History of Political Thought*, v. 12, p. 481-496, 1991.

encounter with Napoleon, his criticism of Spinoza, and an immanentist reading of his *Philosophy of History*.

Hegel's defense of Monarchy as the ultimate regime is found in §279 of the *Philosophy of Right*.

But in the next place subjectivity exists in its truth only as a subject, and personality as a person...Hence, the element which implies absolute decision is not individuality in general but one individual, the monarch.²⁶

Clearly it is on the importance of “subjectivity” and “personality” that this defense depends. But §279's contribution is to translate these generalities into one particular person and one distinct subject.²⁷ And this translation is directly related to the Hegelian conception of Freedom: only in the individual person of the monarch can the Spirit reach full self-consciousness.

This real freedom of the idea, since it gives its own present self-conscious reality to every one of the elements of rationality, imparts to the function of consciousness the final self-determining certitude, which in the conception of the will is the keystone. But this final self-determination can fall within the sphere of human liberty only in so far as it is assigned to an independent and separate pinnacle, exalted above all that is particular and conditional.²⁸

It is nevertheless the claims of “personality” and “subjectivity” in general that are fulfilled in Hegel's monarch: the King himself need not be an extraordinary individual. This is indeed the aspect of Hegel's monarch upon which his defenders must rely: the King need only dot the proverbial ‘i.’²⁹ It would appear that there is only room for one extraordinary person in

²⁶ *Philosophy of Right*, p. 181; §279. The deleted sentence refers to the role of the other forms of government in a constitutional monarchy. “In the constitution, which has matured into rational reality, each of the three elements of the conception has its own independent, real, and separate embodiment.”

²⁷ *Zusatz* to §279; *Philosophy of Right*, p. 181-2: “Personality, further, or subjectivity generally, as infinite and self-referring, has truth only as a person or independent subject.”

²⁸ *Zusatz* to §279; *Philosophy of Right*, p. 184.

²⁹ Addition to §280; *Philosophy of Right*, p. 288-9: “It is often maintained that the position of monarch gives to the affairs of state a haphazard character. It is said that the monarch may be ill-educated, and unworthy to stand at the helm of state, and that it is absurd for such a condition of things to exist under the name of reason. It must be replied that the assumption on which these objections proceed is of no value, since there is here no reference to particularity of character. In a completed organization we have to do with nothing but the extreme of formal decision, and

Hegel's System and that is Hegel himself. In fact, his defense of monarchy should be examined not in a political context but in relation to Absolute Knowledge.

Hegel is willing to admit that his argument that "the constitution which has matured into rational reality" must have a hereditary monarch at its head, lest it lack "subjectivity" and "personality," is notably difficult to accept.³⁰ But he can count on the Christian values³¹ of his listeners when he arraigns the Jewish³² Spinoza's Substance for lacking what Hegel's monarchy unquestionably has:

But because for Spinoza, on the other hand, there exists only absolute universal substance as the non-particularized, the truly real—all that is particular and individual, my subjectivity and spirituality, has, on the other hand, as a limited modification whose Notion depends on another, no absolute existence.³³

Nor is it merely "my subjectivity" that *deus sive natura* lacks: Hegel emphasizes that it is "personality" as well.³⁴ When Hegel speaks in general

that for this office is needed only a man who says "Yes," and so puts the dot upon the "i." The pinnacle of state must be such that the private character of its occupant shall be of no significance."

³⁰ *Zusatz* to §279; *Philosophy of Right*, p. 182: "The conception of monarch offers great difficulty to abstract reasonings and to the reflective methods of the understanding."

³¹ LHP, p. 288 (Volume 3): "His [sc. SPINOZA's] philosophy has only a rigid and unyielding substance, and not yet spirit; in it we are not at home with ourselves. But the reason that God is not spirit is that He is not the Three in One."

³² LHP, p. 252 (Volume 3): "The dualism of the Cartesian system Spinoza, as a Jew, altogether set aside. For the profound unity of his philosophy as it found expression in Europe, his manifestation of Spirit as the identity of the finite and infinite in God, instead of God's appearing related to these as a Third—all this is an echo from Eastern lands." It is easy to see why GWFH insists that Substance must be grasped as Subject as well; it is only this—"the Third" as "Christ"—that separates him from "the East." Cf. LHP, p. 258 (Volume 3): "The difference between our standpoint and that of the Eleatic philosophy is only this, that through the agency of Christianity concrete individuality is in the modern world present throughout in spirit." See also LHP, p. 260-1 (Volume 3), especially on "warped and stunted." On GWFH and the Jews, see YOVEL, Yirmiyahu, *Dark Riddle: Hegel, Nietzsche, and the Jews*, University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1998.

³³ LHP, p. 287 (Volume 3).

³⁴ LHP, p. 287 (Volume 3): "Because negation was thus conceived by Spinoza in one-sided fashion merely, there is, in the third place, in his system, an utter blotting out of the principle of subjectivity, individuality, personality, the moment of self-

terms about Spinoza, it is easy to see the clear parallel between his criticisms on the one hand and his defense of the monarchical principle on the other:

True individuality and subjectivity is not a mere retreat from the universal, not merely something clearly determinate; for, as clearly determinate, it is at the same time Being-for-itself, determined by itself alone. The individual, the subjective, is even in being so the return to the universal; and in that it is at home with itself, it is itself the universal. The return consists simply and solely in the fact of the particular being in itself the universal; to this return Spinoza did not attain.³⁵

In fact, the close parallel becomes very obvious when the reader is asked to determine whether the following sentence comes from the Spinoza section of the *Lectures on the History of Philosophy* or from the *Philosophy of Right*: “Personality expresses the conception as such, while person contains also the actuality of the conception. Hence the conception becomes the idea or truth, only when it receives this additional character.”³⁶

Despite Hegel’s criticism of Spinoza, it is obvious that his own thought is a modification of Spinoza rather than a repudiation of it. In fact, his modifications are very simple and can be reckoned as three: (1) he dispenses with the geometrical method, already detached from Spinozism by Jacobi,³⁷ (2) he adds the element of “personality” by insisting that the

consciousness in Being. Thought has only the signification of the universal, not of self-consciousness.”

³⁵ LHP, p. 261 (Volume 3).

³⁶ *Philosophy of Right*, p. 181; §279.

³⁷ For the influence of JACOBI’s *Concerning the Doctrine of Spinoza in Letters to Herr Moses Mendelssohn* on the young GWFH, see PINKARD, Terry, *Hegel: A Biography*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000, p. 30-3. More revealing is RÜHLE, Volker, Jacobi und Hegel; Zum Darstellungs- und Mitteilungsproblem einer Philosophie des Absoluten, *Hegel-Studien* v. 24, p. 159-182, 1989. For the detachment of the geometrical method from SPINOZA, see JACOBI, Friedrich Heinrich, *Concerning the Doctrine of Spinoza in Letters to Herr Moses Mendelssohn* in *The Main Philosophical Writings and the Novel Altwil*, translated by DI GIOVANNI, George, Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 1994. For GWFH on SPINOZA’s geometrical method, see the following from LHP, p. 263-4 (Volume 3): “The whole of Spinoza’s philosophy is contained in these definitions, which, however, taken as a whole are formal; it is really a weak point in Spinoza that he begins thus with definitions. In mathematics this method is permitted, because at the outset we there make assumptions, such as that of the point and line; but in Philosophy the content should be known as the absolutely true. It is all very well to grant the correctness of the name-definition, and acknowledge that the word “substance” corresponds with the conception which the

True must be expressed “not only as *Substance*, but equally as *Subject*”³⁸ and (3) he substitutes a “Three in One” element for Spinoza’s resolved dualism of thought and extension, *deus sive natura*.³⁹ Nor does Hegel conceal the fact that Spinozism is a moment in, and the inevitable origin of, his own thought.⁴⁰

Hegel’s first presentation of his Philosophy of History, his first presentation of his History of Philosophy as well, is found in a single

definition indicates, but it is quite another question to determine whether this content is absolutely true. Such a question is not asked in the case of geometrical propositions, but in philosophic investigation it is the very thing to be first considered, and this Spinoza has not done.”

³⁸ PhG, p. 10. GWFH’s Spinozism is clearly proved by this passage’s context. “Es kömmt nach meiner Einsicht, welche sich durch die Darstellung des Systems selbst rechtfertigen muß, alles darauf an, das Wahre nicht als *Substanz*, sondern ebensosehr als *Subjekt* aufzufassen und auszudrücken. Zugleich ist zu bemerken, daß die Substantialität [as conceived by SPINOZA] sosehr das Allgemeine oder die *Unmittelbarkeit des Wissens* [Substance as “Thought”] als diejenige, welche *Sein* oder *Unmittelbarkeit für das Wissen* ist [Substance as “Extension”], in sich schließt.—Wenn, Gott als die *eine* Substanz zu fassen [according to Spinoza], das Zeitalter empörte [the traditional charge that Spinozism was Atheism], worin diese Bestimmung ausgesprochen wurde, so lag teils der Grund hievon [GWFH introduces his objection to SPINOZA] in dem Instinkte, daß darin das Selbstbewußtsein nur untergegangen, nicht erhalten ist, [i.e. Spinoza’s Substance does not give due regard to (my) self-conscious Subjectivity] teils aber ist das Gegenteil [GWFH is about to reject the pure Idealism of Subjectivity as well], welches das Denken als Denken festhält, die *Allgemeinheit*, dieselbe Einfachheit oder ununterschiedne, unbewegte Substantialität [i.e. Subjectivity alone becomes SPINOZA’s Substance] und wenn drittens [as in FICHTE] das Denken das Sein der Substanz als solche mit sich vereint [a unity of which GWFH approves] und die Unmittelbarkeit oder das Anschauen als Denken erfaßt, so kömmt es noch darauf an, ob dieses intellektuelle Anschauen nicht wieder in die träge Einfachheit zurückfällt [i.e. Subjectivity remains disconnected from Substance], und die Wirklichkeit selbst auf eine unwirkliche Weise darstellt.” There is something to be said for the view that GWFH regarded this disconnection as the basis of Time; see I.2.2.1.

³⁹ GWFH makes it clear at LHP, p. 288 (Volume 3) that he is synthesizing Jakob BOEHME and SPINOZA on this point. “But the reason that God is not spirit is that He is not the Three in One. Substance remains rigid and petrified, without Boehme’s sources or springs; for the individual determinations in the form of determinations of the understanding are not Boehme’s originating spirits, which energize and expand in one another (*supra*, pp. 202, 203).”

⁴⁰ LHP, p. 257 (Volume 3): “It is therefore worthy of note that thought must begin by placing itself at the standpoint of Spinozism; to be a follower of Spinoza is the essential commencement of all Philosophy.”

stunning paragraph in the last chapter of the *Phenomenology*.⁴¹ Without using any proper names, Hegel causes the Middle Ages, the Crusades, Luther, Descartes, Spinoza,⁴² Leibniz, Kant, Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel himself, to pass before our dazzled inner eye.⁴³ Hegel is present in three ways: as narrator, as part of the chronological procession, and finally, as the whole of the process.⁴⁴ This amazing procession is not something external to himself: it is just as immanent within him as the entire *Phenomenology* has been.⁴⁵ And he can only describe this immanence in

⁴¹ The paragraph (PhG §803) that begins: “Die Bewegung, die Form seines Wissens von sich hervorzutreiben, ist die Arbeit, die er als *wirkliche Geschichte* vollbringt.”

⁴² “Indem es so zunächst die unmittelbare *Einheit* des *Denkens* und *Seins*, des abstrakten Wesens und des Selbsts, selbst abstrakt ausgesprochen und das erste Lichtwesen *reiner*, nämlich als Einheit der Ausdehnung und des Seins—denn Ausdehnung ist die dem reinen Denken gleichere Einfachheit, denn das Licht ist—und hiemit im Gedanken die *Substanz* des Aufgangs wieder erweckt hat, schaudert der Geist zugleich von dieser abstrakten Einheit, von dieser *selbstlosen* Substantialität zurück, und behauptet die Individualität gegen sie.” It will be seen that SPINOZA constitutes the moment of extreme negativity where Subjectivity is concerned: his substance annihilates the Self. In this sense, SPINOZA remains a characteristically *Jewish* thinker with respect to a proto-Nazi *Selbstvergottung*; see the Appendix to Chapter 1 in ALTMAN, William, *The German Stranger: Leo Strauss and National Socialism*. Lanham: Lexington Books, 2010.

⁴³ J.N. FINDLEY mentions most of these in his commentary on p. 591 of the Miller translation of PhG.

⁴⁴ GWFH describes his own achievement as building on KANT’s insights about Time. But he describes that achievement in comparison with SPINOZA’s: “...so daß wie vorhin das Wesen als Einheit des Denkens und der Ausdehnung ausgesprochen wurde [SPINOZA’s achievement], es als Einheit des Denkens und der Zeit zu fassen wäre [this is GWFH’s achievement: the Logical and Chronological Parallel]; aber der sich selbst überlaßne Unterschied [this too is GWFH’s insight: Time is merely the manifestation of Nature’s *difference* from Spirit], die ruhe- und haltlose Zeit fällt vielmehr in sich selbst zusammen [Kant’s discovery of the unreality of Time was a great breakthrough but needed to be completed]; sie ist die gegenständliche Ruhe der *Ausdehnung* [GWFH celebrates his derivation of Time from (Extension’s) Space; the process so well described by HEIDEGGER] diese aber ist die reine Gleichheit mit sich selbst, das Ich [apparently what GWFH means is that when Time collapses, the chronological process of World-History as Substance can become immanent in the I as Subject].”

⁴⁵ “...die Substanz hat, als Subjekt [GWFH himself], *die erst innere* Notwendigkeit an ihr, sich an ihr selbst als das darzustellen, was sie *an sich* ist, *als Geist* [a duty GWFH has now discharged by writing the PhG: the (subjective) path from Subject to Substance]. Die vollendete gegenständliche Darstellung [but the PhG is not complete until the (objective) path from Substance to Subject has been traversed as well] ist erst zugleich die Reflexion derselben oder das Werden derselben zum Selbst [in fact, as PhG §803 will show, the two paths are mirror images of each

terms of Spinoza's Substance: indeed the paragraph chronicles the process by which Substance achieves the apparently Christian Subjectivity of Self.⁴⁶ Substance and Subject must be united in self-consciousness: by the time the paragraph has ended, Hegel can proclaim that each has passed over into the other.⁴⁷

With this kind of procession passing through his own consciousness, it is little wonder that the appearance of Napoleon in Jena in October 1806, just as he was finishing the *Phenomenology*, made such a deep impression on the thirty-six year old Hegel. It was comparatively easy for the penniless philosopher to recognize "the World-Spirit on horseback."⁴⁸ But it was hardly more difficult for Hegel, who had just completed one of the most innovative and brilliant books ever written, to see Napoleon as merely an unself-conscious reflection of himself. Nor was he without objective grounds for seeing things this way. As the future proved, the stunning reversal of Prussia's humiliation at Jena just nine years later at Waterloo coincided with Hegel's own emergence into prominence as the foremost philosopher of his day and Prussia's most brilliant defender. Hegel is,

other].—Eh daher der Geist nicht *an sich*, nicht als Weltgeist sich vollendet, kann er nicht als *selbstbewußter* Geist seine Vollendung erreichen [only as *Weltgeist* can GWFH bring his book to an end: *Absolute Wissen* requires both paths.]” It will be seen that GWFH achieves Chronological Completeness with the PhG. Nor did he ever subsequently doubt that he had done so.

⁴⁶ The completion of this process is announced in the following sentence: “Oder Ich ist nicht nur das Selbst, sondern es ist die *Gleichheit des Selbsts mit sich*; diese Gleichheit aber ist die vollkommene und unmittelbare Einheit mit sich selbst, oder *dies Subjekt* ist ebensowohl *die Substanz*.” The important role GWFH has played in this process is indicated by the sentence that precedes this one in the text.

⁴⁷ PhG, §804: “Der Geist aber hat sich uns gezeigt, weder nur das Zurückziehen des Selbstbewußtseins in seine reine Innerlichkeit zu sein [as in FICHTE's Idealism], noch die bloße Versenkung desselben in die Substanz und das Nichtsein seines Unterschiedes [as in SPINOZA], sondern *diese* [doubled] *Bewegung* des Selbsts, das sich seiner selbst entäußert und sich in seine Substanz versenkt [externalized in Time, Nature, and History], und ebenso als Subjekt aus ihr in sich gegangen ist [i.e. it returns out of this *Versenkung*], und sie zum Gegenstände und Inhalte macht [Spirit achieves self-consciousness by this return], als es diesen Unterschied der Gegenständlichkeit und des Inhalts aufhebt [the Substance is no longer external but merely a Reflection of the Subject, as the Subject likewise is of Substance].”

⁴⁸ “This morning I saw the Emperor [Napoleon]—this world-soul (*diese Weltseele*)—ride through town . . . It is a marvelous feeling to see such a personality, concentrated in one point, dominating the entire world from horseback . . . It is impossible not to admire him” (Hegel to Niethammer, 13 Oct 1806). BUTLER, Clark and SEILER, Christiane, *Hegel: The Letters*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984.

moreover, the last Professor of Philosophy whose claim to being one of History's greatest thinkers is undisputed. He remains the Napoleon of Philosophy: he had made the whole of it his own.

It is much easier to dismiss Hegel's bizarre notion of the End of History than to explain why it is a plausible view. But to Hegel's credit, it must be acknowledged that he lived in a period of crisis that proved remarkably hospitable to great or rather stunning achievements. In defense of Hegel, one might ask whether there has yet arisen a greater musician than Beethoven, likewise born in 1770?⁴⁹ The early successes and ultimate failure of the French Revolution arguably remain the most important events of Modern Times. For all his substantial achievements, Bonaparte (born 1769) was a towering colossus of unpredictable Subjectivity; how could any of Hegel's contemporaries deny its intoxicating claims? Hegel had been fifteen when the *Pantheismusstreit* over Lessing's Spinozism rocked the German intellectual world and changed it forever. The fact that Schelling and Hölderlin were Hegel's roommates,⁵⁰ both towering geniuses in their own right with whom he endlessly discussed the Greeks, Nature, and the *εν και παν*, would make anybody, even a person without Hegel's intellectual gifts and energetic tenacity, feel rather special. He could boast a personal relationship with Goethe and was able to meet Kant as an equal, making the latter's static Categories dance to the dialectic's tune. Above all, there are his books and the beautiful thoughts they contain to be considered. Where had there ever been such insight into the Past? When had there ever been seen such a towering and all-embracing intellect? The great compliment he pays to the equally comprehensive Aristotle by concluding his *Encyclopedia* with a quotation from the *Metaphysics* (§577) is made in the complete confidence of his own evident superiority. He accomplished something stupendous and knew perfectly well that he had done so.

It is noteworthy that Hegel repeatedly emphasizes the *unconsciousness* of even the greatest individuals in World-History. Unlike Hegel, they *don't* know what they are doing.

⁴⁹ One might consider for comparison the remarks of the fictional pianist Kretschmar about BEETHOVEN and "the end of the Sonata" in MANN, Thomas, *Doktor Faustus*.

⁵⁰ BAUM, Manfred, *Metaphysischer Monismus bei Hölderlin und Hegel*, *Hegel-Studien* vol. 28, pp. 81-102, 1993 and HENRICH, Dieter, *Between Kant and Hegel: Lectures on German Idealism*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993 are particularly insightful, not least of all because both emphasize the crucial role of F.H. JACOBI, who brought on the *Pantheismusstreit*.

348. At the summit of all actions, including world-historical actions, stand individuals. Each of these individuals is a subjectivity who realizes what is substantive (§279, *note*). He is a living embodiment of the substantive deed of the world-spirit, and is, therefore, directly identical with this deed. It is concealed even from himself, and is not his object and end (§344). Thus they do not receive honour and thanks for their acts either from their contemporaries (§344), or from the public opinion of posterity. By this opinion they are viewed merely as formal subjectivities, and, as such, are simply given their part in immortal fame.⁵¹

Except insofar as he knew better than to expect “honor and thanks” either from contemporaries or “the public opinion of posterity,” this description hardly applies to Hegel. But the statements he makes here don’t refute the notion that he is a “world-historical” individual; they confirm it. He excels those he describes and could only describe them as he does because he knows it. It is Hegel who had *consciously*, as we saw in the last Chapter of the *Phenomenology*, shown himself to be “a subjectivity who realizes what is substantive.” In paragraph §344 of the *Philosophy of Right*, twice cited in the passage above, he offers a clue as to the chief difference between himself and Napoleon: “Yet are they the unconscious tools and organs of the world-spirit, *through whose inner activity the lower forms pass away.*”⁵² Napoleon had destroyed the Holy Roman Empire; in Hegel’s *Lectures on the Philosophy of History*, the Past is preserved in its entirety. The Greeks have not passed away: no friend of Hölderlin could have possibly thought that. But Hegel has not only relived the Greeks. It has all been preserved in him, through his agency and as the self-conscious realization of “what is substantive.”

Nor could it have been very different: it is only through the individual Subject that a self-conscious unity with Substance can be achieved. No less than a worldly Kingdom does the Kingdom of the Spirit needs a King. Hegel’s personal achievement of Absolute Knowing is needed to complete the edifice but what he accomplished is closer to dotting an ‘i’ than most would think. Be that as it may, Hegel rivals Napoleon and Caesar and excels them both. Both Napoleon and Caesar have crossed into Germany from the West and therefore unconsciously prepared Hegel’s way. Hegel consciously returns the favor: he alone can *explain* what they have done. It is the German World—in the person of Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel—that has realized the unity of Substance and Subject. He is a mighty conqueror in the realm of the Spirit. No one has a better claim to realizing Nietzsche’s ideal: it was Hegel who had already been “the Roman Caesar

⁵¹ *Philosophy of Right*, p. 218; §348.

⁵² *Philosophy of Right*, p. 217; §344 (emphasis mine).

with Christ's soul."⁵³ It is in Hegel's ingenious System that an immanent Trinity informs a domain of limitless extent: it is no longer only Gaul that has been divided into three parts. But his is no merely external conquest; he has absorbed everything he could learn about the World and found thereby that it was always already immanent in him. Substance can only become conscious of itself through the agency of Subject. It has done so through "Hegel."

⁵³ NIETZSCHE, Friedrich. *The Will to Power*. Translated by Walter Kaufmann and R.J. Hollingdale. New York: Vintage, 1968, §983.

Part II. Introduction

With the analysis of Hegel's Philosophy of History now in place, it becomes a much easier matter to reveal its scandalous aspects; indeed, they are already implicit in the foregoing analysis. But it was impossible to begin with the simpler matter: the order of the two parts could not have been reversed. It is far more difficult—and therefore requires more effort and pages—to explain and defend Hegel's conception of Time than to attack it. Part II will therefore be considerably shorter than Part I. Despite its comparative brevity, however, it will duplicate the structure of Part I even if this results in short sections and miniscule chapters. Central to the organization of Part II is the distinction between Right and Left Hegelianism,¹ a distinction that grows directly out of what I have called "The Problem of Time in Hegel's Philosophy of History." I would like to suggest that both schools were "one-sided moments" in Hegel's sense; neither adequately captured the truth about Hegel.² The Right Hegelians correctly perceived that there was no place for the future in Hegel's thought but could only succeed in making Hegel look foolish or old-fashioned as a result.³ The Left Hegelians correctly perceived that if there were to be an End of History, it would occur in the future; their error was to imagine that Hegel had shared this attractive point of view and thus they radically distorted his intentions.⁴ The inadequacy of both Right (II.2) and Left Hegelianism (II.3) is therefore rooted in Hegel himself and his inevitable failure to solve the problem of Time (II.1).

¹ AVINERI, Shlomo, Hegel Revisited in Alasdair MacIntyre ed., *Hegel: A Collection of Critical Essays*, p. 329-348. New York: Doubleday, 1972.

² BURBIDGE, John, Where is the Place of Understanding in George di Giovanni ed., *Essays on Hegel's Logic*, p. 171-182. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1990; p. 178: "Neither the right-wing, nor the left-wing interpretation of Hegel is right."

³ See PARKINSON, G.H.R. Hegel's Concept of Freedom in Michael Inwood, *Hegel*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985; p. 173, last paragraph.

⁴ The second half of this sentence applies only to "Hegel scholars" of Left Hegelian orientation; the first applies to "the Young Hegelians," many of whom were in open revolt against GWFH. The former category deserves serious scholarly attention. For the latter, see LÖWITH, Karl, *Einleitung to Die Hegelsche Linke*, Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Friedrich Frommann, pp. 7-38, 1962.

Part II. Section 1. (II.1) The Scandal of Time

The title of this section is misleading because Hegel's scandalous views about Time are inseparable from what makes his thought scandalous in general. To that extent, this section could also have been called "The Scandal of Absolute Knowledge" or "The Scandal of Philosophy." But the purpose of Part II is to show why Hegel's confusion of Logical and Chronological Priority, and therefore Logical and Chronological Completeness, is the Achilles heel of his philosophy, i.e. that which inevitably renders Hegelian philosophy scandalous as a whole. Before considering two scandalous *symptoms* of "The Problem of Time in Hegel's Philosophy of History"—the well-known difficulty Hegel encounters when beginning each his books (Chapter 8; II.1.1) and the seldom noticed but *almost* perfectly pervasive equivocation on the crucial word "moment" (Chapter 9; II.1.2)—a few general remarks are in order.

The true shape in which truth exists can only be the scientific system of such truth. To help bring philosophy closer to the form of Science, to the goal where it can set aside the title 'love of knowing' and be *actual* knowing—that is what I have set myself to do.⁵

This passage indicates what might have been called "The Scandal of Philosophy." The scandal of the End of History, mediated by what I have called "Chronological Completeness," follows from what Hegel here calls "the form of Science" in Absolute Knowledge: i.e. what I have called "Logical Completeness." Just as true Time does not end in the Present, so also does philosophy in the traditional sense—i.e. "the love of wisdom"—necessarily and eternally search outside or beyond its limits. Hope, *Wanderlust*, and yearning are all predicated on the beyond: on that which is outside of us whether in a temporal, spatial, or spiritual sense. *Such openness to the beyond is human but it is not Hegelian.* This sentence gestures towards the scandalous essence of Hegel's achievement; although I have concentrated on the suppression of one particular kind of "beyond," i.e. the Future of tick-tock Time's "spurious infinite," it is a pervasive hostility to any *jenseits* that is determinative and characteristic of Hegelian thought.⁶

⁵ PhG (Miller), p. 3; HW 3.13.

⁶ SCHULZ, Walter, Hegel und das Problem der Aufhebung der Metaphysik in Günther NESKE (ed.), *Martin Heidegger zum siebzigsten Geburtstag*, Pfullingen: Neske, 1959, pp. 67-92, at p. 68: "Hegels eigene Metaphysik ist Aufhebung der

The choice of “The Scandal of Time” is not entirely arbitrary, however. The skeptical can doubt that there exists any true wisdom while the ultimate scandal in Hegel’s thought, i.e. the substitution of Hegel’s “Absolute Knowledge” for God,⁷ is hardly accessible or persuasive in the anti-theological intellectual climate that has been dominant since the First World War. “Time” is a far better place to reveal the scandal of Hegel’s thought because no matter what we may privately think about “God” or “wisdom,” we all believe in tick-tock time and bear its shackles on our wrists.⁸ We take Time for granted, as a constitutive part of human existence, as indeed it is. The central irony in Hegel’s thought is that although both his “Philosophy of History” and his “History of Philosophy” pioneered our ability to make events in time the legitimate objects of philosophical inquiry, he himself did not take Time for granted and indeed could not have done so. The archeology presented in Part I has had the goal of explaining how such a strange thing is possible, i.e. how he could have achieved such an amazing but scandalous result.

The “Scandal of Time” is therefore merely the most accessible remnant of what makes Hegel’s thought truly scandalous in a theological sense: his repudiation or rather appropriation of God’s Wisdom. In fact, it is no mere remnant: in the traditional view, Wisdom is timeless and God dwells in eternity. Hegel secularizes these concepts: there is no Time in Hegel’s system because there had never been any Time in God’s eternal Wisdom. Hegel’s “philosophy” stands at a moment of theological transition that we post-Hegelians can only recover with considerable archeological effort: we have forgotten how hostile traditional philosophy had always

Metaphysik des Jenseits in eine Metaphysik, die den Gegensatz von Jenseits und Diesseits überhaupt und als solchen zu negieren sucht.”

⁷ As far as *atheism* is concerned, it is necessary to distinguish between the denial of God’s existence—although I deny their claims, with mere *atheists* I have no quarrel—and “a decidedly non-theistic vindication of God.” For the latter, see STRAUSS, Leo, Note on the Plan of Nietzsche’s Beyond Good and Evil in *Studies in Platonic Political Philosophy*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 174-191, 1983, at p. 181. STRAUSS’s NIETZSCHE is not objectionable *qua* atheist but rather insofar as he “makes atheism religious.”

⁸ Even McTAGGART, J. Ellis, The Unreality of Time, *Mind* (n.s.), vol. 17, n. 68 (Oct., 1908), pp. 457-474, 1908 does not undertake to prove the non-existence of change or indeed of discrete moments. For the theological connections, cf. GEACH, Peter, Cambridge Philosophers III: McTaggart. *Philosophy*, vol. 70, n. 274, pp. 567-579, 1995. p. 572: “As I indicated, disbelief in the reality of time reinforced McTaggart’s inherited atheism. Traditional Jewish or Christian or Muslim theism treats of an eternal God who created and providentially controls a changeable world; any such theism must be rejected if time is a delusion. For loss of belief in God, McTaggart thinks, we need not mourn.”

been to Time. *This hostility was based on God.* Hegel doesn't simply ignore or reject God as so many philosophers after him have done with a clean conscience; he does something infinitely more impious: he usurps the place, or rather the *eternal perspective*, of God.⁹ This, then, is the primordial scandal in Hegelian thought although the fact that he presents his philosophy in Trinitarian terms is the scandal that would make a pious Christian tremble for the sake of his immortal soul.¹⁰

Trembling, of course, is foreign to Hegel's project because one only trembles in the face of what is beyond one's knowledge. *There is no such entity in Hegel's system.* This is why the first passage I analyzed in the Introduction was about the stars. If Hegel cannot rationalize the configuration of Kant's "the starry heavens above me," then there is eternally no rational order to be sought there. The possibility that our knowledge might expand in the future, that we could come to know more about the stars and the mysteries of Outer Space, these interrelated possibilities are antithetical to Hegel's project: the nature of boundless space is as irrational as the infinite time mankind could devote to plumbing its secrets. In short, "The Scandal of Time" was therefore already implicit in Hegel's astronomy. The "epistemological humility" intrinsic to philosophy *qua* "love of wisdom" is merely the subjective correlate of "Astronomy's Epistemological Future;" neither can find a place within the closed circle of Hegelian science.

⁹ The contrast between GWFH and e.g. McTAGGART should be noted. Notice that the place of Time in KANT's Transcendental Aesthetic cannot be separated from a critique of pure reason that makes room for the noumenal *Ding an sich*.

¹⁰ For a noteworthy attempt to present GWFH as a Christian, see KÜNG, Hans, *The Incarnation of God: An Introduction to Hegel's Theological Thought as a Prolegomena to a Future Christology*. Translated by J.R. Stephenson. New York: Crossroad, 1987; especially at p. 409: "Was not Hegel (if we look, not at his system, but at himself as a man) marked by a pathos to know the real God? On his long toilsome way from Stuttgart to Tübingen to Bern, Frankfurt and Jena, and from there via Bamberg, Nuremberg and Heidelberg to Berlin, did he not wage an impressively truthful struggle through an orthodoxy gone rigid on the one side and the Enlightenment and Kantian moralism on the other, pressing forward to a deeper understanding of Christianity, going from an Enlightenment-style to a speculative religiosity, and hence from a rejection of Jesus through a more detached indifference to a thinking affirmation of Jesus Christ?" In addition to answering these two questions with "No," I note the parenthesis in the first: it is "Hegel" that KÜNG presents as a Christian, *not Hegel*.

Chapter 8. (II.1.1) Beginning with the End

The reason that Hegel has difficulty beginning his books is that the only justification for the place he must begin is always found at the end, i.e. in “Absolute Knowledge.” It is only in the context of Logical Completeness, in relation to the Concept, that Hegelian science becomes possible. But science cannot be presented as that which “becomes” in the present or emerges, for example, from Hegel’s own intention to supersede “the love of wisdom.” Science *is* the truth and the true *is* the whole. Constitutive of Hegel’s conceptualization of Science is the pervasive claim that the Concept is logically prior to its moments. Although its moments must be presented first as a matter of exposition and the Concept introduced as if it synthesized the moments presented beforehand, the truth is entirely different: the moments are derived from the Concept. In other words: the Chronological Priority given to any Concept’s moments is merely an unfortunate matter of *exposition*, i.e. the way in which Science must be presented or exposed to the public.¹¹

Consider how the paragraph from *Phenomenology of Spirit* about superseding “the love of wisdom” quoted in the Introduction to this section continues:

The inner necessity that knowing should be Science lies in its nature, and only the systematic exposition of philosophy itself provides it... To show that now is the time for philosophy to be raised to the status of a Science would therefore be the only true justification of any effort that has this aim, for to do so would demonstrate the necessity of the aim, would indeed at the same time [*zugleich*] be the accomplishing of it.¹²

If Hegel began honestly, i.e. with his *intent* to give an account of the whole, he would be required to begin with *what is first for us*, in this case, with an account of the Present that would “show that now is the time for philosophy to be raised to the status of a Science.”¹³ But to begin with his intent would be to admit that he is merely “Hegel” and that his viewpoint is purely subjective; to address the needs of the present would be to grant something other than his philosophical system—in this case, a set of political, social, and philosophical conditions prevailing at the Present—

¹¹ The problem receives special treatment in FULDA, Hans Friedrich, *Das Problem einer Einleitung in Hegels Wissenschaft der Logik* (2nd edition), Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1975.

¹² PhG (Miller), p. 4-5; HW 3.13.

¹³ The relevant data for such an account can be found in *Differenzschrift* and *Glauben und Wissen*.

objective reality.¹⁴ *Science requires that he must rather derive both present conditions and his own intent with respect to philosophy from the scientific result reached at the end of the process.*

This approach is the inevitable but scandalous result of Hegel's solution to "The Problem of Time." There is no Time in the Concept.¹⁵ It is only as a matter of exposition that its moments appear to be logically prior to the Concept; the fact that exposition requires that they be granted Chronological Priority must not confuse us as to the Concept's Logical Priority. Nor can we imagine the "moments" derived from the Concept in a logical sense to be constitutive elements out of which the Concept emerges in a chronological sense. Hegel makes a rare slip in the youthful *Phenomenology* when he writes that the necessity underlying his intent and "the justification of any effort that has this aim" would occur *zugleich* (i.e. "at the same time"); intent and fulfillment may be *logically* simultaneous but it is a scandal to assert that they are simultaneous in a chronological sense as well. But this slip is characteristic of Hegel's application of the Logical/Chronological Parallel: the imposition of Logical Completeness on a chronological process and the scandalous suppression of Time.

¹⁴ While it is true that neophytes read the history of philosophy from the point of view of their own present concerns—and tend to find their own conceptions mirrored in the great thinkers of the past—a thorough philosophical education requires the subordination of our own perspective to that of the author or, at the very least, it requires the *will* to this subordination. A *proof* that this subordination is impossible will not be forthcoming since its existence would refute that which it purported to prove.

¹⁵ For a recent exposition of KOJÉVE on this point, see NICHOLS, James H. Jr., *Alexander Kojève: Wisdom at the End of History*, Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2007, pp. 34-8.

Chapter 9 (II.1.2) The Hegelian Moment

II.1.2.1. A Momentary Lapse

But this slip is mild compared to the far more serious error that Hegel makes in the sentence deleted in the previous passage from the *Phenomenology*:

The inner necessity that knowing should be Science lies in its nature, and only the systematic exposition of philosophy itself provides it. But the *external* necessity, so far as it is grasped in a general way, setting aside accidental matters of person and motivation, is the same as the inner, or in other words it lies in the shape in which time sets forth the sequential existence of its moments [*wie die Zeit das Dasein ihrer Momente vorstellt*]. To show that now...¹⁶

Hegel's *intent* is to prevent any separation between his intent and its fulfillment: the former will be justified "at the same time" as its accomplishment. To that end, the internal necessity that will determine throughout the various steps to be described in "The Phenomenology of Spirit" is logically inseparable from the intent and ability of Hegel, i.e. the pure philosophical residue of "Hegel" after "setting aside accidental matters of person and motivation," to present them as such.

The scandal is that this is the only passage in Hegel's mature writings where the word "moment" is applied to Time. Never again would Hegel be so foolish as to reveal his awareness there could be no logical "moment" in his sense (*das Moment*) if there was not always already *der Moment*.

II.1.2.2. Borsche's History of *das Moment*

In a few brilliantly conceived pages from an article in the *Historisches Wörterbuch der Philosophie* devoted to "Moment," Tilman Borsche makes a great contribution to the proper understanding of Hegel.¹⁷ Beginning with the distinction between *der Moment* and *das Moment* (p. 100), he divides his treatment of the modern use of *Moment* in into three parts: "The Metaphysical Moment" (p. 100-1), "The Timeless Moment" (p. 101-2), and most importantly for the understanding of Hegel, "The Logical Moment." Although his comments on Cusanus (p. 101), Leibniz (p. 100, 101-2), and

¹⁶ PhG (Miller), p. 3; HW 3.13.

¹⁷ BORSCHÉ, Tilman, "Moment" in *Historisches Wörterbuch der Philosophie*, edited by Joachim Ritter and Karlfried Gründer, Basel / Stuttgart: Schwabe & Co, 1984, volume 6, pp. 100-108 (hereafter "BORSCHÉ"). In the section that follows, I will cite this article in the text by parenthetical page numbers.

Descartes are important,¹⁸ attention here will be confined to three key figures in the third section: Kant, Schelling, and Hegel.

II.1.2.2.1. Kant

No serious student of Hegel will be surprised to discover that the most important precedent for his use of *das Moment* in a logical sense is found in Kant. After mentioning that Kant, while discussing physics, uses *das Moment* as a translation for the Latin *momentum*, Borsche adds (p. 102): “*Folglich ist (der oder das) M. in zeitlicher Bedeutung kaum zu finden.*” Particularly since he notes an exception, it is interesting that he uses the word “folglich” here; this suggests a zero-sum conflict between a timeless (*zeitlos*) or timely (*zeitlich*) use of the term. Borsche then proceeds to the main point:

Daneben aber gewinnt das Wort in der *Kritik der reinen Vernunft* eine neue, auf Hegel vorausweisende Bedeutung. Dort werden die logischen Funktionen des Verstandes in Urteilen in zwölf «M.» gegliedert.¹⁹

Having revealed this important fact, Borsche next makes an important observation about Kant’s usage:

An diesem Sprachgebrauch wird deutlich, daß unter M. unselbständige Entitäten zu verstehen sind, die aus der Zergliederung einer Einheit, in bezug auf welche allein sie Bedeutung haben, hervorgehen. Folglich sind sie von Teilen, aus denen ein Ganzes zusammengesetzt ist, streng zu unterscheiden.²⁰

Once again, Borsche suggests a zero-sum antithesis: one can conceive of moments either as parts out of which a whole will be constructed or as the parts that always already presuppose the whole. One wonders if these two cases of either/or are linked: certainly the paradox of the temporal use of “moment” is that time itself must be composed or built up from an infinite number of constitutive “moments” that are, considered individually, timeless. In any case, Borsche draws the important conclusion:

¹⁸ Given the relationship between GWFH’s first use of *das Moment* in the context of “Good Friday” (see my “Preface”) and the central purpose behind SCHELLING’s use of the term (see II.1.2.2.2.) it is interesting that LEIBNIZ used “moment” while grappling with the problem of Cartesian dualism: “*omne enim corpus est mens momentanea, seu carens recordatione.*” For the citation and context, see BORSCHKE, p. 102 and 102 n. 10.

¹⁹ BORSCHKE, p. 103.

²⁰ BORSCHKE, p. 103.

Bei Kant bleibt dieser logische Gebrauch des Terminus «M.» auf die Sphäre der Urteile beschränkt. Hegel wird ihn universalieren, indem er, kurz gesagt, alles Begreifliche als ein M. der absoluten Idee bestimmt.²¹

Kant therefore constitutes what might be called “the first moment” of both the *Entstehungsgeschichte* of Hegel’s characteristic use of the word *das Moment* and its Hegelian *Begriff*. Naturally, I do not regard the fact that it is both of these things at the same time (*zugleich*) as accidental.

II.1.2.2.2. Schelling

“*Nach Schelling’s Ansicht aus der Zeit um 1800 ist es «die einzige Aufgabe der Wissenschaft...die Materie zu konstruieren».*²² The only appropriate comment on this scandalous project is that it actually was unavoidable for German Idealism.²³ To a considerable extent, the actual existence of tick-tock time is inseparable from the actual existence of the material world: take away the latter, and the former will disappear *zugleich*. In any case, Borsche documents Schelling’s use of “moment” in relation to three different triads, all connected with what he called “science’s only task.” Since the material world exists in three dimensions, Schelling assigns *their* construction to three scientific processes, each of which he calls “a moment.”²⁴ Borsche wisely refuses to explain the details of this construction but quotes a text requisite for showing that, for Schelling, it

²¹ BORSCHÉ, p. 103. But consider also: “Trotz dieser unauffälligen Entstehung läßt sich der Ursprungsort der neuen Bedeutung bei Hegel recht genau bestimmen, dagegen sind ihre Quellen nur vermutungsweise zu eruieren.”

²² BORSCHÉ, p. 103; the citation is found at 104 n. 1.

²³ See WINFIELD, Richard Dien, Space, Time and Matter: Conceiving Nature Without Foundations in HOULGATE, Stephen (ed.), *Hegel and the Philosophy of Nature*, Albany: State University of New York Press, 1998, pp. 51-69 (hereafter “WINFIELD, Space, Time and Matter”), for the implications of this project for GWFH (p. 62): “To avoid a similar vicious circularity, matter must be constituted without any material factors. Consequently, the very ideality and formality of space, time, place and formal motion qualify them as resources in nature that can serve to account for matter.”

²⁴ BORSCHÉ, p. 103: “Die erste Entwurf zur Lösung dieser Aufgabe findet sich im *System des transzendentalen Idealismus*, nach ihm müssen «in der Konstruktion der Materie drei M. unterschieden werden.» Diese drei M. der Konstruktion werden in der Natur durch deren drei Grundkräfte repräsentiert (Magnetismus, Electricität, chemische Prozeß), die sich damit auch als «die allgemeinen Kategorien der Physik» erweisen und zugleich die drei Dimensionen der Materie (Länge, Breite, Dicke) hervorbringen.” It is doubtless a necessary feature of this “construction” that the derivation of one triad from the other be *zugleich*.

must not be understood as taking place “in time.”²⁵ In accordance with his Transcendental Idealism, it ultimately becomes necessary for Schelling to derive Nature from self-consciousness,²⁶ and the word “moment” is also instrumental for making this amazing transition.²⁷ Borsche comments:

Von hier aus nun wird die Wahl des Ausdrucks «M.» verständlich. Da das *System* ein Versuch ist, wie der Autor in der Vorrede sagt, «die gesammte Philosophie als das, was sie ist, nämlich als fortgehende Geschichte des Selbstbewußtseyns» vorzutragen, kommt es «hauptsächlich darauf an, die einzelnen Epochen derselben und in denselben wiederum die einzelnen M.» aufzufinden und al seine notwendige «Stufenfolge» darzustellen.²⁸

Not only does the evolution of the material world from self-consciousness have a “history,” that history is progressive (*fortgehende*) in the sense that it proceeds step-by-step (*Stufenfolge*); Schelling is evidently not resolutely committed to the *Tilgung* of time.²⁹ This is not to say that time is Schelling’s chief concern in this process: he only needs the three “moments” of self-consciousness in order to create a parallelism with the *Naturkräfte*, themselves describes as “moments.”³⁰ But Borsche, whose real concern is the evolution of *das Moment* in Hegel’s sense, wisely makes the crucial observation:

²⁵ BORSCHÉ, p. 103: “Die Begründung dieser Konstruktion kann hier nicht gegeben, doch muß wenigstens darauf hingewiesen werden, «das diese Unterscheidung nur zum Behuf der Speculation gemacht werde, daß man sich nicht vorstellen müsse, die Natur durchlaufe jene M. etwa wirklich, in der Zeit, sondern nur, sie seyen dynamisch oder, wenn man dieß deutlicher findet, metaphysisch in ihr gegründet.»” SCHELLING is espousing the remarkable position that time really exists.

²⁶ FACKENHEIM, Emil L. *The Religious Dimension in Hegel’s Thought*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1967, p. 87.

²⁷ BORSCHÉ, p. 104: “«In den drei Kräften der Materie und in den drei M. ihrer Konstruktion» lassen sich die «drei Akte des Ichs...in der ersten Epoche des Selbstbewußtseyns» (Ich als Empfundenes, als Empfindendes, als produktive Anschauung) wiederfinden. Schelling versucht zu zeigen, daß sie sich «wirklich entsprechen» und folgert, daß «jene drei M. der Natur eigentlich drei M. in der Geschichte des Selbstbewußtseyns.»” In an email to the author of 3 January 2010, BORSCHÉ expressly denied that he had written this article with any attempt to amuse the reader.

²⁸ BORSCHÉ, p. 104.

²⁹ BORSCHÉ, p. 104: “Die Schellingische Übertragung des Ausdrucks «M.» ist also durchaus von dessen zeitlicher Bedeutung her zu verstehen.”

³⁰ BORSCHÉ, p. 104: “Auf diese Weise hofft er [sc. SCHELLING], den «Parallelismus der Natur mit dem Intelligenzen» sichtbar machen zu können...”

Es überrascht daher nicht, daß sowohl in dieser wie in anderen Schriften der gleichen Zeit «der M.» zumeist in seiner gewöhnlichen Bedeutung erscheint. Die übertragende Bedeutung, nicht durch den veränderten Artikel lexikalisch abgehoben wie bei Hegel, führt auch nicht zu einer terminologischen Fixierung.³¹

At this stage in the evolution of *das Moment*, it is still very much *der Moment*, a word which Schelling can therefore use both in the customary (*zeitlich*) sense but also in the service of creating his “parallelism.” Because Schelling can only derive nature from the *evolving* history of self-consciousness, he is not ruthlessly committed to imagining this “parallelism,” no matter how unlikely his project may otherwise be, as simply *zeitlos*; he thereby does not reach the acme of absurdity. But he is getting rather close: Borsche points out that Schelling is imagining a parallelism “...*der darin bestehen soll, daß die «verschiedene[n] M. der Evolution des Universums» den «unveränderlichen und für alles Wissen festehenden M. in der Geschichte des Selbstbewußtseyns» entsprechen.*”³² In other words, he is beginning to imagine a “history of self-consciousness,” progressively arranged in stages as it may be and linked to the parallel development of the universe as it must be, as composed of fixed and unchangeable “moments” that are logical rather than temporal.

II.1.2.2.3. Hegel

As a matter of *a priori* dialectical logic, Hegel needed only to synthesize the positions of Kant and Schelling in order to reach his own characteristic use of *das Moment*. The parallelism between Mind and Nature that Schelling needed his “moments” to explain or justify was now taken as a fact: Hegel revealed the unity of subjective and objective in what he called “the true philosophy.”³³ Like Kant, Hegel could therefore use his

³¹ BORSCHKE, p. 104.

³² BORSCHKE, p. 104. Both quotations are from SCHELLING’s *System des transzendentalen Idealismus*. For all citations to SCHELLING in this section, see BORSCHKE, p. 104.

³³ HW 429-30 (*Glaube und Wissen*; emphasis mine): “Nachdem auf diese Weise durch die Totalität der betrachteten Philosophien der Dogmatismus des Seins in den Dogmatismus des Denkens, die Metaphysik der Objektivität in die Metaphysik der Subjektivität umgeschmolzen [ist] und also der alte Dogmatismus und Reflexionsmetaphysik durch diese ganze Revolution der Philosophie zunächst nur die Farbe des Innern oder der neuen und modischen Kultur angezogen [hat], die Seele als Ding in Ich, als praktische Vernunft in Absolutheit der Persönlichkeit und der Einzelheit des Subjekts,—die Welt aber als Ding in das System von Erscheinungen oder von Affektionen des Subjekts und geglaubten Wirklichkeiten,—das Absolute aber als ein Gegenstand und absolutes Objekt der

“moments” to describe parts of something that was always already a whole. But the “whole” that was Kant’s concern was very much on the subjective side; Hegel’s “whole,” by contrast, presupposed the success of what Schelling had called “*die einzige Aufgabe der Wissenschaft*.” Considered as the culmination of a triadic Hegelian *Begriff*, Hegel’s “*das Moment*” is therefore restored to the Kantian timelessness of its first subjective and therefore one-sided “moment” at a higher level having passed through Schelling’s “moment” of temporal indeterminacy that unifies the objective and subjective. In order to advance the most unlikely step of the Idealist project—the “construction” of the material world from self-consciousness—Schelling had needed to restore motion to his “moments:” productive of the three dimensions as *Naturkräfte*, these dynamic forces were themselves “moments” of self-consciousness’s history. As the “moment” of opposition in this *Momentbegriff*, Schelling’s *der Moment* is simultaneously *zeitlich* and *zeitlos*; Hegel’s *das Moment* can finally be restored to a Kantian timelessness only after Schelling’s evolutionary *Momente* have done their work by annihilating the distinction between subjective self-consciousness and objective nature.

Whatever truth it may capture, the foregoing description in Hegelian terms of a non-textual *Momentbegriff* belongs as much to the realm of *a priori* philosophical speculation as to actual historical facts. As it happens, Borsche explains that the historical *a posteriori* origins of Hegel’s *das Moment* are even more closely connected to “the problem of time in Hegel’s philosophy of history.”

As late as 1801, Hegel is still using the word “moment” indiscriminately in Kant’s,³⁴ Schelling’s,³⁵ as well as in the conventional sense;³⁶ the latter may incidentally constitute the missing “antinomy of

Vernunft in ein absolutes Jenseits des vernünftigen Erkennens sich umgewandelt und diese Metaphysik der Subjektivität, während andere Gestalten derselben auch selbst in dieser Sphäre nicht zählen, den vollständigen Zyklus ihrer Formen in der Kantischen, Jacobischen und Fichteschen Philosophie durchlaufen und also dasjenige, was zur Seite der Bildung zu rechnen ist, nämlich das Absolutsetzen der einzelnen Dimensionen der Totalität und das Ausarbeiten einer jeden derselben zum System, vollständig dargestellt und damit das Bilden beendigt hat; so ist hierin unmittelbar die äußere Möglichkeit gesetzt, daß *die wahre Philosophie*, aus dieser Bildung erstehend und die Absolutheit der Endlichkeiten derselben vernichtend, mit ihrem ganzen, der Totalität unterworfenen Reichtum sich als vollendete Erscheinung zugleich darstellt.”

³⁴ HW 2.146 (“Bouterweks Anfangsgründe der spekulativen Philosophie”).

³⁵ HW 2.109 (*Differenzschrift*).

³⁶ HW 2.43 (*Differenzschrift*).

time”³⁷ (see Preface) to which he directed the reader in the 1800 *Systemfragment*.³⁸ But in 1802, something new appears and Borsche documents the first appearance of the characteristically Hegelian *das Moment* in *Glaube und Wissen*. There it is used in the context of Hegel’s historical description (*Darstellung*)³⁹ of prior stages—“the Kantian, Jacobian, and Fichtean philosophy”—of progress towards “the true philosophy.”⁴⁰

³⁷ Particularly insightful is BAUM, Manfred. Zur Vorgeschichte des Hegelschen Unendlichkeitsbegriff. *Hegel-Studien* v. 11, pp. 89-124, 1976, pp. 103-9.

³⁸ HW 2.43 (*Differenzschrift*): “Das Vernünftige muß seinem bestimmten Inhalte nach, nämlich aus dem Widerspruch bestimmter Entgegengesetzter, deren Synthese das Vernünftige ist, deduziert werden; nur die dies Antinomische ausfüllende und haltende Anschauung ist das Postulable. Eine solche sonst postulierte Idee ist der unendliche Progreß, eine Vermischung von Empirischem und Vernünftigem; jenes ist die Anschauung der Zeit, dies die Aufhebung aller Zeit, die Verunendlichung derselben; im empirischen Progreß ist sie aber nicht rein verunendlich, denn sie soll in ihm als Endliches, als beschränkte Momente, bestehen,—er ist eine empirische Unendlichkeit. Die wahre Antinomie, die beides, das Beschränkte und Unbeschränkte, nicht nebeneinander, sondern zugleich als identisch setzt, muß damit zugleich die Entgegensetzung aufheben; indem die Antinomie die bestimmte Anschauung der Zeit postuliert, muß diese—beschränkter Moment der Gegenwart und Unbeschränktheit seines Außersichgesetzseins—beides zugleich, also Ewigkeit sein.” For an English translation, see HEGEL, G.W.F., *The Difference Between Fichte’s and Schelling’s System of Philosophy*, translated by H.S. Harris and Walter Cerf. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1977, pp. 111-12.

³⁹ See BRAUN, Hermann, Spinozismus in Hegels *Wissenschaft der Logik*, *Hegel-Studien*, vol. 17, pp. 53-74, 1982 at p. 72 for an insightful discussion of *Darstellung* as opposed to *Vorstellung*.

⁴⁰ BORSCHKE, p. 105: “Der neue Bedeutung des Begriffs entsieht erst im Jahr 1802, und zwar in Zusammenhang mit den Arbeiten am *Kritischen Journal der Philosophie*. Mit diesem *Journal* stellten Schelling und Hegel die Aufgabe, durch eine Kritik der philosophischen Bildungen der Zeit zur wahren Philosophie hinzuführen. Hegels Aufsatz *Glauben und Wissen*, der letzte Kritische Beitrag in *Journal*, bringt diese Absicht zur Vollendung. In ihm wird, wie die Untertitel schon ankündigt, «die Reflexionsphilosophie der Subjectivität, in der Vollständigkeit ihrer Formen, als Kantische, Jacobische, und Fichteschen Philosophie» durchlaufen. Erst in diesem «vollständigen Cyclus» der Formen einer Sphäre wird sichtbar, daß in einzelnen von ihnen nichts anderes sind als «Dimensionen der Totalität», die sich jede für sich absolut setzen. Durch diese Einsicht aber tritt zugleich «die wahre Philosophie, aus dieser Bildung entstehend, und die Absolutheit der Endlichkeiten derselben vernichtend», indem sie sich den «Reichthum» den früheren Bildungen unterworfen hat, zur Totalität vollendet in Erscheinung.” Cf. ROCKMORE, Tom, *Hegel’s Circular Epistemology*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986, p. 113.

Was in der Darstellung selbst noch als selbständige Gestalten, als zum System ausgearbeitete Philosophien auftrat, wird nun am Schluß der Darstellung in Begriff der wahren Philosophie—zu «M.» derselben «herabgesetzt».⁴¹

Although these previously self-standing systems are prior in time to “the true philosophy,” they are not “moments” of its development because that process is unfolding in time (even though it is and has); they can only be integrated as “moments” into a characteristically Hegelian process—one that *just happens* to have unfolded in time as well—once it is complete.⁴² Many themes come together in a “moment” that prepares the ground for “the end of history.” In any case, Borsche has revealed the historical origins of the Logical/Chronological Parallel, its two worlds knotted together by the new usage of “*das Moment*.” Not without humor, Borsche comments: “*Von diesem Moment an ist der neue Gebrauch des Begriffs «M.» bei Hegel allgegenwärtig.*”

II.1.2.3. A Moment to Consider

Having found in Borsche a guide to the *Entwicklung* of Hegel’s use of *das Moment*, it is appropriate to briefly reflect on the significance of that use. If “the problem of time” is the Achilles heel of the Hegelian System, attention to Hegel’s use of *das Moment* is Paris’s arrow. In this section, Hegel’s “Moment” will be briefly considered as problematic on a variety of levels: historical, etymological, and philosophical.

II.1.2.3.1. Historical Critique

From an historical perspective, the most important point is simply that the origin of *das Moment* in Hegel’s sense is Hegel himself. Confronted with a clear-cut and therefore post-Hegelian difference between *der* and *das Moment*, it is easy for the modern reader to assume that Hegel, having consulted a lexicon, simply used one term in preference to another. But this is not the case and unless our own lexicon contains an historical apparatus, it will give the unwary reader the impression that it was perfectly legitimate for Hegel to use *das Moment* in a non-temporal sense because unlike *der Moment*, the former is *by definition* non-temporal. The problem here is that the only non-temporal meaning of *das Moment* before Hegel had nothing to do with a one-sided stage in a logical development: unlike Hegel, Kant

⁴¹ BORSCHÉ, p. 105.

⁴² BORSCHÉ, p. 105: “Diese Art von Integration selbständiger Bildungen zu einem umfassenden und damit wahren Ganzen, in dem jene Endlichkeiten «aufgehoben» sind, wird fortan zu einer Grundfigur des Hegelschen Philosophierens...”

made no effort—at least in print⁴³—to show that his table of judgments are interconnected through a dialectical process by means of which one evolves from another. By embedding his new version of *das Moment* in the context of “development,” “stages,” “process,” and “evolution”—all of which presuppose motion in time—Hegel both preserved and concealed the connection of his *das* with *der Moment*.

II.1.2.3.2. Etymological Critique

Although many other classic writers do both, Cicero never uses the word *momentum* to mean either “a very short period of time, instant, moment” or “a movement, impulse, push”; he does, however, reveal the meaning that connects the two: “a decisive stage in a course of events, change of situation.”⁴⁴ Calculus offers another example of how the physicist’s *momentum* is connected to the temporal “moment” of the man on the street: differentiating an equation allows us to calculate instantaneous velocity or *momentum* at any given point or *moment*. Linguistically, the nodal point is the second of the following notions: “that which exerts a decisive influence or turns the scale.” Whether it is the moment from which momentum arises or that particular moment to which a new momentum in retrospect imparts special significance, *the etymological root of “moment” is motion*: what makes any given moment momentous is the momentum visible in that which moves. And movement is meaningless without time.⁴⁵

While every German verb is a *Zeitwort*, the verb “to move” deserves this description in a double sense. The relativity of time and space is predicated on the fact that motion cannot be defined by either one of them in isolation. This was no less obvious to Hegel than it is to us despite the fact that he was influenced by the infinitesimal calculus but not by Einstein. One would think that the nodal point of space and time in a pre-Einstein context is the identity of the logical antinomy created by the contrast between the infinite boundlessness of both and the radical finitude of the

⁴³ See DÜSING, Klaus, *Ontology and Dialectic in Hegel’s Thought* in LIMNATIS, Nectarios G. (ed.), *The Dimensions of Hegel’s Dialectic*, p. 97-122. London: Continuum, 2010, p. 119 n. 17.

⁴⁴ *Oxford Latin Dictionary* (1982), p. 1129; see definitions 1, 5, and 6. Definition 7b will be quoted below; this sense is attested by Seneca, Tacitus, Livy, Lucretius, and Caesar.

⁴⁵ WINFIELD, *Space, Time and Motion*, pp. 57, 61, and 59: “Since, however, motion presupposes the passage of time, time itself cannot involve a self-externality of space relying on the movement of bodies to distinguish space from itself at different moments.”

vanishing points of each;⁴⁶ Hegel, of course, has his own reasons for generating the line and plane from the point rather than a moment of time.⁴⁷ The more important thing is that, as a subspecies of movement in general, every process, development, or evolution necessarily involves time. In fact “a timeless process” is unthinkable except by suspending the absolute opposition between the finite and the infinite.⁴⁸

II.1.2.3.3. Philosophical Critique

“Which came first, the chicken or the egg?”

This well-known conundrum is really a question about Chronological Priority and, without a transcendent and eternal God to create *ex nihilo* the first chicken—or egg, for that matter—the problem is insoluble *in time*. Given that Hegel can tolerate *no insoluble questions*—he is, after all, at war with Kant—it is easy to see why time must undergo *Tilgung* in Hegel’s system. A Hegelian solution to this conundrum is: *the chicken comes first*. But for Hegel, this chicken is not the antithesis of the merely momentary egg; both “egg” and “chicken,” as other-excluding opposites, belong only to the moment of *Verstand* or Reflection. They are, in fact, the merely one-sided moments of a continuous, eternal, and circular process that is the real chicken: a dialectical chicken that *is* precisely the circular and therefore non-temporal process—as opposed to a linear sequence unfolding *in time*—that connects egg to chicken to egg without either end or beginning.⁴⁹

⁴⁶ See WINFIELD, Space, Time and Matter, pp. 58-9 and 61: “With identifiable spatio-temporal locations, the ideal of self-transcendence of point into line and line into plane can be tied to a succession of temporal moments, constituting motion as the double-sided becoming where time transpires in terms of a succession of different places and space extends itself in terms of the sequence of time.”

⁴⁷ Were one to begin with the objective reality of the external world, one would work in the opposite direction: a series of abstractions beginning with solid objects ending after two stages with the point, from which, in term, the moment—which arguably has no natural existence—could then be derived.

⁴⁸ See BAUM, Manfred. Zur Vorgeschichte des Hegelschen Unendlichkeitsbegriff. *Hegel-Studien* v. 11, pp. 89-124, 1976.

⁴⁹ “As it was in the beginning, so now and ever shall be; world without end; Amen.” Just as the transcendent God who creates *ex nihilo* is the only basis for solving this conundrum *in Time*, so also is substitution of an immanent “God” who pours himself forth into all things the only basis for a solution that *uses time as a mere moment of an eternally present process*. GWFH preserves the first God’s eternity—an eternity only made possible by the abyss dividing Man from God—for *himself*, the heir of “Christ” who *tilgt* this abyss. See WESTPHAL, 219: “Here [sc. the *Tilgung* of Time at the end of PhG] the temptation is all but irresistible to think that whatever has gone on previously in the text, Hegel has finally and abruptly introduced a transtemporal, super-human Absolute, since such a being seems the only appropriate subject for this timeless knowledge.” Cf. VIELLARD-BARON,

It would be a serious error to disconnect our conception of what it is to be a chicken from the chicken itself: subject and object are not separable in Hegel. Only by ignoring the dialectical element in all knowledge can we understand the egg as something different from the chicken. This separation depends equally on an epistemological and a metaphysical confusion: only the *Begriff* is capable of expressing both what actually is and what can be known. Insofar as the dialectical chicken—the process that contains both “chicken” and “egg” as merely one-sided moments—is a whole, it can doubtless be made to *appear* as timeless but within this whole, precisely because it contains “moments,” time has not been subjected to *Aufhebung*: it has been both preserved *and concealed*.

II.1.2.3.4. Towards a Theological Critique

As I indicated in the Preface, this is merely the direction in which my thinking about “The Problem of Time in Hegel” is tending. At the center of this new concern are *Glauben und Wissen* (1802) and the writings close to it, in particular *Differenzschrift* (1801)⁵⁰ and *Naturrecht* (1802-3). It does not seem to be accidental that the first use of “moment” in the new sense occurs in a passage that makes reference to the “speculative Good Friday”⁵¹ and points forward to the *die Schädelstätte des absoluten Geistes* at the conclusion of the *Phänomenologie*.⁵² In addition, Hegel’s critique of F.H. Jacobi in *Glauben und Wissen* contains his most revealing attacks on the reality of time.⁵³ Given the connection between time and the Philosophy of Nature in Hegel’s mature System, the connection in Hegel’s mind between God the Son and the Philosophy of Nature is revealing.⁵⁴ Having given Himself over into temporal particularity as Jesus, God is annihilated on the Cross in order to be resurrected in *Realphilosophie*.⁵⁵ As an historical event

Jean-Louis, L’Idée Logique, L’Idée de la Philosophie et la Structure Théologico-Historique de la Pensée de Hegel, *Hegel-Studien* v. 38, p. 61-82, 2003 on “la hiéro-histoire de philosophie.”

⁵⁰ For the treatment of time in the *Differenzschrift*, see RAMETTA, Gaetano, *Il Concetto del Tempo: Eternità e «Darstellung» speculative nel pensiero di Hegel*, Milano: Franco Angelo, 1989, pp. 105-7, n. 57.

⁵¹ HW 2.431.

⁵² HW 3.590. See MURRAY, Michael, Time in Hegel’s *Phenomenology of Spirit*, *Review of Metaphysics*, vol. 34 n. 4, pp. 682-705, 1981.

⁵³ HW 2.322-92, in particular pp. 342-3 and 347-8.

⁵⁴ HARRIS, H.S., *Hegel’s Development: Night Thoughts*, p. 155.

⁵⁵ Cf. THEUNISSEN, Michael, *Hegels Lehre vom absoluten Geist als theologisch-politische Traktat*, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1970, p. 282 (emphasis mine): “Christus ist auferstanden, weil sein Tod *ein Moment* des göttlichen Lebens war, die letztmögliche Radikalisierung der der Negativität des Urteils, des im ewigen

in “the divine life” that is *zugleich* the necessary tipping point of a timeless process, the “death of God” is the primal “moment” that reveals “the theological origins of the problem of time in Hegel’s thought.”⁵⁶

II.1.2.3.5. Critical Conclusion

In the meantime, we need to attend more carefully to what Hegel actually writes in his mature works and recognize his absolute but unacknowledged dependence on what might be called “*Zeitwörter*.” As an example of this method, consider the following sentence from *Wissenschaft der Logik*:

Sondern es kann nur *die Natur des Inhalts* sein, welche sich im wissenschaftlichen Erkennen *bewegt*, indem zugleich diese *eigene Reflexion* des Inhalts es ist, *welche seine Bestimmung* selbst erst setzt und *erzeugt*.⁵⁷

Hegel’s intent is to describe a scientific method that corresponds to its timeless content: the content itself produces the implicit moments that already constitute the whole. We need to attend more closely not only to his verbs (*bewegt* and *erzeugt*) but also to his adverbs (*zugleich* and *erst*). Empirical observation will show that Hegel’s entire method of exposition depends throughout on *Zeitwörter* and we need to read him against the grain by asking why.

In short, Hegel can only solve the insoluble problem of Chronological Priority by substituting Logical Priority and then (a) ignoring that *any* form of “Priority” always already presupposes time, (b) incorporating movement—possible only in time—as atemporal logical moments in a process outside of and indeed *prior to time*, and (c) deceiving us about his scandalous solution. In Part II, Section 3, I will return to “(c)” and argue that the scandal is in the solution, not in its concealment, because Hegel’s

In sich sein des dreieinigen Gottes begründet ist und mit der Erschaffung der Erscheinung erstmals gefällt wurde.”

⁵⁶ Cf. BAUM, Manfred, *Die Entstehung der Hegelschen Dialektik*, Bonn: Bouvier, 1986, p. 61-7.

⁵⁷ HW 5.515. The passage is introduced by rejecting the methods of SPINOZA, KANT, and FICHTE: “Der wesentliche Gesichtspunkt ist, daß es überhaupt um einen neuen Begriff wissenschaftlicher Behandlung zu tun ist. Die Philosophie, indem sie Wissenschaft sein soll, kann, wie ich anderwärts erinnert habe, hierzu ihre Methode nicht von einer untergeordneten Wissenschaft, wie die Mathematik ist, borgen, sowenig als es bei kategorischen Versicherungen innerer Anschauung bewenden lassen oder sich des Rasonnements aus Gründen der äußeren Reflexion bedienen.”

ability to deceive us depends on a logically and chronologically prior act of *self-deception*.

II.1.2.4. Arantes on Hegel

Those who find my use of the word “scandal” *scandalous* will derive some support from the important work of Paulo Eduardo Arantes;⁵⁸ his *Hegel: A ordem do tempo* (2000) is a thoughtful attempt to harmonize Hegel’s conception of Time with our own and thereby to absolve Hegel of the scandal of systematically confusing Chronological and Logical Priority. Arantes recognizes the distinction and admits that Hegel “deduces”⁵⁹ our Time—he calls it “a primeira manifestação exterior do negativo e da contradição”⁶⁰—from the chronologically posterior but logically prior Concept.⁶¹ Most importantly, he directly addresses Hegel’s pervasive equivocation on the word “moment.”⁶² In addition to distinguishing a “*momento real*” from a “*momento ideal*”⁶³—a distinction for which he can

⁵⁸ ARANTES, P. A., *Hegel: A ordem do tempo*. Tradução e prefácio de Rubens Rodrigues Torres. Sao Paulo: Hucitec, 2000. Hereafter: “ARANTES.” This version is a Portuguese translation of the author’s doctoral dissertation, written in French.

⁵⁹ ARANTES, p. 354.

⁶⁰ ARANTES, p. 173; “primeira” denotes Chronological Priority, “exterior” preserves the Logical Priority of the Concept. This description depends heavily on ARANTES’s useful explication at p. 89-93 of GWFH’s remarks on HERACLITUS in LHP, p. 286-7. Note in particular the use of the word “moments” in the passage ARANTES quotes at the bottom of p. 92: “In time we have the moments of Being and non-being manifested as negative only, or as vanishing immediately; if we wish to express both these moments as one independent totality, the question is asked, which physical existence corresponds to this determination [the answer is “fire,” not “time”]” (LHP, p. 287).

⁶¹ Cf. ARANTES, p. 91: “...reencontraremos o momento do tempo, como momento constitutivo e subordinado.”

⁶² In addition to ARANTES, p. 55-7 and p. 349-50, see the translator’s comments at p. 14.

⁶³ ARANTES, p. 349. Cf. CIRNE-LIMA, Carlos, *Beyond Hegel: A Critical Reconstruction of the Neoplatonic System*, <http://www.cirnelima.org/>, 2006, p. 138: “Time is the process of emergence and disappearance of subidentities. We have already seen that they emerge. But do they disappear? Yes, whenever there is an internal contradiction that may arise due to the change in the network of oppositions, or an external opposition, something inevitable in a network of relations that is so complex and in perpetual movement. The rise and disappearance of subidentities in the web of subidentities constitute the real time. The *prius et posterius* here, in this world of changes and transformations have as real time what happens in the web of the Universe, between the rise and disappearance of a being or real thing. The non-identity between the rise and disappearance, as procedural flux,—by abstraction—becomes the ideal time prevailing in the world of pure

only find tenuous textual warrant in the early Jena writings⁶⁴—he comes close to raising precisely the right question in a footnote.⁶⁵ But even those who find his concluding summary of Feuerbach’s common sense critique⁶⁶ less compelling than his own ingenious defense of Hegel’s qualified loyalty to natural Time in “Egoidade e Temporalidade”⁶⁷ will easily discover the problem with his denial that Hegel is even taking a “risco calculado” in scandalously reversing Chronological and Logical Priority:

Em certo sentido, é possível dizer que esse movimento [sc. “um retorno que faz com que o imediato se encontre *posto* segundo seu ser verdadeiro”] combina *pressuposição* do posterior e *posição* do anterior;

quality and pure quantity.—Here is the derivation of the ideal time. Real time is the real distance between the real quantity and the real quality from the beginning to the end of this movement.”

⁶⁴ In other words, before GWFH developed his characteristic use of *das Moment*. See ARANTES, p. 66-7, particularly “os momentos do tempo” at p. 67. On the peculiarities of the Jena period, see KOYRÉ, Alexandre. Hegel à Iéna in *Etudes d’histoire de la pensée philosophique*. Paris: Gallimard, 1971, BOUTON, Christophe, *Temps et Esprit dans la philosophie de Hegel de Francfort à Iéna*. Paris: J. Vrin, 2000, and HORSTMANN, Rolf-Peter, Jenaer Systemkonzeptionen in PÖGGELER, Otto (ed.), *Hegel: Einführung in seine Philosophie*, p. 43-58, Freiburg/München: Karl Alber, 1977. A fascinating study of GWFH’s development is BAPTIST, Gabriella. Ways and Loci of Modality: The Chapter “Actuality” in the *Science of Logic* between its Absence in Jena and its Disappearance in Berlin in George di Giovanni ed., *Essays on Hegel’s Logic*, p. 127-143. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1990.

⁶⁵ ARANTES, p. 56 n. 3: “Estariamos autorizadas a sugerir uma contaminação recíproca entre determinação lógica e determinação temporal, ou trata-se apenas de expressões metafóricas, que mantêm apenas elos longínquos com o “gênio” especulativo da língua?” In fact, the contamination is not reciprocal; the Dialectic depends on Time and despite GWFH’s best efforts, it is the common sense embodied in the language that occasionally betrays his attempt to reverse this natural priority.

⁶⁶ ARANTES, p. 371-75 and FEUERBACH, Ludwig, *Vorlesungen über Logik und Metaphysik (Erlangen 1830-1831)*, edited by ASCHERI, Carlo and THIES, Erich, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1976, p. 16-18: “Die Zeit selbst w[urde] genannt die Erscheinungsform der Einheit des Seins und Nichts; sie stellt aber selbst diese Wahrheit dar.” In addition to this passage, LUCKNER, *Genealogie der Zeit: Zu Herkunft und Umfang eines Rätsels*, Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1994, p. 103, n. 50 directs the reader to TRENDELENBURG, Adolf, *Logische Untersuchungen*.

⁶⁷ ARANTES, p. 147-63; cf. WdL, p. 843: “By reason of this freedom [sc. with which “the Idea *freely releases* itself in its absolute self-assurance” into Nature], the form of its determinateness is also utterly free—the *externality of space and time* existing absolutely on its own account without the moment of subjectivity.”

ou seja, o fato de que a ordem do tempo seja em parte outra, que não a do Conceito (tal determinação deve ser tratado antes de tal outra, apesar ou a conrepele da ordem de aparição delas), longe de ser um simples risco calculado, ganha um sentido mais rico pelo fato de ser captado à luz da reflexão.⁶⁸

The central problem with all attempts to make Hegel consistent with himself is that “o ordem do tempo” is always already presupposed, even in the allegedly atemporal “moments” of “the concept in movement.”⁶⁹ Arantes performs a valuable service by calling attention to Hegel’s claim in the *Lectures on the History of Philosophy* that Heraclitus laid the foundations for the Concept by recognizing that Time “is the first form of Becoming.”⁷⁰ But Time has already entered Hegel’s account of the History of Philosophy even before Heraclitus makes his entrance as its third “moment:” despite the anachronism involved,⁷¹ Time is already implicit in his decision to *begin the process* with Parmenides.⁷² Precisely because

⁶⁸ ARANTES, p. 349.

⁶⁹ In a chapter called “Le concept en mouvement” in JARCYK, Gwendoline, *Système et Liberté Dans la Logique de Hegel* (2nd edition), Paris: Éditions Kimé, 2001, she writes at p. 30: “...car l’entreprise d’auto-réalisation, ou le mouvement auto-réalisateur, est en même temps, et de façon paradoxale, un mouvement de regression, de réductio, étant donné qu’il se fonde sur le déjà-là intemporel.”

⁷⁰ ARANTES quotes LHP, p. 286 at p. 90. Cf. HOULGATE, Stephen, *The Opening of Hegel’s Logic: From Being to Infinity*, West Lafayette, Purdue University Press, 2006, p. 284.

⁷¹ See KIRK and RAVEN for the chronological priority of HERACLITUS. An interesting apologia for such anachronisms is found in BUTLER, p. 301-08 (his final chapter is “Empirical versus Rational Order in the History of Philosophy”); on PARMENIDES-HERACLITUS specifically, see BUTLER, p. 39 (emphases mine): “If Heraclitus had no knowledge of Parmenides, the Hegelian dialectical reconstruction of history differs from the historical order. Yet the rational reconstruction need not be invalidated by such a procedure (see the Introduction and final chapter to this work).” Compare KÜNG, p. 390: “The generation which succeeded Hegel (and this is true not only of Marx, but also of such skilled historians as Ranke, Droysen and Burckhardt) were no longer able to discern that everything proceeds reasonably in world history, or that the whole of history is the step-by-step dialectical self-unfolding of the Spirit.”

⁷² GWFH ignores, and indeed must ignore that PARMENIDES offered a deliberately fraudulent account of “the Way of Opinion,” the result of deriving reality from the interplay of opposites, as GWFH will later try to do. See MOURELATOS, Alexander P.D. *The Route of Parmenides*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1970.

“Time is pure change,”⁷³ every change, every process, and every beginning always already presupposes Time.⁷⁴

By *beginning* his system with Being, by showing how Being and Nothing enter into their inevitable *dance*—a dance, it should be added, to the music of Time—and then pretending to derive Becoming as an atemporal *result* of the preceding but strictly logical “moments,”⁷⁵ Hegel’s “eternity” inevitably depends on the prior but concealed incorporation of Time.⁷⁶ Hegel’s need to distort Parmenides’ Being,⁷⁷ to fudge the moment of Nothing,⁷⁸ and to commit the Heraclitus anachronism are strictly secondary phenomena—as indeed Hegel’s entire Philosophy of History is merely a secondary phenomenon, a mere symptom—with respect to the primordial “problem of time.”

II.1.2.5. Höhle and Wandschneider on Time

Justly famous for *Hegels System* (1987),⁷⁹ Vittorio Höhle’s most important contribution to the problem of time is found in a 1983 article he co-authored with Dieter Wandschneider.⁸⁰ This article’s conclusion offers an ingenious solution to the apparently irreconcilable conflict between “the end of history” and the open-ended progress into the future desiderated by Hegel’s defenders, a solution that creates an unlikely link between Hegel and Platonism:

Als Vollendung der *Idee* kann sie nur *ideal*, nur im *Begriff* des Begriffs erreicht werden, der sie *als solcher* über die Endlichkeit und damit

⁷³ In addition to LHP, p. 286-7, see ARANTES p. 90 and 95.

⁷⁴ As a monument to GWFH-induced abandonment of common sense, see FLEISCHMANN, Eugène, *La Science Universelle ou La Logique de Hegel*, Paris: Librairie Plon, 1968; p. 57: “Processus, mouvement, rapport etc., tout cela n’est que l’œuvre du penser qui ni situe pas dans les objets eux-mêmes.”

⁷⁵ Consider the ease with which temporality can be read back into GWFH by OHASHI, Ryosuke, *Zeitlichkeitsanalyse der Hegelschen Logik; Zur Idee einer Phänomenologie des Ortes*. Freiburg/München: Karl Alber, 1984.

⁷⁶ On “the emergent character of Hegel’s eternity,” see WESTPHAL, Merold, *History and Truth in Hegel’s Phenomenology* (3rd edition), Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1998; p. 219-22.

⁷⁷ The Being of Parmenides is changeless precisely because it is *not* everything: it is emphatically not “*Sein, reines Sein, ohne alle weitere Bestimmung.*”

⁷⁸ See DÜSING, p. 132.

⁷⁹ HÖSLE, Vittorio, *Hegels System: Der Idealismus der Subjectivität und das Problem der Intersubjectivität*. 2 vols. Hamburg: Felix Meiner, 1987 (hereafter “HÖSLE”).

⁸⁰ WANDSCHNEIDER, Dieter and HÖSLE, Vittorio, Die Entäusserung der Idee zur Natur und ihre zeitliche Entfaltung als Geist bei Hegel. *Hegel-Studien* 18 (1973), p. 173-199 (hereafter “WANDSCHNEIDER and HÖSLE”).

Zeitlichkeit der Realisierung in der Tat erhaben ist. Nur so, scheint es, kann die drohende Aporie von Fortschritt und Vollendung für die Hegelauslegung vermieden werden.⁸¹

The “end of history” is merely “ideal” and only on the conceptual level does the Hegelian *Begriff* reach completion; in comparison with this conceptual perfection, *Realisierung in der Tat*, which can only occur in time, never reaches, and merely resembles, the completeness of the *Begriff* and therefore necessarily admits of further progress.⁸² It would be difficult to imagine a solution less consistent with Hegel’s own conception of *der Begriff* than this attempt to divide it from reality: “*Die Idee vollendet sich im Begriff ihrer Vollendung. Dennoch kann nicht gesagt werden, daß die Vollendung damit realisiert sei.*”⁸³ At the center of this distinction is an implicit but on-going assumption that since time is real *in der Tat*, Hegel must necessarily regard it as such.

The most interesting result of this assumption is not the ingenious solution of *die drohende Aporie* but a remarkable willingness to see time at work throughout Hegel’s system.

Daß die *Wissenschaft der Logik* mit dem «Sein» *beginnt* und mit der «absoluten Idee» *endet*, ist im Hinblick auf den Denkvollzug des Geistes *zeitlich*, dialektisch-logisch hingegen als *überzeitlicher Prinzipierungszusammenhang* zu fassen. Die logische und zeitliche Perspektive haben *ihre spezifische Berechtigung*, und erst im absoluten Geist, in der Philosophie, kann es gelingen, dies begreifend zu vereinen.⁸⁴

Their willingness to see time as necessarily implicit in Hegel’s *Logic* from beginning to end is refreshing. But the chronological element in the *Logic* must once again be ignored so that “the logical Idea” (i.e. the end result of the *Logic*) can pass over into time in the *Philosophy of Nature*.

Nur an sich ist die logische Idee göttlich, überzeitlich, Ihre Realisierung gehört notwendig der Zeit an, sie ist gleichsam die Weltwerdung Gottes, so wie die Erhebung der Welt in den Geist umgekehrt deren Verklärung und Heiligung bedeutet.⁸⁵

⁸¹ WANDSCHNEIDER and HÖSLE, p. 196-7.

⁸² For a reference to the distinction between *Begriff* and reality in *Hegels System*, see HÖSLE, vol. 2, p. 311: “Ein wichtiger Gesichtspunkt bei einer genauen Klärung dieses Problem—das hier nicht näher untersucht werden kann, dessen Lösung jedoch ein wichtiges Desiderat wäre—scheint mir zu sein, daß es zum *Begriff* einiger (aber nicht aller) Entitäten gehört, *real* andere voraussetzen.”

⁸³ WANDSCHNEIDER and HÖSLE, p. 196.

⁸⁴ WANDSCHNEIDER and HÖSLE, p. 198.

⁸⁵ WANDSCHNEIDER and HÖSLE, p. 198.

In order to synthesize Hegel's true position with another that, in accord with post-Hegelian prejudice,⁸⁶ is much more "time-friendly," Wandschneider and Höhle must blur the distinction between the end of the *Logic* with the end of the *System* as a whole.

This blurring is required because it is only as a result of the logical Idea's passing over into time in Nature that the authors can discover in the *System* as a whole a pseudo-Platonic and utterly un-Hegelian gap between conceptual completeness and temporal realization:

Eine anschließende, «absolute» Philosophie wird und kann die Geschichte offenbar nicht verwirklichen, weil deren Realisierung—mag sie immer ein Leitbild und Ziel des Geistes sein—beständig von der Nichteliminierbarkeit des Natürlichen durchkreuzt und vereitelt wird.⁸⁷

It will be noted that this description of "the absolute Philosophy" is no longer based on the necessarily one-sided aspect of the "the logical Idea": the authors are intent on solving *die Aporie* that threatens the entire *System*. And given the solution they will offer at the end, one needs to read carefully in order to see that a statement like the following is true only for the end of the *Logic*:

Vollendet wäre die Entwicklung dann wenn die *Totalität* der Idee erreicht ist. Als *Totalität* kann sie indes nie *realisiert* sein, insofern Realisierung wesentlich das *Setzen von partikulären Bestimmungen* der Idee bedeutet. Das gilt selbst noch für die Bestimmung «absolute Idee»: Als isolierte Bestimmung ist auch sie offenbar nur ein «Moment» der *Totalität* der Idee, *nicht* diese *Totalität* selbst.⁸⁸

In fact, this blurring is pervasive. Since "time" only enters the Hegelian *System* at the beginning of the Philosophy of Nature, the best points made by Wandschneider and Höhle often seem at odds with the text:

Es ist dies die Art und Weise, wie sich die logische Idee *expliziert*: In Gestalt der *Wissenschaft der Logik* etwa, in der die Ideale *Totalität* des

⁸⁶ Cf. LAKEBRINK, Bernhard, Hegels Metaphysik der Zeit in *Studien zur Metaphysik Hegels*, p. 135-148, Freiburg: Rombach, 1969, p. 146: "Raum und Zeit sind nach Hegel nur minimale, ja die minimalsten Entitäten dieser Welt, leere Behälter, die auf ihre Erfüllung warten. Sie zu beherrschenden Prinzipien der Hegelschen Ontologie zu machen, den Logos selbst zu temporalisieren und zu historisieren, wie man das heutzutage versucht, ist einfach absurd."

⁸⁷ WANDSCHNEIDER and HÖHLE, p. 196.

⁸⁸ WANDSCHNEIDER and HÖHLE, p. 196.

Logischen nun diskursiv, in der Sukzession von Zeilen, Seiten, und Kapiteln eines Buchtexts zeitlich entfaltet wird. *Diese* Logik ist ein Werk des Geistes, und das heißt eben: sukzessives Auseinanderlegen dessen, was an sich außer der Zeit ist, aber der Zeit zur Realisierung seiner Bestimmungen bedarf.⁸⁹

They are correct, of course, because—as I have been arguing—*time is the suppressed condition for the possibility of the entire process* by which each *Begriff* is constituted by one-sided “moments” that drive the process forwards. And, as I have already indicated, the authors sometimes seem quite close to admitting this.⁹⁰ But even when a more textual approach emphasizes that time enters the picture only with Nature,⁹¹ the authors tend to defend this view by extra-textual means,⁹² for example by introducing the word “*Naturmoment*”:

Das hiermit *notwendig* implizierte Naturmoment aller geistigen Tätigkeit wäre folglich als Grund jener Irritation zu begreifen, die ein Zufallselement in die geistige Entwicklung hineinträgt mit der Konsequenz, daß die zeitliche Entfaltung der Idee dadurch nicht mehr in ihrer logischen Reinheit, Notwendigkeit, und Vollständigkeit, sondern gleichsam verschleiert, deformiert, und verkürzt erscheint.⁹³

In short: the important conclusion that the rest of the System will inevitably unfold in time, i.e. in a way that falls short of the completeness of the

⁸⁹ WANDSCHNEIDER and HÖSLE, p. 198.

⁹⁰ WANDSCHNEIDER and HÖSLE, p.188: “Die trennende Tätigkeit des Verstandes—der, so Hegel, «verwundersamsten..., der absoluten Macht» (*Phänomenologie*. 27)—ist unerläßliche Voraussetzung des Denkens, und hier wird in der Tat ein *zeitlicher* Aspekt des Geistes sichtbar.”

⁹¹ WANDSCHNEIDER and HÖSLE, p. 195: “Derartige Kontingenzen gehen nun aber, soweit zu sehen ist, wesentlich auf das Konto jener *Natürlichkeit*, von der sich der Geist wohl prinzipiell losgesagt hat, die aber damit keineswegs getilgt ist. Im Gegenteil: Es hatte sich gezeigt, daß es vielmehr zur Bestimmung des Geistes gehört, sich äußerlich zu setzen, um die immanente Dialektik auszutragen.”

⁹² Another example of this procedure is explained at WANDSCHNEIDER and HÖSLE, p. 177: “177: “Zum besseren Verständnis kann es hilfreich sein, jenes Prinzip der *Veräußerlichung einer inneren Struktur* anhand eines «innerlogischen» Übergangs zu studieren: Der Fortgang vom «Begriff» zum «Urteil» bietet gewissermaßen ein logisches Modell dessen, was sich auf andere ontologischer Ebene als «Erschaffung» der Natur aus der Idee—traditionell-theologisch «Schöpfung» genannt—vollzieht.” Cf. p. 182 n. 18.

⁹³ WANDSCHNEIDER and HÖSLE, p. 195. The passage continues: “Dieses Naturmoment, das den Geist nicht in seiner Substanz betrifft, die immanente Notwendigkeit seiner Entwicklung aber durch Kontingenzen stört, muß seiner Unvermeidlichkeit willen gleichwohl Ernst genommen werden.”

Begriff, is here made to depend not only on an extra-textual *Naturmoment*, but on what they call the “*Naturmoment aller geistigen Tätigkeit*,” i.e. the necessarily temporal character of Spirit.⁹⁴ This is all the more jarring because the authors claim at the start that they will rely exclusively on “system-immanent Argumentation.”⁹⁵ On the other hand, they are perfectly honest about the gaps in the argument that Hegel has left for them to fill.⁹⁶

The most distinctive feature of Hösle’s⁹⁷ solution to “the problem of time” is to admit that while it enters the System at the beginning of the Philosophy of Nature (i.e. in *das Naturmoment*), time only becomes central in—and is indeed constitutive of—the Philosophy of Spirit. He accomplishes this result by means of the following analogy: Space : Time :: Nature : Spirit.⁹⁸ What makes this form of argumentation *systemimmanent* is that it is plausible on a formal or structural level without being textual.⁹⁹

⁹⁴ WANDSCHNEIDER and HÖSLE, p. 189: “Im Sinne fortschreitender Befreiung von der Natur macht es somit eine Entwicklung, durch das zeitliche Sichselbstoffenbaren des Geistes scheint als der Prozeß seiner Ablösung von der Natur verstanden zu können.”

⁹⁵ WANDSCHNEIDER and HÖSLE, p. 173: “Wohlgemerkt: Da es in folgenden wesentlich darum geht, zu klären, inwieweit diese Fragen [sc. “Das Verhältnis von Idee, Natur, und Geist”] im Rahmen des Hegelschen Systementwurfs selbst beantwortbar sind, kann die Argumentation nur *systemimmanent* sein. Externe Motive Hegelschen Denkens, zeitgeschichtliche Einflüsse, Hegels philosophische Entwicklung usw.: All das sind außerordentlich wichtige Aspekte der Hegelauslegung, die aber dort, wo es allein um die innere Konsistenz eines philosophischen Systems zu tun ist, nicht nur nicht thematisch, sondern letztlich ohne Beweiswert sind.” Notwithstanding, HÖSLE and WANDSCHNEIDER cite the relevant connection to SCHELLING at p. 183 n. 19.

⁹⁶ WANDSCHNEIDER and HÖSLE, p. 188 (emphasis mine): “Freilich ist die Frage nach der eigentümlichen Leistung des Geistes damit zunächst nur verschoben, denn es kann weitergefragt werden: *Weshalb* gibt es Denken nur in der Zeit? Warum ist die dialektische Entfaltung der Idee im denken nicht zeitlos? *Bei Hegel selbst finden sich diesbezüglich nur sehr indirekte Formulierungen.*”

⁹⁷ Note that this “solution” plays no part in WANDSCHNEIDER, Dieter, *Raum, Zeit, Relativität: Grundbestimmungen der Physik in der Perspektive der Hegelschen Naturphilosophie*, Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1982.

⁹⁸ HÖSLE, Vol. 2, p. 310: “Die Proportion Raum : Zeit = Natur : Geist hat ferner die äußerst wichtige systematische Auswirkung, daß Hegel nur der Geist—and nicht die Natur—eine Geschichte hat. Die Entwicklung des Geistes findet in der *Zeit*, nicht in Raum statt: «Die Weltgeschichte ...ist...die Auslegung des Geistes in der Zeit, wie die Idee als Natur sich in Raume aulegt» (12.96f.). Cf. WANDSCHNEIDER and HÖSLE, p. 187 n. 23: “Allgemein verhält sich, Hegel zufolge, der Raum zur Zeit wie die Natur zum Geist.” See p. 97 n. 26 above.

⁹⁹ WANDSCHNEIDER and HÖSLE, p. 187: “Die Analogie von Zeit und Geist ist hier zunächst formal aus der Systemstruktur begründet worden.”

Naturally Hösle admits that the introduction of time takes place in Nature;¹⁰⁰ his ingenious move is to link it solely to Spirit.¹⁰¹

Die Proportion Raum : Zeit = Natur : Geist hat ferner die äußerst wichtige systematische Auswirkung, daß Hegel nur der Geist—und nicht die Natur—eine Geschichte hat.¹⁰²

Although there is little textual basis for this analogy¹⁰³—and none for this “extremely important consequence”—Hösle certainly does his best with what evidence there is.¹⁰⁴ The stakes, indeed, are very high and in the article, the authors support their claims with considerable eloquence.¹⁰⁵ It is important to grasp that the final gap between merely “ideal” *Begriff* and necessarily incomplete *Realisierung in der Tat* depends entirely on Spirit’s

¹⁰⁰ HÖSLE, Vol. 2, p. 309: “Raum und Zeit sind als die ersten Bestimmungen der Naturphilosophie grundlegend für die *ganze* Realphilosophie, und zwar verhält sich nach Hegel der Raum zur Natur ähnlich wie die Zeit zum Geist.”

¹⁰¹ The decision to link time exclusively to Spirit as opposed to Nature is too Kantian for GWFH; see WINFIELD, *Space, Time and Matter*, p. 55, 57, and 60: “Once more, this very formality [sc. “time is as abstract and ideal as space”] leaves no room for injecting the very concrete distinctions between objectivity and subjective consciousness that Kant will add by treating time as a pure form of subjective intuition.”

¹⁰² HÖSLE, Vol. 2, p. 310. Note that this approach denies GWFH any prescience where DARWIN is concerned: “Allerdings hat Hegels Zuordnung der Zeit zum Geist zur Folge, daß Hegel keine Entwicklung der Natur kennt” (p. 311). See p. 113 above.

¹⁰³ More can be found at BONSIEPEN, Wolfgang. Hegels Raum-Zeit-Lehre; dargestellt anhand zweier Vorlesungs-Nachschriften. *Hegel-Studien* v. 20, p. 9-78, 1985, see p. 51, 70-73.

¹⁰⁴ HÖSLE, Vol. 2, p. 309: “In der Anmerkung zu §258 vergleicht Hegel den Raum mit der Objectivität, die Zeit mit der Subjectivität: «Die Zeit ist dasselbe Prinzip als das Ich = Ich des reinen Selbstbewußtseins; aber dasselbe oder der einfache Begriff noch in seiner gänzlichen Äußerlichkeit und Abstraktion» (9.49; vgl. 2.348, 3.584, 12.103). Was kann dies Behauptung, wenn überhaupt, für einen Sinn haben? M.E. läßt sie sich aus dem von Hegel mehr implizit vorausgesetzten als explizit begründeten «Gesetz der superponierten Formen» erklären, nach dem die Mikrostruktur des Systems dessen Makrostrukturen abbilden. Demnach entspricht die Zeit als die erste *negative* Kategorie der Natur der Negation der Natur als ganzer, also dem Geist, während im Raum sich das Wesen der Natur noch in völliger Unmittelbarkeit ausdrückt.” HÖSLE supplements his case with some remarks about music from the *Lectures on Aesthetics* (p. 310). Cf. BRAUER, Oscar Daniel, *Dialektik der Zeit: Untersuchungen zu Hegels Metaphysik der Weltgeschichte*, Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Friedrich Frommann, 1982, p. 152-5.

¹⁰⁵ WANDSCHNEIDER and HÖSLE, p. 192: “Die Natur ist die ewige Wiederkehr des Gleichen, der Geist hingegen Fortschritt in der Zeit, *Geschichte*.”

necessarily historical manifestation. More importantly, once we agree that Spirit is necessarily historical,¹⁰⁶ the entire System—considered as a production of Spirit—must necessarily unfold *in time*.

This particular *Auswirkung* of the analogy is, of course, extra-textual and as such can only weaken the truth-claims of an explicitly *systemimmanent* project that aims to save Hegel from *die drohende Aporie*. But it creates an interesting link between the defense offered by Hösle and Wandschneider (on the one hand) and the critique I have developed in this dissertation. It will be noted that their defense of Hegel depends on the same claim upon which my critique is based: time is the basis for the Hegelian System. Consider the following passage:

Das sukzessive Sich-für-sich-selber-Offenbaren des Geistes macht bereits einen eigentümlichen *Prozeßcharakter* sichtbar, der sich für alles Geistige als konstitutiv erweisen wird. Dieses dem Geist immanente Werden, sein wesensmäßig *geschichtlicher* Charakter soll im folgenden näher beleuchtet werden.¹⁰⁷

All of the expressions used here—“sukzessive Sich-für-sich-selber-Offenbaren des Geistes”, “eigentümliche Prozeßcharakter...der sich für alles Geistige als konstitutiv”, “das dem Geist immanente Werden”, and its “wesensmäßig geschichtlicher Charakter”—validate my on-going argument that time is immanent in the System from the start. Wandschneider and Hösle are therefore perfectly correct to emphasize the temporal basis of many Hegelian expressions:

Im Zusammenhang mit der konkreteren Begriffsstimmung des Geistes finden sich bei Hegel immer wieder zeitliche Prädikate wie «Prozeß», «Werden», «Bewegung», «Entwicklung», «Entfaltung», «Fortschritt» usw.¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁶ Note that such a notion creates a common ground between GWFH and HEIDEGGER. In addition to WANDSCHNEIDER and HÖSLE, p. 187 n. 24, see DE BOER, Karin. *Thinking in the Light of Time: Heidegger's Encounter with Hegel*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2000.

¹⁰⁷ WANDSCHNEIDER and HÖSLE, p. 186.

¹⁰⁸ WANDSCHNEIDER and HÖSLE, p. 186. The passage continues: 186: “Hier ergibt sich indes eine Schwierigkeit: Prozessualität kommt zunächst einmal dem naturhaft Seienden zu, weil und insofern es—im Gegensatz zur Idee—raumzeitliche Existenz besitzt. Der Geist aber, so war deutlich geworden, gehört als solcher *nicht* mehr der Natur an...Auch hier gilt, das Hegels eigene Ausführungen mehr oder weniger thetisch gehalten sind...Damit soll nicht gesagt sein daß das Problem vom Hegelschen Denkansatz her nicht zu klären sei.”

The difference between us is that they are defending Hegel on the basis of the same evidence I am using to expose his scandalous solution to “the problem of time.”¹⁰⁹ The defense offered by Wandschneider and Hösle must claim that Hegel simply failed to make explicit the temporal character of his project: “*Der Prozeßcharakter des Geistes wird zwar immer wieder hervorgehoben und bekräftigt, aber eine explizite Begründung sucht man in den einschlägigen Texten vergeblich.*”¹¹⁰ Naturally I am offering a very different account of why these texts cannot be found. In the last analysis, it all comes down to *das Moment*; for all their astute observations about “Process,” “Becoming,” “Development”¹¹¹ etc., Wandschneider and Hösle fail to recognize the necessarily temporal implications of “the Hegelian Moment.”

Hier ist daran zu erinnern, daß es dem Geist obliegt, die *Dialektik* der Idee zu realisieren. Wie dargelegt, heißt das, daß er die logischen Bestimmungen *als solche setzen*, sie also zunächst einmal festhalten und auseinanderhalten muß. Daß dies nicht etwas ist, das sich von selbst versteht, ergibt sich daraus, daß in der Sphäre des Logischen ja gerade keine *isolierten* Bestimmungen angetroffen werden, sondern jede, entsprechend ihrer dialektischen Natur, mit ihrer Gegenteil behaftet, «Moment» in einem übergreifenden Zusammenhang ist.¹¹²

¹⁰⁹ WINFIELD, *Space, Time and Motion*, p. 60: “Indeed it is time’s constitutive reference to space that permits the sequence of the categories of space and time to be, like that of all categories in the philosophy of nature, a merely conceptual ordering. The move from point to line to plane is not temporal in character because it itself involves no continuous differentiation of spatial backdrops. A hopeless paradox would, of course, arise if the transition from space to time were temporal, rather than categorical, for then the emergence of time would be preceded by a passage of time.”

¹¹⁰ WANDSCHNEIDER and HÖSLE, p. 186.

¹¹¹ FULDA, Hans Friedrich, *Das Problem einer Einleitung in Hegels Wissenschaft der Logik* (2nd edition), Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1975, p. 197: “Insofern nun das Allgemeine sich ihm reinen Denken zum Besonderem *entwickeln* soll, ist es daher auf ein Medium angewiesen, eine Ordnung des Früher und Später—die Zeit, in welcher die Entwicklung stattfindet kann.”

¹¹² WANDSCHNEIDER and HÖSLE, p. 189.

Part II. Section 2. (II.2) The Scandal of Right Hegelianism

As Hegel would have pointed out, Right Hegelianism can only exist in opposition to Left Hegelianism. With the collapse of the Soviet Union, on the other hand, Right Hegelianism could once again become, at least in some sense, Hegelianism *simpliciter*. But it could only be a Hegelianism *that is itself the result of a dialectical movement*: it is *the negation of a negation*. Let's consider the post-Hegel development of Hegelianism as an Hegelian Triad:

First of all, there was Hegel himself. Thanks to the Problem of Time, there were certain internal tensions in this original Hegelianism. These tensions gave rise to the Young Hegelians who opposed the closed circularity of Hegel's System. Thus arose the dialectical Moment of Reflection: both Left and Right Hegelians claiming to represent the exclusive *Wesen* of Hegelianism. The resolution of this antithesis could only be a synthesis of the two antagonistic positions. This synthesis is what I will call "New Right Hegelianism" and it will be the subject of Chapter 11 (II.2.2). It has emerged from the negation of Left Hegelianism but it also preserves it as a "moment;" this preservation is what makes it "New." To that extent, then, it is Left Hegelianism. But its opposition to Left Hegelianism remains absolute: it has simply found a new way to achieve the End of History.

A few historical remarks are necessary.

Up until 1918, Right Hegelianism remained a surprisingly plausible and defensible position. Despite the rise of dangerous Left Hegelian movements—from Social Democracy and Socialism to Bolshevism—the *status quo* demonstrated a truly remarkable resilience. Germany resisted Republicanism in 1848 and the French Third Republic was manifestly in Germany's interest. The Kingdom of Prussia had succeeded in creating the Second Reich; as Kaiser, its King had—for a second time—made a Napoleon serve the German World's interests. The new Reich's 1871 constitution preserved and extended the social and political principles of Right Hegelianism in a theoretical sense while the Prince von Bismarck, its cunning architect, consistently showed himself, particularly in his inconsistencies, to be a master of its practical application. The achievement of German Unification through Bismarck's *Realpolitik* was pure Hegelianism:¹¹³ the nationalistic and republican ideals of 1848 bowed to

¹¹³ Cf. MEINECKE, Friedrich, *Weltbürgertum und Nationalstaat* (1907) or rather *Cosmopolitanism and the National State*, translated by Robert B. Kimber, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1970, p. 197: "From this point of view [sc.

the rational realities of 1871. The preservation of the monarchical principle found its perfect expression in Kaiser Wilhelm the Second who ascended the throne in 1888.

If Arthur Schopenhauer could only play the role of disgruntled Brahms to Hegel's towering Beethoven, Friedrich Nietzsche, the most famous German thinker between Hegel's death and the First World War, could do even less. In 1888, he could still deny that Germany had any philosophers:

One asks: can you point to even a single spirit who counts from a European point of view, as your Goethe, your Hegel, your Heinrich Heine, your Schopenhauer counted? That there is no longer a single German philosopher—about that there is no end of astonishment.¹¹⁴

As if to prove himself right, Nietzsche lapsed into insanity the following year: Hegelianism had survived its vituperative critic. Nor is it entirely clear that Nietzsche was ever as anti-Hegelian as he claimed to be.¹¹⁵ The *amor fati* of the *Übermensch* is simply a more accessible version of Absolute Knowledge, the "Eternal Return" serves only to make the real rational, while the transcendent God of Hegel's "Unhappy Consciousness" had been proclaimed dead long before Zarathustra came along. Nietzsche's self-image as the post-historical "untimely one" is a gross imposture: his post-Hegelian individualism owes more to both hope and despair than reality.¹¹⁶ And his failure to finish *The Will to Power*—to create a System that consistently puts Becoming first—shows that Hegel had the last laugh.

Nor did the outbreak of the World War *per se* deal a blow to Right Hegelianism: quite the contrary.¹¹⁷ The prodigious national War Effort, the readiness of a People to sacrifice itself for the State, was a pan-European phenomenon. Nothing except a whole-souled commitment to Hegelian *Sittlichkeit* can explain the willingness of a generation to endure the

"the liberation of political thinking from nonpolitical, universalistic ideas" by means of "the transition from conjectural to empirical thinking, from ideal and speculative to realistic thinking"], Hegel, Ranke, and Bismarck are the three great liberators of the state."

¹¹⁴ NIETZSCHE, *Twilight of the Idols*; "We Germans."

¹¹⁵ HOULGATE, Stephen, *The Opening of Hegel's Logic: From Being to Infinity*, West Lafayette, Purdue University Press, 2006, p. 345-6.

¹¹⁶ See HOULGATE, Stephen, *Hegel, Nietzsche and the Criticism of Metaphysics*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1986.

¹¹⁷ KIESEWETTER, Hubert, *Von Hegel zu Hitler; Eine Analyse der Hegelschen Machtstaatsideologie und der politischen Wirkungsgeschichte des Rechthegeanismus*, Hamburg: Hoffmann und Campe, 1974, p. 195-201 ("Die Hegelianer und der Erste Weltkrieg").

unspeakable horrors of the Western Front.¹¹⁸ It was the hundred-year Peace between 1815 and 1914 that had seemed un-Hegelian. The fact that France was the only Republic among the major combatants, unless one insists on including the Americans, demonstrates just how strong the State remained. As Verdun proved, the citizens of the Third Republic were just as committed to it as the Germans were. And even the United States were so *Hegelianized* by the experiences of Modern War that only the verb “was” now applied to a singular *it* where a plurality had once been.

But this particular War, in which Germany stood almost alone and was soundly beaten as a result, was a disaster for Right Hegelianism, at least in its original form. Despite the fact that only the certainties of Hegelian *Sittlichkeit* that made it possible for the Germans to fight as long and effectively as they did, these proved insufficient in practice. The “*Dolchstoß*” legend was invented to counteract this terrible truth.

Hegel had deliberately distinguished German Freedom from the *merely formal* Anglo-American alternative. This was one of Right Hegelianism’s two great mistakes. Anglo-American Freedom proved itself to be more flexible, effective, and powerful than the more compact German model Hegel had celebrated: to put it more simply, it won.¹¹⁹ The other great mistake was Right Hegelianism’s underestimation of Left Hegelianism. The price of giving Germany a second chance to win the War in 1918 was allowing Lenin to return to Russia: the result was the Soviet Union. When the War was over, it was now Hegel’s “Germanic World” that looked like a mere *epoch*: the future belonged to the Republicans in the West and the Left Hegelians in the East. Flexible enough to temporarily ally even with Communism, Anglo-America defeated the Right Hegelians of Germany a second time.¹²⁰ Only then, with Germany divided between them, did the

¹¹⁸ MEINECKE, Friedrich, *Die Deutsche Katastrophe: Betrachtungen und Erinnerungen*, Wiesbaden: E. Brockhaus, 1947, p. 28: “Der deutsche Machtstaatsgedanke, dessen Geschichte mit Hegel began, sollte in Hitler eine ärgste und verhängnisvollste Steigerung und Ausbeutung erfahren.”

¹¹⁹ It is unclear how GWFH would have responded to an *ad oculos* refutation of this kind; certainly his critique of Anglo-Americanism is conceptual as well as empirical. To some extent, this is the question raised by FUKUYAMA’s “Hegelianism,” a topic that will receive attention below. But for what it may be worth, I would suggest that it is very unlikely that GWFH could have embraced any link between Logical Completeness and liberal, i.e. limited, institutions; thanks primarily to the idea of progress and the separation of Church and State, they are antithetical.

¹²⁰ See STERN, Alfred. *Philosophy of History and the Problem of Values*. The Hague: Mouton, 1962, p. 21: “It is well known that Fascism drew its inspiration from the right wing Old-Hegelians, while Communism is the intellectual child of

Great War between West and East become both rational and real. And by 1989, it was becoming clear that Left Hegelianism had lost it. When Francis Fukuyama announced “The End of History” in his influential 1989 article of that name,¹²¹ he initiated the rebirth of Right Hegelianism, i.e. the birth of “New Right Hegelianism.” Before examining that scandalous rebirth, it is useful to consider what Hegel wrote about the Americas, with particular attention to his comments on Anglo-American “freedom” (Chapter 10; II.2.1).

the leftist Young-Hegelians. It was said that the two opposing Hegelian factions met finally in the mortal embrace of the battle of Stalingrad.”

¹²¹ FUKUYAMA, Francis, *The End of History?* in *The National Interest* 16, p. 3-18, 1989 (hereafter “FUKUYAMA”).

Chapter 10. (II.2.1) Hegel on the Americas

Hegel's comments on the Americas follow the exact same pattern as does the *Zusatz* from the *Philosophy of Nature* about the stars considered in the Introduction: it is only *after* showing why nothing more is to be expected Logically that he allows for a Chronological *bis jetzt*: i.e. it is only at the end of his account that he calls America "the land of the future."¹²²

After a geographical introduction, Hegel introduces the History of the New World in explicitly political terms: "With the exception of Brazil, republics have come to occupy South as well as North America."¹²³ To a liberal ear, this may sound hopeful: Brazil alone is holding back the march of Freedom and Progress. But Hegel was scarcely a Republican. It is not merely that Hegel rejects Kant's "Perpetual Peace," he rejects the form of government on which it is based. As we shall see, the only "future" that Hegel allows for America *will be the abandonment of the republican form in order to become a true State*, i.e. a Constitutional Monarchy of the type that already exists in Europe. But the closest Hegel comes to making an actual prediction is his speculation (likewise made at the end of the passage) that there may be "a contest between North and South America" in the future. For that contest he prepares the reader from the beginning. "In comparing South America (reckoning Mexico as part of it) with North America, we observe an astonishing contrast."¹²⁴

The details of this contrast are interesting in their own right, particularly because it is very easy to miss Hegel's meaning. In the account of the Americas as a whole, Hegel's almost exclusive emphasis is on the United States of America; i.e. on North America. And this emphasis would seem to rest on his prejudice that it is superior to the South. He specifically mentions the freedom and prosperity of the North in contrast to the political turbulence and the dependence on military force in the South; thus he would seem to favor the one and reject the other.¹²⁵ The same would seem

¹²² Insufficient work has been done on this subject, as indicated by BUCK-MORSS, Susan, *Hegel, Haiti, and Universal History*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2009.

¹²³ *Philosophy of History*, p. 83.

¹²⁴ *Philosophy of History*, p. 83.

¹²⁵ *Philosophy of History*, p. 83-4: "In North America we witness a prosperous state of things; an increase of industry and population civil order and firm freedom; the whole federation constitutes but a single state, and has its political centres. In South America, on the contrary, the republics depend only on military force; their whole history is a continued revolution; federated states become disunited; others previously separated become united; and all these changes originate in military revolutions."

to apply to his statement about the religious contrast: Hegel, as a Lutheran, would appear to be less sympathetic to the Catholic South than to the Protestant North.¹²⁶ But these appearances are misleading. Hegel quickly shows himself to have no more use for the “freedom and prosperity” of the North than for its peculiar style of “Protestantism.” In fact, I would suggest that the prognosticated “contest between North and South America” has in fact already begun: Hegel the defender of War is a secret partisan of the South, where “republics depend on military force.”

He begins his War with an account of the specific kind of political “freedom” encountered in the North America. He describes the “industrious Europeans” who first “betook themselves to agriculture”¹²⁷ and created a polity, as it were, as an afterthought.

Soon the whole attention of the inhabitants was given to labor, and the basis of their existence as a united body lay in the necessities that bind man to man, the desire of repose, the establishment of civil rights, security and freedom, and a community arising from the aggregation of individuals as atomic constituents; so that the state was merely something external for the protection of property.¹²⁸

The magic word “freedom” is found once again but one instinctively senses that, like the Repulsion that governs the stars, it is merely *formal*. A State that is “merely something external” hardly sounds like the kind to promote Hegelian *Freiheit*. And Hegel has already given us, in the Introduction to his *Lectures on the Philosophy of History*, his opinion of “a community arising from an aggregation of individuals as atomic constituents.” Before continuing with his account of “the land of the future,” it is important to consider in detail what he has already said about the kind of freedom to be found there.

Hegel is introducing the subject of the relationship between the State and the Individual. He points out that the individual Subject does not exist apart from the political Substance.¹²⁹

This essential being is the union of the *subjective* with the *rational* Will: it

¹²⁶ *Philosophy of History*, p. 84: “South America, where the Spaniards settled and asserted supremacy, is Catholic; North America, although a land of sects of every name, is yet fundamentally, Protestant.”

¹²⁷ *Philosophy of History*, p. 84: “These were industrious Europeans, who betook themselves to agriculture, tobacco and cotton planting, etc.”

¹²⁸ *Philosophy of History*, p. 84.

¹²⁹ *Philosophy of History*, p. 38: “But the subjective will has also a substantial life — a reality — in which it moves in the region of *essential* being, and has the essential itself as the object of its existence.”

is the moral Whole, the *State*, which is that form of reality in which the individual has and enjoys his freedom; but on the condition of his recognizing, believing in, and willing that which is common to the Whole.¹³⁰

This is the true Hegelian Freedom that Tugendhat discovered in the paragraph from the *Encyclopedia* about *Sittlichkeit*. It must be sharply distinguished from another kind of “spurious” Freedom:

And this must not be understood as if the subjective will of the social unit attained its gratification and enjoyment through that common Will; as if this were a means provided for its benefit; as if the individual, in his relations to other individuals, thus limited his freedom, in order that this universal limitation — the mutual constraint of all — might secure a small space of liberty for each.¹³¹

It will easily be recognized that this is “the aggregation of individuals as atomic constituents” for whom “the state [is] merely something external for the protection of property.” Of the Freedom made possible by this kind of arrangement in comparison with true *Sittlichkeit*, Hegel is clear:

Rather, we affirm, are Law, Morality, Government, and they alone, the positive reality and completion of Freedom. Freedom of a low and limited order is mere caprice; which finds its exercise in the sphere of particular and limited desires.¹³²

With this description in mind, let us return to Hegel’s description of economic arrangements in the United States.

Universal protection for property, and a something approaching entire immunity from public burdens, are facts which are constantly held up to commendation. We have in these facts the fundamental character of the community — the endeavor of the individual after acquisition, commercial profit, and gain; the preponderance of *private* interest, devoting itself to that of the community only for its own advantage.¹³³

Here Hegel’s enmity is readily apparent: although “constantly held up to commendation” by Liberals, the Freedom found in the United States is unquestionably of “a low and limited order.” Hegel’s defense of Monarchy in the *Philosophy of Right* (see I.3.3.2) should be kept in mind while

¹³⁰ *Philosophy of History*, p. 38.

¹³¹ *Philosophy of History*, p. 38.

¹³² *Philosophy of History*, p. 38.

¹³³ *Philosophy of History*, p. 85.

attending to his comments on more strictly political arrangements,¹³⁴ his contempt becomes more obvious when he describes the moral practices of the republic's wealthiest citizens.¹³⁵

The attack only gains momentum when Hegel turns to religion. Although Hegel has refrained from using the dreaded word "caprice" (*Willkür*) when describing the political arrangements of the United States, he does not hold back when he attacks the so-called "Protestantism" to be found there.

If, on the one side, the Protestant Church develops the essential principle of confidence, as already stated, it thereby involves on the other hand the recognition of the validity of the element of feeling to such a degree as gives encouragement to unseemly varieties of caprice.¹³⁶

Hegel evidently enjoys himself in ridiculing a religious environment in which every individual has their own,¹³⁷ where enthusiasts are sent into spasms in an endless variety of sects,¹³⁸ and where, in consequence, the Church (regrettably, one assumes) "has no independent existence:"

This complete freedom of worship is developed to such a degree, that the various congregations choose ministers and dismiss them according to their absolute pleasure; for the Church is no independent existence — having a substantial spiritual being, and correspondingly permanent external arrangement — but the affairs of religion are regulated by the good pleasure for the time being of the members of the community.¹³⁹

¹³⁴ *Philosophy of History*, p. 84-85: "If we compare North America further with Europe, we shall find in the former the permanent example of a republican constitution. A subjective unity presents itself; for there is a President at the head of the State, who, for the sake of security against any monarchical ambition, is chosen only for four years."

¹³⁵ *Philosophy of History*, p. 85: "We find, certainly, legal relations — a formal code of laws; but respect for law exists apart from genuine probity, and the American merchants commonly lie under the imputation of dishonest dealings under legal protection."

¹³⁶ *Philosophy of History*, p. 85.

¹³⁷ *Philosophy of History*, p. 85: "Those who adopt this standpoint maintain, that, as everyone may have his peculiar way of viewing things *generally*, so he may have also a *religion* peculiar to himself."

¹³⁸ *Philosophy of History*, p. 85: "Thence the splitting up into so many sects, which reach the very acme of absurdity; many of which have a form of worship consisting in convulsive movements, and sometimes in the most sensuous extravagances."

¹³⁹ *Philosophy of History*, p. 85; GWFH adds (as if he needed to do so): "In North America the most unbounded license of imagination in religious matters prevails, and that religious unity is wanting which has been maintained in European States,

With this bitter portrait of freedom's excesses now complete—comparable to Plato's description of Democracy in Book VIII of the *Republic*¹⁴⁰—Hegel is now ready to make his central point: that the “land of the future” *has a great deal of catching up to do*. An abrupt shift from religion back to politics suggests the direction of his attack:

As to the political condition of North America, the general object of the existence of this State is *not yet* fixed and determined, and the necessity for a firm combination does not *yet exist*; for a real State and a real Government arise only after a distinction of classes has arisen, when wealth and poverty become extreme, and when such a condition of things presents itself that a large portion of the people can no longer satisfy its necessities in the way in which it has been accustomed so to do.¹⁴¹

It will be seen that Hegel admits that the Future will bring changes to the Americas: but those changes hardly challenge the notion of the End of History. It was never the Present *per se* that is Hegel's $\tau\epsilon\lambda\omicron\varsigma$; as far as politics are concerned, for example, it is the reality of the rational State. America has not yet attained even *the conditions for the possibility* of such a State, whose reality has already been realized in the Kingdom of Prussia. But the day will come when population growth will saturate the continent and the impoverished immigrant will no longer find freedom of movement and opportunity in the West.¹⁴² Hegel's predictions are chillingly accurate simply because they are not really predictions at all: he is merely applying the fully realized Concept¹⁴³ to America's geographical potentiality.

where deviations are limited to a few confessions.”

¹⁴⁰ ALTMAN, William H.F. “Platão, Democrata?” Lecture at UFSC; 24 May, 2006.

¹⁴¹ *Philosophy of History*, p. 86; emphases mine.

¹⁴² *Philosophy of History*, p. 86: “But America is hitherto exempt from this pressure, for it has the outlet of colonization constantly and widely open, and multitudes are continually streaming into the plains of the Mississippi. By this means the chief source of discontent is removed, and the continuation of the existing civil condition is guaranteed. A comparison of the United States of North America with European lands is therefore impossible; for in Europe, such a natural outlet for population, notwithstanding all the emigrations that take place, does not exist. . . North America will be comparable with Europe only after the immeasurable space which that country presents to its inhabitants shall have been occupied, and the members of the political body shall have begun to be pressed back on each other.”

¹⁴³ *Philosophy of Right*, p. 183; *Zusatz* to §279: “If by the phrase “sovereignty of the people” is to be understood a republic, or more precisely a democracy, for by a republic we understand various empirical mixtures which do not belong to a

America's Future is Europe's Past: once the farmers are defeated, a real State will appear.¹⁴⁴ Of course any real State will put an end to the reign of caprice that currently guides both religion and politics in the United States: if we are prepared to take Hegel's criticisms seriously, we can already glimpse the outlines of a revolutionized State—equipped with an established Religion, a Standing Army,¹⁴⁵ and a King (or Caesar) at its head—that will have finally caught up with the past. And for these reasons, the United States of America will already have been defeated in its coming contest with the South whether or not it emerges victorious.¹⁴⁶

Therefore, even though the scene has shifted to the West, the play remains the same. As he did before with the stars, Hegel appears to acknowledge at the very end that the Future may bring changes that we cannot know.¹⁴⁷ But he has already indicated that the only change to be expected is the inevitable transformation of merely formal Freedom into its truly terrifying Hegelian alternative. This ghastly American Future is Hegel's scathing response to Kantianism: the Republic has been revolutionized and its goal is now conquest, not "Perpetual Peace." Hegel may well modestly admit that is not the Historian's job to consider the Future; he leaves the New World on that note.¹⁴⁸ But it is as a Philosopher that Hegel speaks.

philosophic treatise, all that is necessary has already been said (§273, *note*). There can no longer be any defense of such a notion in contrast with the developed idea."

¹⁴⁴ *Philosophy of History*, p. 86: "North America is still in the condition of having land to begin to cultivate. Only when, as in Europe, the direct increase of agriculturists is checked, will the inhabitants, instead of pressing outwards to occupy the fields, press inwards upon each other—pursuing town occupations, and trading with their fellow-citizens; and so form a compact system of civil society, and require an organized state."

¹⁴⁵ This is the last point GWFH considers (see *Philosophy of History*, p. 86); in context, his remarks about America's lack of a Standing Army are written only in the mode of *bis jetzt* and *noch nicht*. I am tempted to develop this point further.

¹⁴⁶ On the other hand, since GWFH is astute enough to realize the secret of Great Britain's continued mastery (see *Philosophy of History*, p. 86), he could have assumed that the coming contest with the South could be won without bullets. But that's because he conceived of History as ending with Germanic Caesarism, not Britain's equally bellicose Free Trade.

¹⁴⁷ *Philosophy of History*, p. 87 (emphasis mine): "Dismissing, then, the New World, and the dreams to which it may give rise, we pass over to the Old World—the scene of the World's History..."

¹⁴⁸ *Philosophy of History*, p. 87: "What *has* taken place in the New World up to the present time is only an echo of the Old World—the expression of a foreign Life; and as a Land of the Future, it has no interest for us here, for, as regards *History*, our concern must be with that which has been and that which is."

In regard to *Philosophy*, on the other hand, we have to do with that which (strictly speaking) is neither past nor future, but with that which *is*, which has an eternal existence —with Reason; and this is quite sufficient to occupy us.¹⁴⁹

Hegel's *τελος* is not the Present. And for just that reason, mankind has nothing to hope from Hegel's "land of the future." Nor is there any certainty that Kant's faith will yet triumph over Hegel's knowledge.

¹⁴⁹ *Philosophy of History*, p. 87.

Chapter 11. (II.2.2) The Rebirth of Right Hegelianism

It would be more accurate to say that when Francis Fukuyama announced “The End of History” in his influential article of that name, he initiated the *esoteric* rebirth of New Right Hegelianism.¹⁵⁰

The word “esoteric” demands some explanation. Although Leo Strauss is not mentioned in “The End of History,”¹⁵¹ his influence can be plainly seen there by one who has been taught by Strauss “to read between the lines.” It was Strauss who rediscovered *exotericism*: the idea that political philosophers conceal their secret teaching (their *esoteric* message) between the lines and therefore covered by a merely *exoteric* shell.¹⁵² In addition to certain Straussian expressions,¹⁵³ Fukuyama makes his debt to Strauss obvious in three major ways. (1) He deliberately bases his approach to Hegel on Alexander Kojève, Strauss’s close friend and collaborator,¹⁵⁴ (2)

¹⁵⁰ For a response to FUKUYAMA from a position more sympathetic to GWFH, see GRIER, Philip T., *The End of History and the Return of History* in STEWART, Jon (ed.), *The Hegel Myths and Legends*, p. 183-198, Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1996.

¹⁵¹ See BLOOM, Allen, Responses to Fukuyama, *National Interest* 16, p. 19-21, 1989 at p. 21.

¹⁵² See in particular Exoteric Teaching in STRAUSS, Leo, *The Rebirth of Classical Political Rationalism*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989.

¹⁵³ The most obvious linguistic Straussianism is FUKUYAMA’s use of the words “one is inclined to say” in the following sentence (p. 14): “One is inclined to say that the revival of religion in some way attests to a broad unhappiness with the impersonality and spiritual vacuity of liberal consumerist societies.” Compare STRAUSS, Leo, *Studies in Platonic Political Philosophy*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983, p. 34: “One is inclined to say that Heidegger has learned the lesson of 1933 more thoroughly than any other man.” Just as it is dangerous for FUKUYAMA to be expressing so early in the article a critique of Liberalism, so also is it dangerous for STRAUSS to claim what he does about HEIDEGGER, a former Nazi who never condemned the Holocaust.

¹⁵⁴ For STRAUSS and KOJÈVE, see STRAUSS, Leo, *On Tyranny; Including the Strauss-Kojève Correspondence*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000. The first time Strauss mentions Kojève in print is in STRAUSS, Leo, *The Political Philosophy of Hobbes; Its Basis and Genesis*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1952 (first published Great Britain in 1936). “M. Alexandre Kojevnikoff and the writer intend to undertake a detailed investigation of the connexion between Hegel and Hobbes” (p. 58, n. 1). This reference is important: STRAUSS had identified HOBBS as the creator of Liberalism (see FUKUYAMA, n. 15) and he and KOJÈVE apparently intended to revive GWFH’s critique of HOBBS and “state of nature” theory generally, on which see AHLERS, Rolf, *The Dialectic in Hegel’s Philosophy of History* in Robert L. Perkins ed., *History and System*:

he acknowledges the help of two prominent Straussians, Allan Bloom (who also translated Kojève) and Nathan Tarcov,¹⁵⁵ and (3) he writes the article as an exoteric text. The last point is the crucial one.

It is only in the article's conclusion that Fukuyama makes explicit his dissatisfaction with "The End of History."¹⁵⁶ Up until this point, he has been showing that Liberalism's triumph over first Fascism and then Communism has brought History to an end. He has expressed his dissatisfaction with those competing ideologies in many places. He has presented both Hegel¹⁵⁷ and Kojève¹⁵⁸ as Liberals and has given us very

Hegel's Philosophy of History, p. 149-166. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1984; p. 162. GWFH's reversal of HOBBS (see references to M. RIEDEL in AHLERS) is echoed in STRAUSS's 1932 essay "Notes on Carl Schmitt, *The Concept of the Political*" in SCHMITT, Carl, *The Concept of the Political*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996. SCHMITT joined the Nazi Party the same day HEIDEGGER did: 1 May, 1933.

¹⁵⁵ FUKUYAMA p. 3: "This article is based on a lecture presented at the University of Chicago's John M. Olin Center [. Thanks to them] and to Nathan Tarcov and Allan Bloom for their support in this and many earlier endeavors."

¹⁵⁶ FUKUYAMA p. 18: "The end of history will be a very sad time... Even though I recognize its inevitability, I have the most ambivalent feelings for the civilization that has been created in Europe since 1945, with its north Atlantic and Asian offshoots. Perhaps this very prospect of centuries of boredom at the end of history will serve to get history started once again."

¹⁵⁷ FUKUYAMA p. 4: "For as early as this [sc. 1806] Hegel saw in Napoleon's defeat of the Prussian monarchy at the Battle of Jena the victory of the ideals of the French Revolution, and the imminent universalization of the state incorporating the principles of liberty and equality...To say that history ended in 1806 meant that mankind's ideological evolution ended in the ideals of the French or American Revolutions: while particular regimes in the real world might not implement these ideals fully, their theoretical truth is absolute and could not be improved upon."

¹⁵⁸ FUKUYAMA p. 5: "Kojève, far from rejecting Hegel in light of the turbulent events of the next century and a half, insisted that the latter had been essentially correct. The Battle of Jena marked the end of history because it was at that point that the vanguard of humanity (a term quite familiar to Marxists) actualized the principles of the French Revolution. While there was considerable work to be done after 1806—abolishing slavery and the slave trade, extending the franchise to workers, women, blacks, and other racial minorities, etc.—the basic principles of the liberal democratic state could not be improved upon." But some of KOJÈVE's real views—views the Liberal reader will assume that FUKUYAMA regards as ironic—emerge in the following sentence and the footnote attached to it (p. 5: "For Kojève, this so-called "universal homogenous state" found real-life embodiment in the countries of postwar Western Europe—precisely those flabby, prosperous, self-satisfied, inward-looking, weak-willed states whose grandest project was nothing more heroic than the creation of the Common Market [n. 3].") Only in the footnote does FUKUYAMA make clear that KOJÈVE regards American Liberalism as

little reason to doubt that he is one as well. If Fascism and Communism are bad, then why does he not welcome the triumph of Liberalism? This proves to be a very important question indeed.

Before answering, it is important to point out that Hegel was not a Liberal: Fukuyama is either a fool or a liar for suggesting anything else. In fact, Fukuyama is neither. He is what Strauss calls “a political philosopher:” he is very *political* in the way he goes about *philosophy*.¹⁵⁹ Liberalism is *generally regarded as true*—he is in fact proclaiming its universal triumph—and therefore he too appears to be its proponent. He attacks its enemies, foreign and domestic.¹⁶⁰ *Although apparently celebrating its victory, he is in fact deploring it.* In order to celebrate its triumph, he claims that he is merely re-celebrating something Hegel recognized in 1806. By proclaiming “the End of History,” Hegel showed himself to be a Liberal supporter of the French and American Revolutions. But Hegel was in fact none of those things. Hegel would have rejected the Liberal version of the “end of history” announced by Fukuyama.

But Fukuyama realizes and skillfully exploits the emotional repulsion that “the end of history” inspires. The first time he mentions the doctrine is

objectionable as Russian Communism (p. 5 n. 3): “Kojève alternatively identified the end of history with the postwar “American way of life,” toward which he thought the Soviet Union was moving as well.” This view is borrowed from HEIDEGGER, who STRAUSS regarded as “the only great thinker of our time” (see STRAUSS, *The Rebirth of Classical Political Rationalism*, p. 29), see HEIDEGGER, Martin, *An Introduction to Metaphysics*. Translated by Ralph Manheim. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1959; p. 37: “From a metaphysical point of view, Russia and America are the same; the same dreary technological frenzy, the same unrestricted organization of the average man.”

¹⁵⁹ See On Classical Political Philosophy, the third selection in STRAUSS, Leo, *What is Political Philosophy?* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1959; p. 93-4: “From this point of view [i.e. that up to which the essay as a whole has led; roughly speaking, the perspective of ‘Classical Political Philosophy’] the adjective “political” in the expression “political philosophy” designates not so much a subject matter as a manner of treatment; from this point of view, I say, “political philosophy” means primarily not the philosophic treatment of politics, but the political, or popular, treatment of philosophy, or the political introduction to philosophy—the attempt to lead qualified citizens, or rather their qualified sons, from the political life to the philosophic life.”

¹⁶⁰ FUKUYAMA p. 18 (emphasis mine): “The passing of Marxism-Leninism first from China and then from the Soviet Union will mean its death as a living ideology of world historical significance. For while there may be some isolated true believers left in places like Managua, Pyongyang, or Cambridge, Massachusetts, the fact that there is not a single large state in which it is a going concern, undermines completely its pretensions to being in the vanguard of human history.”

in the context of Marxism, not Hegelianism.¹⁶¹ And he makes an interesting remark (p. 18) about Marxism's appeal:

The passing of Marxism-Leninism first from China and then from the Soviet Union will mean its death as a living ideology of world historical significance...the fact that there is not a single large state in which it is a going concern, undermines completely *its pretensions to being in the vanguard of human history* (emphasis mine).

As long as a movement is generally regarded as “the vanguard of progress,” it is strong. Fukuyama is showing that it is Liberalism—not Fascism or Communism—that deserves to be considered this. Fukuyama would seem to be teaching Liberalism to regard itself as strong: it is only at the end of his article that he forces us to go back and reconsider his true purpose.

The key figure, of course, is Hegel. In addition to concealing Hegel's anti-Liberalism, his contempt for economic individualism of the Anglo-American type, Fukuyama also conceals Hegel's antagonism to “Perpetual Peace.” Fukuyama devotes no little effort to showing why wars between Great Powers will disappear at “the End of History.”¹⁶² This is hardly Hegel's position: in fact, when Fukuyama finally comes to deploring “the end of history,” he is echoing precisely Hegel's attack on “Perpetual Peace.” For neither Hegel nor Fukuyama is War an absolute evil. He therefore *appears* to be reviving Hegel's vision but he does so in terms that are diametrically opposed to that vision. This raises the decisive question: is Fukuyama opposed to the End of History *per se* or simply the Liberal version of it *that neither he nor Hegel approves*? I suggest it is only the latter: Fukuyama is in fact ridding Right Hegelianism of its most embarrassing claim and attaching that “claim”—in the form of an achievement—to the Liberal enemy. Fukuyama's new version of Right Hegelianism—masquerading as the celebration of Liberalism—is merely the exoteric cover for something quite different. But what then is Fukuyama's esoteric message? The answer, unfortunately, is to be found in his description of Fascism.

¹⁶¹ FUKUYAMA (p. 4): “The notion of the end of history is not an original one. Its best known propagator was Karl Marx, who believed that the direction of historical development was a purposeful one determined by the interplay of material forces, and would come to an end only with the achievement of a communist utopia that would finally resolve all prior contradictions.”

¹⁶² See his extended discussion of Charles KRAUTHAMMER (FUKUYAMA p. 15-6).

The first thing that Fukuyama chooses to tell the reader about Fascism is that it rejects Liberalism for much the same reasons that he eventually does.¹⁶³

In the past century, there have been two major challenges to liberalism, those of fascism and of communism. The former [n. 11] saw the political weakness, materialism, *anomie*, and lack of community of the West as fundamental contradictions in liberal societies that could only be resolved by a strong state that forged a new “people” on the basis of national excessiveness.

In the footnote to this passage, Fukuyama begins by ridiculing the excesses of anti-Fascists.¹⁶⁴ He then offers his own definition of the term:

“Fascism” here denotes any organized ultra-nationalist movement with universalistic pretensions—not universalistic with regard to its nationalism, of course, since the latter is exclusive by definition, but with regard to the movement’s belief in its right to rule other people.

Unfortunately, Fukuyama’s description leaves room for an ultra-nationalist, belligerent, and arrogant State whose “universalistic pretensions” are expressed in terms of spreading Liberalism. In other words, if Liberalism is widely believed to be the End of History, an ultra-nationalist State that exports it by force would have an exoteric Liberal exterior but a Fascist esoteric core.¹⁶⁵ Unfortunately, it hardly required much imagination while writing this sentence in 2006 to conceive that such a State could actually come into being. In any case, Fukuyama’s discussion of Fascism offers those of us who are Liberals little comfort: his central objection to it is simply that it failed (p. 9):

¹⁶³ FUKUYAMA p. 18: “The struggle for recognition, the willingness to risk one’s life for a purely abstract goal, the worldwide ideological struggle that called forth daring, courage, imagination, and idealism, will be replaced by economic calculation, the endless solving of technical problems, environmental concerns, and the satisfaction of sophisticated consumer demands.”

¹⁶⁴ FUKUYAMA (p. 9 n. 11): “I am not using the term “fascism” here in its most precise sense, fully aware of the frequent misuse of this term to denounce anyone to the right of the user.” This should be compared with STRAUSS’s *reductio ad Hitlerum*: he rejects the idea that a view should be rejected simply because HITLER held it (see STRAUSS, Leo, *Natural Right and History*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953, p. 42-3). Both STRAUSS and FUKUYAMA ward off in advance the charge of Fascism. There is a reason for that.

¹⁶⁵ FUKUYAMA feels compelled to conceal this alternative (p. 9 n. 11: “Obviously fascist ideologies cannot be universalistic in the sense of Marxism or liberalism, but the structure of the doctrine can be transferred from country to country.”)

Fascism was destroyed as a living ideology by World War II. This was a defeat, of course, on a very material level, but it amounted to a defeat of the idea as well. What destroyed fascism as an idea was not universal moral revulsion against it, since plenty of people were willing to endorse the idea as long as it seemed the wave of the future, but its lack of success.

Here again is “the wave of the future” motif seen earlier in Fukuyama’s discussion of Communism as “the vanguard of progress.” Only an ideology that it can present itself in this light can succeed. Today, it is only Liberalism that can present itself in that light. Therefore, instead of following Heidegger and Kojève in rejecting Communism or Liberalism as fostering Nietzsche’s “Last Man,” Fukuyama is suggesting that only a form of Fascism *that can present itself as advancing the inevitable hegemony of Liberalism* can succeed where the previous version failed.

But the key that unlocks an exoteric text is its internal contradictions, as Strauss showed in his 1941 “Persecution and the Art of Writing.”¹⁶⁶ In the passage just quoted, Fukuyama first tells us that Fascism “was destroyed as a living ideology by World War II.” In the very next sentence, he adds that this military defeat “amounted to a defeat of the idea as well.” But then he points out that it was precisely *not* the *idea* of Fascism that was rejected: he emphasizes that there “was not universal moral revulsion against it [i.e. “fascism as an idea”], since plenty of people were willing to endorse the idea.” But their willingness to support it was contingent on its success. All that prevents Fascism from once again becoming “a living idea” (since there are many who, along with Fukuyama, share Fascism’s contempt for “the political weakness, materialism, *anomie*, and lack of community of the West”) is to find a way for it to present itself as “the wave of the future.”¹⁶⁷ Lest we underestimate Fascism, Fukuyama then adds this curious sentence (p. 9):

After the War, it seemed to most people that German fascism as well as its other European and Asian variants were bound to self-destruct.

Fukuyama does not say that this majority (“most people”) was correct, especially because he has already made it clear that Fascism did not “self-

¹⁶⁶ Reprinted in STRAUSS, Leo, *Persecution and the Art of Writing*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1952.

¹⁶⁷ BLOOM, Allen, Responses to Fukuyama, p. 21: “I would suggest that fascism has a future, if not *the* future. Much that Fukuyama says points in that direction. The facts do too.” Of course BLOOM mentions “the American Left,” not the Republican Right, in this connection.

destruct.” It therefore becomes difficult to explain why he adds this sentence except on the hypothesis that he is calling attention to the possibility that—at least in some new variant—it is still “a living ideology.” He continues (p. 9):

There was no material reason why new fascist movements could not have sprung up again after the war in other locales, but for the fact that expansionist ultra-nationalism, with its promise of unending conflict *leading to disastrous military defeat*, had completely lost its appeal [emphasis mine].

Here Fukuyama confirms our suspicions: the only reason that “*new fascist movements*” have not in fact “sprung up again after the war in other locales” is that Fascism was discredited by its military defeat. There is nothing objectionable about “expansionist ultra-nationalism, with its promise of unending conflict” *per se*:¹⁶⁸ what is objectionable is that this project was militarily defeated. But it was defeated only because it lost its ability to persuade the majority that it was “the wave of the future.” Fukuyama is offering his neo-conservative peers a blueprint for pressing their attack on Liberalism: present the United States (under anti-Liberal leaders) *as spreading Liberalism* and you will appear to be *the vanguard of progress*. Then you can be as ultra-nationalist (and apparently religious) as you want. And “unending conflict” can continue. As a result, we have returned—by a most circuitous route—to Hegel’s true intentions, and Fukuyama’s.

It is therefore not the political basis of Hegel’s “End of History” that Fukuyama is rejecting: by attaching it to Liberalism and the hideous triumph of Nietzsche’s “Last Man,”¹⁶⁹ he turns Hegel’s most embarrassing doctrine into a remarkably effective polemical bludgeon. Fukuyama’s innovation is the realization that a Liberal version of “the End of History” *can be put to use* within the Hegelian context as an exoteric cover. Hegel had already used words like “Freedom” and “Progress”—the watchwords of bourgeois Liberalism—for a similar purpose. But the twin defeats of

¹⁶⁸ Consider FUKUYAMA’s careful wording in the following sentence (p. 16; emphases mine): “But *in retrospect it seems* that Hitler represented a diseased by-path in the general course of European development, and since his fiery defeat, the legitimacy of any kind of territorial aggrandizement *has been thoroughly discredited*.”

¹⁶⁹ This point is developed in FUKUYAMA, Francis, *The End of History and the Last Man* (1992). For the Fascist appropriation of NIETZSCHE’s Last Man, see HEIDEGGER and STRAUSS, conveniently brought together at STRAUSS, *Studies in Platonic Political Philosophy*, p. 34, n. 3.

Germany in the 20th Century had made a “New Right Hegelianism”¹⁷⁰ *necessary* while the defeat of Left Hegelianism finally made it *possible*. In this new version, Anglo-American Freedom has both postponed and provided camouflage for Hegel’s “End of History.”¹⁷¹ By committing itself to universalizing Freedom by force while entering into “unending conflict” with those States still “mired in history,”¹⁷² the New World will eventually catch up to the Old. And as the previous chapter showed, this was always Hegel’s intent.

¹⁷⁰ For the Left Hegelian analogue, cf. “a post-Hegelian Hegelianism” at BURBIDGE, John W., Hegel’s Open Future in BAUR, Michael and RUSSON, John (eds.), *Hegel and the Tradition: Essays in Honour of H.S. Harris*, p. 176-189, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997, p. 187.

¹⁷¹ GWFH lays the theoretical foundation of this practical application in the “not yet” of the majority’s ignorance of History’s End (see I.3.2.3 above).

¹⁷² FUKUYAMA (p. 15, emphasis mine): “What are the implications of the end of history for international relations? Clearly, the vast bulk of the Third World remains very much *mired in history*, and will be a terrain of conflict for many years to come.”

Part II. Section 3. (II.3) The Scandal of Left Hegelianism

To the extent that Left Hegelianism is more attractive than Right Hegelianism, it is also less Hegelian. But if Right Hegelianism reveals more about Hegel's own intentions, Left Hegelianism reveals more about the unsolved problem at the core of Hegel's thinking, i.e. "The Problem of Time in Hegel's Philosophy of History."

This section contains what I regard as the most important findings of this dissertation. In the simplest terms, the emergence of Left Hegelianism reveals that Hegel, having suppressed Time in his own Logically Complete system, was fittingly rewarded by the re-emergence of the Future in "Young Hegelians" like Karl Marx. In this inevitable re-emergence, Left Hegelianism reveals the scandal implicit in Hegel's own spurious solution to "the problem of time." In explaining this re-emergence, I will refer to the Freudian concept "the return of the repressed" (Chapter 14; II.3.3). I want to emphasize from the start that I have no interest in Hegel's psychobiography: it is not "Hegel" himself but rather the Hegelian System that is ripe for a Freudian analysis.

In Chapter 12 (II.3.1), Daniel Berthold-Bond's astute defense of a Left Hegelian Hegel will set the stage for the alternative I propose: a bifurcated Hegel, i.e. one whose unconscious motivations, at odds with his conscious intent, makes him ripe for Freudian analysis. Although Berthold-Bond's reading reverses these two aspects—it is not the End of History to which his Hegel is *consciously* committed—his analysis paves the way for this dissertation's most important conclusion. The *locus* of the latter is Hegel's *Lectures on the History of Philosophy* and his criticisms of Plato both there and in his *Philosophy of Right*. I will show in Chapter 13 that Hegel *projects* (it is here that Freud first becomes useful) his own dilemma with perfect precision onto Plato. Just as Hegel's Plato did everything that he could do to repress the world-historical emergence of "the free infinite personality," so also Hegel's Philosophy of History reveals the lengths to which Hegel would go to repress the emergence of Time, the condition for the possibility of the 19th Century's evolutionary and progressive *Zeitgeist* and the unconscious basis of his own achievements.

Chapter 12. (II.3.1) Self-Deception in Hegel

Unlike most Left Hegelian approaches to what Daniel Berthold-Bond calls the “The Question of Completion,” his does not try to avoid the central problem:

There is no room for dispute that Hegel speaks of the “end of history” and the “conclusion” of the development of spirit in Absolute Knowledge. What is open to dispute is what Hegel means by this.¹⁷³

This honesty is most refreshing and it leads him to succinctly state the problem as a dilemma: “...either Hegel’s eschatological vision is of an *absolute* end, where no further progress in history or knowledge is possible, or it is an *epochal* conception, where the completion he speaks of is the recurring fulfillment of successive historical epochs, leaving the future open to progress.”¹⁷⁴ His own thoughtful answer is judiciously indicated by the title of the section in which he raises the issue: he calls it “The Ambiguity.”¹⁷⁵ The title is apt: Berthold-Bond recognizes “...a real ambivalence and ambiguity in Hegel’s philosophy.”¹⁷⁶ Rather than make an effort to play down this ambiguity, he emphasizes it as “an internal tension.”¹⁷⁷ Despite it, however, he is prepared to argue for a Left Hegelian reading:

While I am convinced that a faithful interpretation of Hegel can only result in a confirmation of his ambivalence, still, I feel that preference should be given to the reading which emphasizes the epochal, dialectically open-ended pole of the ambivalence as against the absolutist pole.¹⁷⁸

An *intelligent* defense of an epochal reading, one that does not deny “the internal tension” underlying “the ambiguity,” is badly needed because an absolutist approach destroys the “dialectical principle:” the essence of Hegel’s thought.

¹⁷³ BERTHOLD-BOND, p. 115.

¹⁷⁴ BERTHOLD-BOND, p. 115.

¹⁷⁵ BERTHOLD-BOND, p. 114-18.

¹⁷⁶ BERTHOLD-BOND, p. 115

¹⁷⁷ BERTHOLD-BOND, p. 115: “For the ambiguity represents an internal tension in Hegel’s philosophy between two goals which he seems to find equally important but which stand in complete conflict with each other.”

¹⁷⁸ BERTHOLD-BOND, p. 116.

This [sc. an epochal reading] is desirable because once the dialectical principle is removed (as it unavoidably is under the absolutist reading where the strife of becoming is finally overcome), we have removed the very soul of Hegel's anatomy of spirit, effecting a sort of philosophical lobotomy.¹⁷⁹

In addition to his unusual honesty, the thing that makes Berthold-Bond's approach so original is its nuanced reliance on Hegel's Christianity. Although admitting the idiosyncrasy of his unorthodox views, Berthold-Bond takes Hegel's Christian imagery seriously and, on that basis, argues that "Hegel's specifically Christian eschatology is central to his conception of the End or completion of knowledge and history."¹⁸⁰ But there is an important difference: while Christian eschatology takes place "beyond history,"¹⁸¹ Hegel's unorthodox version doesn't:

Hegel's Christianity is quite idiosyncratic, however, and he does not simply take over the Christian vision of the "end of the world" and the creation of the New Jerusalem, but has an unorthodox historical interpretation of the eschatological end. As we shall see, it is precisely because of this unorthodoxy that Hegel is not necessarily committed to the common Christian reading of an apocalyptic End—an absolute close of history—but can also be read as proposing a nonabsolutist, epochal conception of the End.¹⁸²

Hegel's transformation of Christian eschatology—whereby the *τελος* can now occur in history—next allows Berthold-Bond to incorporate a frankly post-Christian vision of the future taken from Karl Löwith.¹⁸³

This means, according to Löwith, that there is no End of historical time *per se*, and when Hegel speaks of the completion of history, he is really intending to refer to "the end of the history of the Christian *logos*." This

¹⁷⁹ BERTHOLD-BOND, p. 116.

¹⁸⁰ BERTHOLD-BOND, p. 117. Cf. FREY, Christopher, *Reflexion und Zeit: Ein Beitrag zum Selbstverständnis der Theologie in der Auseinandersetzung vor allem mit Hegel*, Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1973, p. 403-13.

¹⁸¹ BERTHOLD-BOND, p. 120: "It is from this basic tenet of Christian eschatology, that there is no historical hope for man but that the salvation and redemption of man will occur only at the End of history, or "beyond history," that Hegel's vision of the consummation of the Christian *telos* departs."

¹⁸² BERTHOLD-BOND, p. 117.

¹⁸³ BERTHOLD-BOND discusses LÖWITH, Karl, *Von Hegel bis Nietzsche* on p. 126-28.

implies that Hegel views Christianity as something to be superseded itself...¹⁸⁴

Although Berthold-Bond finds Löwith's post-Christian reading "tempting" because, as he writes, "only under an epochal reading of Hegel's language of completion can we salvage the metaphysics of becoming which makes his anatomy of spirit intelligible,"¹⁸⁵ he is clearly hesitant to accept it; he takes Hegel's Christianity too seriously. But his primary loyalty is to "the metaphysics of becoming" and he is therefore willing to let Löwith point the way towards an epochal reading whereby a tension continues to exist between Hegel's preservation of Christian eschatology on the one hand and the possibility of a post-Christian epoch on the other.¹⁸⁶

If we are to accept Löwith's reading, *as I believe we should*, it is important to explicitly recognize that it is a reading which stands in fundamental tension with the other (apocalyptic) side of Hegel's ambivalence, a side which in fact *got the better of him* in his directly theological musings on history.¹⁸⁷

In other words, Berthold-Bond is the mirror-image of Hegel: just as the absolutist aspect of Christian eschatology "got the better of him" (i.e. Hegel), so also does Löwith's post-Christian vision of the end of the Christian epoch first "tempt" and then persuade, although not without considerable misgiving, Berthold-Bond.¹⁸⁸ In fact, the most interesting aspect of Berthold-Bond's argument is his insistence on Hegel's irreducible ambivalence: an ambivalence that is clearly more consistent with open-endedness than final conclusion.¹⁸⁹

¹⁸⁴ BERTHOLD-BOND, p. 124.

¹⁸⁵ BERTHOLD-BOND, p. 127.

¹⁸⁶ BERTHOLD-BOND, p. 118: "...we look in vain for an unambiguous formulation of his [sc. GWFH's] eschatological vision, precisely because he is torn in two opposing directions by conflicting desiderata of his philosophy."

¹⁸⁷ BERTHOLD-BOND, p. 128; emphasis mine.

¹⁸⁸ BERTHOLD-BOND, p. 128 (emphases mine) leaves the reader in no doubt as to how he is able to conquer his own ambivalence. "Hegel fell under the spell of the *Christian* description of the ultimacy of its own *Logos*, and as a result *he compromised his Heraclitean metaphysics*, against all of his own principles. If we wish to accept an epochal reading such as Löwith's, we must correct it by seeing how it is in fact a rereading and reconstruction of Hegel's eschatology, which is necessary *to recover the integrity of the Hegelian dialectic from the spell of the radical End which crippled it.*"

¹⁸⁹ If this is BERTHOLD-BOND's argument (and not mine) he never makes it with sufficient clarity. But it's an interesting argument and clearly inspired by his approach.

In fact, Berthold-Bond's argument has both its strong and weak points, and this is consistent with his balanced presentation. He writes well about the *Tilgung* of Time¹⁹⁰ but then seems to promptly miss the point that Time's existence is problematic in Hegel.¹⁹¹ He never considers that his emphasis on *Erinnerung* leads to Hyppolite's concept of "the immanence of history" and he defends his open-ended view with at least one troubling analogy.¹⁹² But the heart of his argument is interesting and is developed through an analysis of four passages; it is only here that the scales finally dip in favor of his epochal reading.

But I will argue that they [sc. the Golgotha passage from the *Phenomenology* and two others that make reference to a "new world"] will also show—particularly when read with the third "new world" passage, from the Preface to the *Phenomenology*—that one side of the ambiguity has stronger claims than the other, *if consistency with the principles of Hegel's dialectic is to be taken as the criterion of judging*.¹⁹³

Even in his analysis of these passages, Berthold-Bond preserves the sense of balance: for each passage he offers both an absolutist and an epochal reading.¹⁹⁴ But it is in this context of contrasting arguments that he introduces his strongest suggestion: that the achievement of the *τελος*, Absolute Knowledge, is in itself *transformative* and therefore opens up a new epoch in history. He states it with caution:

¹⁹⁰ BERTHOLD-BOND, p. 129: "By this interpretation, the "annulment of time" refers to the eternal form of concepts, what Hegel calls the "inward" (*innerlich*) form of thought as opposed to its "outer" or "external" (*äußerlich*) form. This inward form of thought is precisely the *Er-innerung* in which past shapes of "outer" historical existence become grasped as comprehended history. In this sense, when knowledge has (epochally) overcome the antithesis between its thought and its objects, its concepts become comprehended in their eternal significance." He doesn't seem to grasp that for GWFH, Time itself is merely *äußerlich* although he is close.

¹⁹¹ BERTHOLD-BOND, p. 129-30 (emphasis mine): "Christianity is the End or *telos* of human history in the sense that it expresses the ultimate purpose and meaning of spirit, but this too *must be subject to the world of time*, the world of change: this purpose and meaning must be worked out and evolved in history." In other words, he needs Time to survive the *τελος*.

¹⁹² Consider his comparison of GWFH's to "Marx's eschatology" (BERTHOLD-BOND, p. 130): "If Marx is able to speak of a "resolution" of history which still allows for historical development, why shouldn't we permit Hegel to do the same?" The answer to this question is that MARX was the only Left Hegelian of the two!

¹⁹³ BERTHOLD-BOND, p. 133 (emphasis mine).

¹⁹⁴ BERTHOLD-BOND, p. 135-38.

On the other hand, Hegel may mean that the “outer existence” of spirit—the historical being of man immersed in the world of *praxis*—is transformed by the speculative comprehension of its past, and itself gains a new existence, a new shape, a new world, by this *begreifendes Erkennen* of its history.¹⁹⁵

Following Hyppolite’s suggestion that Absolute Knowledge is really the *Erinnerung* (“recollection”) of History, he moves outward, towards the future, instead of inward, towards the “immanence of history,” as Hyppolite himself had done.

And rather than understanding recollection as a final, transhistorical redemption of spirit from this *via dolorosa* [of the Golgotha passage], I would like to see it as an episodic way station, a comprehension of the meaning of an epoch, which is made possible only as that epoch reaches its consummation, but which always bears within it the seed of a new world. By this reading, recollection will not only be a sort of memorial of the past but an anticipation of the future, a redemption or resurrection of spirit into a new birth in historical time.¹⁹⁶

By the time he comes to the Preface of the *Phenomenology*, he dispenses with the paired arguments: “This passage is frankly and straightforwardly anticipatory, a looking-forward to a new era in history.”¹⁹⁷ Even here, however, he doesn’t lose the balanced approach: it is the *ambiguity* of Hegel’s position that he wants to emphasize.¹⁹⁸

And that is doubtless why he chooses to reveal his own position in a section called “Pro and Con.” There is no bravado in Berthold-Bond’s Left Hegelianism: it is chastened, serious, thoughtful, and laborious. We cannot simply repudiate the absolutist reading, we must rather solemnly *sacrifice*

¹⁹⁵ BERTHOLD-BOND, p. 136; emphases mine. It will be noticed that he presents the *absolutist* reading of the three passages first and only then his own *epochal* version.

¹⁹⁶ BERTHOLD-BOND, p. 137.

¹⁹⁷ BERTHOLD-BOND, p. 140. See PhG, p. 6. He doesn’t mention the possibility that it is anticipatory only of GWFH’s own achievement of Absolute Knowing—and therefore the sensitive reader’s as well—coming at the end of the book.

¹⁹⁸ And continues to do so in the section called “Pro and Con” (BERTHOLD-BOND, p. 140-43) especially at p. 140: “While I have been arguing that Hegel’s eschatological vision of the completion of history and knowledge can best be understood as referring to the epochal consummation rather than to the absolute conclusion of spirit, I have also maintained that the ambiguity between these two readings is not ultimately resolved in his philosophy.”

it.¹⁹⁹ Nor can we delude ourselves into thinking that Hegel himself is a Left Hegelian: we must take responsibility for helping him to become one. But we do not do so arbitrarily. It is not only because Hegel himself is ambivalent but also because *the finer part of himself* is on the epochal and open-ended, not on the absolutist side.

...if being and history are to reach a radical consummation, an “absolute final end,” they would at once undermine the very conditions that animate the world-spirit. The final *satisfaction* of being and history would be the final *death* of spirit. This is why I feel we must sacrifice Hegel’s desire to portray an absolute, radical, consummation of knowledge and history and being, and seek the value of his philosophy in an epochal conception of the development of *Geist*. Only such a sacrifice can avoid the deeper, paralyzing sacrifice of the dialectical soul of Hegel’s philosophy.²⁰⁰

The reader must help Hegel to affirm what is living in his own thought, not what is dead.

In order to help the reader to better grasp his own extremely sensitive and nuanced position, Berthold-Bond next offers an interesting review of the scholarly treatment of the problem. In “Other Views” (p. 143-154), he discusses “The Literal (Absolutist) Interpretation,”²⁰¹ “Epochal

¹⁹⁹ He literally calls for “a sacrificial renunciation of Hegel’s absolutism” (BERTHOLD-BOND, p. 143).

²⁰⁰ BERTHOLD-BOND, p. 143; emphasis in original. The first part of this passage I have deleted because it refers to arguments made earlier in the book. I will include it here, however: “As with knowledge, which in order to be radically complete would have to destroy the very conditions of its own possibility, so too with being and history—” (p. 142-43). In short, Berthold-Bond tries to show that dialectical progress can never come to rest.

²⁰¹ The first of these sections is the weakest: in order to suggest that the Left Hegelian reading is that of an embattled minority, he presents the absolutist reading as traditional. This leads him to put forward some bizarre representatives of this kind of reading. Berthold-Bond’s emphasis on KIERKEGAARD in this subsection, for example, (BERTHOLD-BOND, p. 143-44) is somewhat odd: it is precisely GWFH’s *failure* to complete the System that KIERKEGAARD emphasizes and appears to attack. And using MARX and ENGELS (p. 144)—who rejected this very completion in principle as spokesmen for the ‘Literal Interpretation’—is also problematic: they are hardly elucidating *why* Hegel believed in the End of History. Jean HYPPOLITE is here (p. 144), curiously joined with the more representative conservatives: Eric VOEGELIN (p. 144-45), Alexander KOJÈVE (p. 145), and the Straussian Stanley ROSEN (p. 145; notice that KOJÈVE as well was an intimate of STRAUSS; these are Francis FUKUYAMA’s intellectual forebears). Citing François CHÂTELET (p. 145) is an imposture for the same reason that citing MARX and ENGELS was. See in particular n. 28 (p. 206-07): most of those mentioned are trying, like BERTHOLD-BOND himself, to salvage a

Interpretations, Hesitant and Otherwise,” and finally “Attempts at a Synthetic Interpretation.”²⁰² It is the second of these three sections that is most relevant to Left Hegelianism, despite the fact that there are many Left Hegelians included among those discussed in the other two sections as well. Here Berthold-Bond makes a distinction between those who arrive at his own epochal reading “too quickly” and those who begin to show the same sort of hesitation that he himself does.²⁰³ In this second sub-set, Berthold-Bond shows the most sympathy for Robert Solomon, who can see “two different Hegels.”²⁰⁴ But even the “hesitant” are not nearly hesitant enough.²⁰⁵ Among the most interesting passages in the book are those in which Berthold-Bond discusses Hegel in relation to Fichte²⁰⁶ and historical relativism;²⁰⁷ although he admits that neither are really refuted if we embrace the epochal reading he advocates, he still maintains an impressive

usable core from the End of History: this is Left Hegelianism. As for Charles TAYLOR (p. 145), BERTHOLD-BOND simply gets it wrong. See TAYLOR, p. 425-26.

²⁰² The representatives of this group are Emil FACKENHEIM (who doesn’t address the issue directly) and J.N. FINDLAY (p. 150). BERTHOLD-BOND finds an interesting quotation in FINDLAY: “Hegel will, however, marvelously include in his final notion of the final state of knowledge the notion of an endless progress that will have no further term” (p. 153). Thus Findlay finds “only a superficial ambiguity” (p. 152) and “essentially collapses into the nonabsolutist version of the completion, rather than being a true synthesis of the absolutist and nonabsolutist poles” (p. 154).

²⁰³ Karl LÖWITH, Herbert MARCUSE, and Quentin LAUER (p. 146) “...adopt the nonabsolutist interpretation all too quickly” as opposed to those who “show a great deal of hesitancy in developing their nonabsolutist, epochal reading:” these are Robert SOLOMON and Shlomo AVINERI (p. 147).

²⁰⁴ BERTHOLD-BOND, p. 149.

²⁰⁵ SOLOMON (p. 149) “...draws back from actually advocating the epochal interpretation he emphasizes, and hence “celebrates” the Heraclitean Hegel more as a matter of inclination than philosophic commitment” while Avineri’s “...proposal finally collapses into the epochal reading without coming fully to grips with the absolutist interpretation” (BERTHOLD-BOND, p. 150).

²⁰⁶ See his extensive comments on FICHTE at BERTHOLD-BOND, p. 156-57. “We must, I think, conclude that Hegel’s opposition to Fichte does in fact backfire to a certain extent—that his criticism of the Fichtean vision of the infinitely progressive character of spirit is in many ways applicable to his own version of the “eternal creation” of spirit. This is the cost of adopting the epochal interpretation of completion, and it would be foolish to try to explain it away.” He also points out that GWFH’s attack on the “spurious” infinite was directed largely against FICHTE (BERTHOLD-BOND, p. 141).

²⁰⁷ BERTHOLD-BOND, p. 158: “There is, I believe, no way for Hegel to avoid a certain sort of historical relativism, if he is at the same time to remain faithful to his metaphysics of becoming.”

commitment to his own nuanced position.²⁰⁸ But his primary loyalty is to the Dialectic²⁰⁹ and he makes a case that we must embrace what is living, not what is dead in the Hegelian System.²¹⁰ Even if Absolute Knowledge is an End, it is a transformative End.²¹¹ And it is the form of the Dialectic itself that must make us give our assent to the epochal reading: the engine that got us to the problem in the first place must be allowed to continue on its way.²¹²

²⁰⁸ Although he does answer the charges quite well; on FICHTE, he writes: “And it is just Hegel’s notion of history as an epochal development, where each epoch can achieve its “principle” or *telos*, that allows him to vindicate knowledge from the kind of infinitely unrealizable project that he views Fichte’s conception of knowledge as condemning us to” (BERTHOLD-BOND, p. 157). And on historical relativism, he distinguishes GWFH’s from William Graham SUMNER’s and John DEWEY’s (p. 158-59). Nor does he open the door very wide to an approach like FOUCAULT’s: “Since history is the theater of the progressive unfolding of reason, each epoch represents what Hegel calls a *Gestalt* of spirit, and the fulfillment of the principle of that *Gestalt* gives rise to a “new world” or new shape of spirit. Hence knowledge is relative to the “principle” of the epoch. But there is a continuity between *Gestalten*, where each stage “is a link in the whole chain of spiritual development” (HPH 2:45)” (BERTHOLD-BOND, p. 159). In *Les Mots et les Choses*, these connections vanish.

²⁰⁹ This is repeatedly emphasized: “Hence, if we are to retain *the integrity of the Hegelian dialectic*, we should opt for his nonabsolutist, open-ended, epochal eschatology” (BERTHOLD-BOND, p. 155; emphasis mine). “Hegel’s ideal of a radical completion to knowledge and being must be set aside, I have argued, in order to retain and affirm the integrity of his dialectic” (BERTHOLD-BOND, p. 156).

²¹⁰ BERTHOLD-BOND, p. 155: “If the grand synthesis of thought and being were finally to dispense with this dialectical soul, and so alter the metabolism of its life as to achieve a final “repose” of spirit, a harmony of thought and being which contradicted the dynamic definition of each of its terms, then we would be left with a *dead* synthesis—for all satisfaction brings a natural death.”

²¹¹ BERTHOLD-BOND, p. 160: “Our knowledge develops as our world is transformed and altered by our historical experience, and hence knowledge is in a fundamental sense always incomplete—for knowledge, being historically grounded, always has a future development on the horizon—but the course of development is itself guided by a universal and eternal *Logos, nous*, reason, spirit.” Thus the (Christian) *Logos* can remain eternal but be so *in* History.

²¹² BERTHOLD-BOND, p. 160 (emphasis mine): “It is this unifying, synthesizing, reconciling *form* of reason which is eternal, and which makes the epochs of history a single whole or system. *While this whole or system is open-ended, it is yet a whole*, for the very impulse to development which ensures that it will be open-ended is an impulse of reason which remains constant through the perpetual course of transition.” I suppose such a self-contradiction was unavoidable.

Having followed the sinuous course of Berthold-Bond's argument, I would now like to introduce an alternate resolution to "the ambiguity" he has astutely recognized in Hegel's thought, a resolution that the following chapter will vindicate. There are, in Robert Solomon's telling phrase, "two Hegels." But unlike Berthold-Bond, I regard the *unattractive* Hegel—the one who celebrates "the closed circle of science"—as *the real Hegel* while the more attractive, open-ended version is one that Hegel scholars have constructed in their own image. But this attractive Hegel is not merely a figment of our own wishful thinking although "he" is unquestionably that as well. In fact, there are not only "two Hegels" but *three* because there are already *two* in Solomon's *first*:

But here we begin to see the possibility of the deep tension in Hegel's philosophy; on the one hand, he is a philosopher whose main claim is to give us a unified all-inclusive world-view, which he calls "the Absolute."²¹³

Insofar as he is still a mere philosopher *making claims*, Hegel remains the man I have called "Hegel." But the real Hegel—according to Hegel, that is—is the knower who gives voice to "the Absolute" in "Absolute Knowledge" and the Substance become Subject. In this unity, "Hegel" and Hegel are one: Berthold-Bond doesn't grasp the closed unanimity, the scandalous impiety, and the absolute consistency of Hegel's *conscious* purpose.²¹⁴ On the other hand, both Berthold-Bond and Solomon are correct that there is nevertheless "a deep tension in Hegel's philosophy" because in addition to the *conscious* Hegel who has emerged from "Hegel," there is yet another *unconscious* version to be considered, a *third Hegel* of whom neither Hegel nor "Hegel" were aware. This shadowy "third" is Solomon's *second* Hegel, a Hegel so attractive to Berthold-Bond that he is obliged to see "him" as the real Hegel. It is, I will argue, *the unconscious Hegel*—Solomon's second and my third—who values, just as we do, the perpetual changes and transformations that Time alone makes possible and who therefore gives to unceasing change the last word:

²¹³ SOLOMON, Robert C. *In the Spirit of Hegel*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983; p. 14.

²¹⁴ When BERTHOLD-BOND writes: "The final *satisfaction* of being and history would be the final *death* of spirit" (p. 143), he has it reversed: The final *satisfaction* of Spirit (GWFH's conscious purpose) would be the final *death* of history. See KRONER, Richard. *Von Kant bis Hegel*. Two Volumes. Tübingen: J.D.B. Mohr, 1921-24 (who identified "*die Antinomie zwischen System und Geschichte*" (see BERTHOLD-BOND, p. 146) and who is therefore the real architect behind BERTHOLD-BOND's vision, and thus mine.

On the other hand, he is the philosopher of change, the phenomenologist of forms, who appreciates, as Kant and most philosophers did not, the rich variety of forms of experience and the complex transformations between them.²¹⁵

As attractive as this Hegel undoubtedly is, we must not allow our own prejudices to delude us:²¹⁶ we must recognize that one victim of self-deception is more than sufficient where Hegel is concerned. To put the decisive point another way: Solomon's "second Hegel" was indeed present among "the three Hegels" but both Hegel and "Hegel" were unconscious of his de-stabilizing presence. It is this *unconscious Hegel* that Solomon and Berthold-Bond prepare us to recognize. Hegel's critique of Plato will confirm his existence.

²¹⁵ SOLOMON, p. 14.

²¹⁶ Consider MALABOU, Catherine, *The Future of Hegel: Plasticity, Temporality, Dialectic*. Translated by Lisabeth During. *Hypatia*, v. 15, n. 4, 196-220, 2000; p. 196 (from During's Abstract): "She takes as her guiding thread the concept of "plasticity," and shows how Hegel's dialectic—introducing the sculptor's art into philosophy—is motivated by the desire for transformation. Malabou is a canny and faithful reader, and allows her classic "maitre" to speak, if not against his own grain, at least against a tradition too attached to closure and system." In fact, most HEGEL scholars are considerably more attached to the *opposite* tradition.

Chapter 13. (II.3.2) Hegel's Platonic Projection

There is undoubtedly a sense in which the historical Plato, like Hegel, ascribed to the proposition that “the real is the rational and the rational is the real.” Taken as a description of *the supersensuous realm of Being*, it is perfectly adequate: for Plato, only the rational Ideas *truly are*. The Plato who can absorb Hegel's identity on these terms had already absorbed Heraclitus along very similar lines long before. Sharply distinguished from rational Being *that alone is truly real*, Heraclitean flux is absorbed by Plato as *Becoming*. As long as the Platonic separation or χωρισμος is retained between them, Plato's metaphysics can be usefully understood as a combination of Hegelianism and Heracliteanism. Such a formulation would allow Plato to do to Hegel what Hegel did to Plato and indeed everyone else: incorporate him into his own philosophical system as a mere “moment.” Of course there is a single terrible problem with this particular formulation of Platonic metaphysics aside from the obvious anachronism: neither Hegelianism nor Heracliteanism can occupy only one side of the χωρισμος.

It is worth belaboring this point. When Heraclitus said: “It is wise to agree that All Things are One,”²¹⁷ he was anticipating Hegel.²¹⁸ The whole point of Hegel's Identity of the Real and the Rational is that neither has any existence apart from the other: there is no dualism between the Ideal and what actually exists. The fact that he joins the two reciprocal statements with an “and” is precisely the sign of this distinctive χωρισμος-annihilating Identity. Of course this is not the only such Identity in Hegel's thought: thanks to Logical Completeness, identities abound. The Hegelian Dialectic itself is simply Hegel's innovative *means* to the ancient *end* of χωρισμος-annihilation. Hegel systematizes Heraclitus, subjectivizes Spinoza's Substance,²¹⁹ and adds a *human-historical* dimension to

²¹⁷ HERACLITUS, Fragment 50.

²¹⁸ LPH, p. 279: “The advance requisite and made by Heraclitus is the progression from Being as the first immediate thought, to the category of Becoming as the second. This is the first concrete, the Absolute, as in it the unity of opposites. Thus with Heraclitus the philosophic Idea is to be met with in its speculative form; the reasoning of Parmenides and Zeno is abstract understanding. Heraclitus was thus universally esteemed a deep philosopher and even was decried as such. Here we see land; there is no proposition of Heraclitus which I have not adopted in my Logic.”

²¹⁹ For useful discussions of GWFH and SPINOZA, see SCHACHT, Richard L. Hegel on Freedom in Alasdair MacIntyre ed., *Hegel: A Collection of Critical Essays*, p. 289-328. New York: Doubleday, 1972 and BRAUN, Hermann,

Aristotle's developmental rationalization of *natural* change.²²⁰ But if these are the three co-equal persons of Hegel's *Philosophical Trinity*—it would be blasphemous to assert that the Holy Trinity constitutes anything but the pious exterior shell of his teaching—he can have only one *human* enemy: Plato.²²¹ Even Kant is mere epigone in comparison. The classical philosopher of the χωρισμος can only be the deadly enemy of the most sophisticated χωρισμος-annihilator there has ever been *or ever will be*.²²² Without ascribing to the End of History, I am perfectly willing to concede that Hegel has spoken the Last Word on χωρισμος-annihilation.²²³

And that word, of course, is by far the most famous of his Identities: “the Real is the Rational and the Rational is the Real.” But this is hardly the only piece of anti-Platonism in the Preface to the *Philosophy of Right*; it is merely the most quotable. Before turning to this Identity specifically, it

Spinozismus in Hegels *Wissenschaft der Logik*, *Hegel-Studien*, vol. 17, p. 53-74, 1982.

²²⁰ Compare DI GIOVANNI, George. A Reply to Cynthia Willett in DI GIOVANNI, George ed. *Essays on Hegel's Logic*, p. 93-98. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1990; p. 95: “Meaning is no longer the product of forms inherent in nature but the function of goal-directed activity. The heavenly spheres of Aristotle's cosmos are being replaced by the circle of a thought reflecting upon itself.”

²²¹ And this is why GWFH must Hegelianize PLATO, as he does the Lord God who created the universe out of nothing with a Word. Note the Medievalism of the following synthesis at LPH, p. 25 (Volume 2; emphasis mine): “In Plato Philosophy becomes mingled with the knowledge of the supersensuous, or what to us is religious knowledge. The Platonic philosophy is thus the knowledge of the absolutely true and right, the knowledge of universal ends in the state, and the recognition of their validity. In all the history of the migration of the nations, when the Christian religion became the universal religion, *the only point of interest* was to conceive the supersensuous kingdom — which was at first independent, absolutely universal and true — as actualized, and to determine actuality in conformity thereto.” What happened to: “My Kingdom is not of this World”?

²²² Cf. HORSTMANN, Rolf-Peter, Hegel's *Phenomenology of Spirit* as an Argument for a Monistic Ontology, *Inquiry*, v. 49 n. 1, p. 103-118, 2006 at p. 104: “After all, Hegel is the most sophisticated monist of modern times and he is the most resourceful.”

²²³ On this score, NIETZSCHE—who seems to have taken GWFH's Christianity seriously while ignoring that GWFH had convincingly proved the utter impossibility of being “an untimely one”—seems both crude and unoriginal. For GWFH's anticipation of NIETZSCHE's self-deification, see DESMOND, William, Rethinking the Origin: Nietzsche and Hegel in Shawn Gallagher ed., *Hegel, History and Interpretation*, Albany: State University of New York Press, 1997; p. 94: “The metaphysical magic that conjures away the otherness between God and man is black magic.

must be pointed out that the Introduction to the *Philosophy of Right* as a whole is the *locus classicus* of Hegel's attack on the *χωρισμος*. Early on, the position of the *χωρισμος*-creators is stated for polemical purposes.²²⁴ The possibility that there is *a beyond that we do not know* is ridiculed as worse than mere ignorance,²²⁵ it can only lead to relativism.²²⁶ But the Platonist's claim *to know the beyond* is equally objectionable:

This treatise, in so far as it contains a political science, is nothing more than an attempt to conceive of and present the state as in itself rational. As a philosophic writing it must be on its guard against constructing a state as it ought to be.²²⁷

This is not the only passage in the Introduction that appears to be directed as much against Kant as Plato; the “ought” is mentioned once again, and this time in a way that ingeniously conflates Platonism with Relativism: its own worst enemy.²²⁸ But Hegel never actually mentions Kant in the Introduction—the progenitor of “Perpetual Peace” will get more than his share of direct abuse in “International Relations” (see I.3.1)—while Plato is named here repeatedly. Even more significant is the fact is that it is an observation *about Plato* that furnishes Hegel with an excuse to introduce the Identity of the Rational and the Real. To that passage we must now turn.

Hegel begins by defining the terms “rational” and “real” that he later intends to synthesize. Even before the Identity itself is unveiled, his attack

²²⁴ *Philosophy of Right*, p. 4: “On the contrary the spiritual universe is looked upon as abandoned by God, and given over as a prey to accident and chance. As in this way the divine is eliminated from the ethical world, truth must be sought outside of it. And since at the same time reason should and does belong to the ethical world, truth, being divorced from reason, is reduced to a mere speculation.”

²²⁵ *Philosophy of Right*, p. 9: “Since that self-named philosophizing has declared that to know the truth is vain, it has reduced all matter of thought to the same level, resembling in this way the despotism of the Roman Empire, which equalized noble and slave, virtue and vice, honour and dishonour, knowledge and ignorance.”

²²⁶ *Philosophy of Right*, p. 9: “In such a view the conceptions of truth and the laws of ethical observance are simply opinions and subjective convictions, and the most criminal principles, provided only that they are convictions, are put on a level with these laws.”

²²⁷ *Philosophy of Right*, p. 11.

²²⁸ *Philosophy of Right*, p. 11: “If a theory transgresses its time, and builds up a world as it ought to be, it has an existence merely in the unstable element of opinion, which gives room to every wandering fancy... It is just as foolish to fancy that any philosophy can transcend its present world, as that an individual could leap out of his time or jump over Rhodes.”

on the χωρισμος has increased markedly in directness and intensity:

Now, as to genuine philosophy it is precisely its attitude to reality which has been misapprehended. Philosophy is, as I have already observed, an inquisition into the rational, and therefore the apprehension of *the real and present*. Hence it cannot be the exposition of *a world beyond*, which is merely a castle in the air, having no existence except in the terror of a one-sided and empty formalism of thought.²²⁹

The emphasized contrast is perfectly clear: this is a rejection of Platonism. It therefore comes as no surprise that Hegel moves directly to Plato in the next sentence. What is surprising is that he seems to be challenging the notion that Plato was a Platonist; at the very least, his remark appears to be a *non sequitur*.

In the following treatise I have remarked that even Plato's *Republic*, now regarded as the byword for an empty ideal, has grasped the essential nature of the ethical observances of the Greeks.²³⁰

Hegel's point seems to be that although Plato is generally assumed to be the exemplar of a philosopher who builds his "castle in the air," i.e. in "a world beyond," that in fact his *Republic* was about something very *real*: "the essential nature of the ethical observances of the Greeks." In fact, he now proceeds to justify the claim that this Hegelianized Plato's *Republic* is not simply about what ought to be, but about what is; not "the exposition of a world beyond" but "of the real and present."

He knew that there was breaking in upon Greek life a deeper principle, which could directly manifest itself only as an unsatisfied longing and therefore as ruin. Moved by the same longing Plato had to seek help against it but had to conceive of the help as coming down from above and hoped at last to have found it in an external special form of Greek ethical observance. He exhausted himself in contriving how by means of this new society to stem the tide of ruin, but succeeded only in injuring more fatally its deeper motive, *the free infinite personality* [emphasis mine].²³¹

The "deeper principle" against which Hegel's Plato struggles is what Hegel

²²⁹ *Philosophy of Right*, p. 10 (emphasis mine). The block quotations that follow will be from the passage that begins here; they will be quoted in sequence without deletion.

²³⁰ *Philosophy of Right*, p. 10.

²³¹ *Philosophy of Right*, p. 10.

calls “the free infinite personality.”²³² In the light of §185,²³³ the passage to which Hegel had previously referred, the Substantial unity of Greek Ethical Life was being threatened by Subjectivity. Plato is infused with this principle, a *real* principle that he nevertheless senses is subversive of Greek ethical *reality*, but he creates a series of new ethical observances that will hold this subjectivity in check. For example, the exclusion of private property in the Ideal City is but one of the ingenious contrivances he creates “to stem the tide of ruin.” In other words, it was his own “free independent personality” that made it possible for him both to recognize (within himself) and to audaciously attempt to neutralize *that very impulse* by creating an Ideal in which that freedom had no place.

One might well ask what this interpretation has to do with Platonism. There is no metaphysical dualism here and consequently no Idea of the Good. Despite these omissions, Hegel’s is perfectly consistent with the traditional view: Plato created a City *as it ought to be* because Plato did not like the reality of *what is*. Hegel’s interpretive innovations would seem to be two: he conjures up a Plato—not so much Hegelianized as anti-Platonic—who fights against himself *and* he invests the *real* principle against which Plato fights with *rationality*. In other words, the “what is” against which Plato vainly fights is “what ought to be.” And therefore the two are one.

Yet he has proved himself to be a great mind because the very principle and central distinguishing feature of his idea is the pivot upon which the

²³² See VIELLARD-BARON, Jean-Louis, *Platon et l'idéalisme allemand*, Paris: Beauchesne, 1979, p. 362-9.

²³³ *Philosophy of Right*, p. 124; §185 (emphases mine): “Plato in his “Republic” represents the *substantive* ethical life in its ideal beauty and truth. But with the principle of independent particularity, which broke in upon Greek ethical life at his time, he could do nothing except to oppose to it his “Republic,” which is *simply substantive*. Hence he excluded even the earliest form of *subjectivity* [note the opposition of Substance and Subject; thus the *Philosophy of Right* is best understood as GWFH’s anti-*Republic*], as it exists in private property (§46, *note*) and the family, and also in its more expanded form as *private liberty and choice of profession* [cf. LPH, p. 109-10 (Volume 2); the decision about whether to choose “the life of justice” (to say nothing of the philosopher’s choice to return to the Cave) is the heart of PLATO’s masterpiece; GWFH’s misunderstanding could not be more complete]. It is this defect, which prevents the large and substantive truth of the “Republic” from being understood, and gives rise to the generally accepted view that it is a mere dream of abstract thought, or what we are used to calling an ideal. In the merely *substantive form of the actual spirit*, as it appears in Plato, the principle of self-dependent and in itself infinite personality of the individual, *the principle of subjective freedom* does not receive its due.”

world-wide revolution then in process turned: What is rational is real; and what is real is rational.²³⁴

By “his idea”—i.e. “the pivot upon which the world-wide revolution then in process turned”—Hegel does not mean the Idea of the Good or the Ideal City. Nor is Hegel saying—although his presentation is anything but clear—that Plato’s Idea is Hegel’s identity of Real and Rational. Plato’s greatness (according to Hegel) is that he recognized—as proved precisely by his attempt to fight against it—the “deeper principle” of “free independent personality.” With the Incarnation still four hundred years away, Plato is already glimpsing the Revolution of Subjectivity: the annihilation of the *χωρισμός* between God and Man. Although guided by that subjectivity, as Socrates was, Plato nonetheless opposed it by creating a rational Ideal, a rigorously regulated City, to hold it in check. What Plato proposed as “rational,” i.e. the City, was neither real nor rational; what Plato opposed was *both rational and real*. Thus the Identity holds even in the case of Plato’s *Republic*.

The Platonic context of this passage, no less than the forced obscurity of Hegel’s thought process, reveals how dangerous Hegel recognized Plato to be. *It seems that Hegel can only defeat a self-defeating Plato*. In other words: Plato can’t be defeated without Plato’s help. By presenting Plato as locked in dubious battle with Subjectivity—and therefore with Hegel’s version of “Christ”—Hegel manages to obscure the identity of Plato’s real enemy even while unveiling that enemy as himself. Something doubtless should be said about Hegel’s scandalous interpretation of Plato’s masterpiece. The pivotal and decisive role played by the supposedly banished “free independent personality” in Plato’s *Republic*—the dialogue²³⁵ is, after all, about whether Glaucon and the rest will *choose* the life of Justice or follow the counsels of Thrasymachus²³⁶—is the topic for an extended study.²³⁷ But the more important point here is that Plato’s real enemy is more accurately understood as the identity that Hegel has just introduced in so misleading a fashion. As I’ve indicated already, the truth about Platonism is that it combines Hegel’s identity, once understood to apply only to the super-sensuous realm of Being, on one side of the *χωρισμός* with Becoming on the other. Hegel, on the other hand, *is investing Becoming with the identity, reserved by Plato to Being, while denying any separate realm to Being, now redefined as a mere moment of*

²³⁴ *Philosophy of Right*, p. 10.

²³⁵ For GWFH’s disparaging remarks about the dialogue form in PLATO, see LHP, p. 9-15 (Volume II).

²³⁶ See my comments *infra* on *Philosophy of Right* §185 above.

²³⁷ See my unpublished manuscript “Plato the Teacher: The Crisis of the *Republic*.”

Becoming. Although invoked by Hegel's literary technique to *witness* this stunning reversal, "the great mind" of Plato now avails him nothing.²³⁸ Platonism is practically rendered invisible: it is not against Hegel's own *χωρισμός*-annihilation that Hegel's Plato *unconsciously* fights, it is against himself, the inevitable wave of the Future, and the man on the street.

Upon this conviction [sc. that the Identity of the Real and Rational is true] stand not philosophy only but even every unsophisticated consciousness. From it also proceeds the view now under contemplation that the spiritual universe is the natural. When reflection, feeling, or whatever other form the subjective consciousness may assume, regards the present as vanity, and thinks itself to be beyond it and wiser, it finds itself in emptiness, and, as it has actuality only in the present, it is vanity throughout.²³⁹

Hegel no longer needs Plato; the *Republic* is promptly forgotten. In fact, the way he used subjectivity to undermine Plato now threatens to swamp his own argument: it is now Hegel himself who battles with "subjective consciousness." He hardly seems to care. No doubt he can simply invoke some other distinction and show that the subjectivity against which he now fights, is—as distinguished from Plato's nemesis—of the merely formal kind. Naturally *this* kind of "subjective consciousness" is the one unprepared to find itself in complete harmony with either Hegel's State or his System. Such subjectivity knows nothing of Hegel's Freedom or the Eternity of Logical Completeness. And Hegel never scruples to call this kind of Completeness "the Idea."

Against the doctrine that the idea is a mere idea, figment or opinion, philosophy preserves the more profound view that nothing is real except the idea.²⁴⁰

Having used Plato's *Republic* as indirect proof that his identity of the Real and Rational is true, Hegel now uses Plato's word "Idea" to mean exactly the opposite of what Plato had originally meant by it. And with his enemy neutralized through scandalous linguistic indirection and

²³⁸ PEPPERZAK, Adriaan, *Philosophy and Politics: A Commentary on the Preface to Hegel's Philosophy of Right*, Dordrecht: M. Nijhoff, 1987, p. 91: "It is clear—and the following paragraphs strengthen this idea—that Plato accomplished the task of the philosopher in an exemplary fashion, notwithstanding his historically conditioned inability to solve the most essential contradiction constituting the ethical problematic. Hegel *is* able to resolve the tension between the two fundamental principles of politics."

²³⁹ *Philosophy of Right*, p. 10.

²⁴⁰ *Philosophy of Right*, p. 10.

interpretive misdirection, Hegel finally feels comfortable to state his anti-Platonism in its purest possible form:

Hence arises the effort to recognize *in the temporal and transient* the substance, which is immanent, and the eternal, which is present. The rational is synonymous with the idea, because in realizing itself *it passes into external existence*.²⁴¹

Here then is Hegel's primordial linguistic and metaphysical *Umkehrung*. Hegel's "Idea" is the exact opposite of Plato's: it that which realizes itself *in external existence*. But Hegel bastardizes Plato more than any mere Neo-Platonist ever did: the "Idea" doesn't even *descend* into the World Soul; it is never separate enough to do that. *It is eternally immanent*. Its immanence is probably indistinguishable from what Hegel calls "subjectivity." In any case, the eternal is inseparable from the temporal, the substantial from the transient. Why not? The χωρισμος has been annihilated and self-contradiction is therefore the order of the day; the day that lasts forever. But it cannot be accidental that Hegel has chosen to annihilate it in Plato's own presence and, as it were, with his help.

To fully understand the *unconscious* basis of Hegel's procedure—the psychological imperative from which his own portrait of an unconscious Plato emerges—it is necessary to turn to his *Lectures on the History of Philosophy*.²⁴² Hegel concludes the Introduction to these Lectures with three important propositions, all closely connected to the Logical and Chronological Parallel.²⁴³ The *first* is that the oldest thoughts are necessarily the most abstract—no compliment coming from Hegel²⁴⁴—and therefore that none of the older philosophical systems can give any real

²⁴¹ *Philosophy of Right*, p. 10.

²⁴² Note the presence of the *third* proposition I will be discussing at *Philosophy of Right*, p. 11 (mentioned above at p. 73 n. 44); its juxtaposition with GWFH's claims about the unconscious PLATO considered above strengthens the case I will be developing in the context of the considerably fuller discussion found in LHP.

²⁴³ The section (entitled "Further comparison between the History of Philosophy and Philosophy itself") begins with the following sentence at LPH, p. 39 (emphasis mine): "We may appropriate to ourselves the whole of the riches apportioned out in time: it must be shown from the succession in philosophies how that succession [as 'apportioned out in time'] *is* the systematization of the science of Philosophy itself." See DE LAURENTIIS for a recent discussion of this material.

²⁴⁴ LPH, p. 40: "...that which first commences is implicit, immediate, abstract, general—it is what has not yet advanced; the more concrete and richer comes later, and the first is poorer in determinations."

satisfaction to our concerns today.²⁴⁵ There are indications even here, before Plato is mentioned by name, that he is Hegel's principal target throughout,²⁴⁶ just as he obviously is in the Preface to his *Philosophy of Right*.

The *second* proposition is that the latest philosophical system is necessarily the most concrete and therefore the most *complete*.²⁴⁷ This observation is obviously self-serving, especially since it comes from a *living* philosopher who is, moreover, prepared to integrate every previous philosopher into his own System, as his *Lectures on the History of Philosophy* are about to prove. Only those given to thoughts of a distant futurity will realize that a philosopher advancing such a proposition encompasses or envisions thereby his own eventual obsolescence. But Hegel says nothing about this. Instead, he uses this proposition to buttress the first: he claims that we are apt to read our own Modern depths into their Ancient shallows.²⁴⁸ But then he makes a most curious statement:

²⁴⁵ LPH, p. 41: "In applying this to the different forms of Philosophy, it follows in the first place, that the earliest philosophies are the poorest and the most abstract...This must be known in order that we may not seek behind the old philosophies for more than we are entitled to find; thus we need not require from them determinations proceeding from a deeper consciousness." For the deletion, see the following note.

²⁴⁶ The sentence deleted in the previous note seems to apply with particular force to PLATO: it is his "Idea" that is "not yet realized;" hardly the case with GWFH's. "In them the Idea is least determined; *they keep merely to generalities not yet realized*" (LHP, p. 41; emphasis mine). PLATO's name is only mentioned somewhat later; first only in company with ARISTOTLE and then with a larger entourage at LHP, p. 46: "Hence the philosophy of Plato and Aristotle, and indeed all philosophies, ever live and are present in their principles, but Philosophy no longer has the particular form and aspect possessed by that of Plato and of Aristotle. We cannot rest content with them, and they cannot be revived; hence there can be no Platonists, Aristotelians, Stoics, or Epicureans today." But PLATO is subsequently singled out, as will be seen below.

²⁴⁷ LHP, p. 41: "From this it follows—since the progress of development is equivalent to further determination, and this means further immersion in, and a fuller grasp of the Idea itself—that the latest, most modern and newest philosophy is the most developed, richest and deepest. In that philosophy everything which at first seems to be past and gone must be preserved and retained, and it must itself be a mirror of the whole history." This description is clearly self-referential. It is likely, moreover, that GWFH believed that no subsequent philosophical system *would recognize itself to be such*.

²⁴⁸ GWFH calls this "A second consequence has regard to the treatment of the older philosophies" at LHP, p. 42. An astute passage about THALES (proverbially "the first philosopher") is used to illustrate this second consequence at LHP, p. 44: "We ought not by such deductions to make an ancient philosophy into something quite

We are too apt to mould the ancient philosophers into our own forms of thought, but this is just to constitute the progress of development; the difference in times, in culture and in philosophies, depends on whether certain reflections, certain thought determinations, and certain stages in the Notion have come to consciousness, whether a consciousness has been developed to a particular point or not.

Hegel here admits that he too will “mould the ancient philosophers into [his] own forms of thought” but he, unlike those who make the Ancients richer than they are, does so only to illustrate “the progress of development.” Having already considered his interpretation of Plato’s *Republic*, it is a relatively easy matter to decipher what Hegel really means here by “certain reflections, certain thought determinations, and certain stages in the Notion.” Although Plato himself cannot allow “the deeper principle” of subjectivity to “come to consciousness” as such, Hegel is merely showing a just regard to “the difference in times, in culture and in philosophies” by expressing Plato’s one-sidedness in Hegel’s own terms. In this case, the *Begriff* is the reality: subjectivity and objectivity are joined conceptually in Logical Completeness. For Plato, the moment of subjectivity has not come to full self-consciousness: it is present in Plato’s World—it is indeed the Real that is Rational—but Plato cannot see it as such. Plato is blind to the “moment” because he does not possess the Concept. Hegel is not distorting Plato’s thought, he is merely expressing it in terms of its place in “the progress of development.”

In the *Philosophy of Right*, Hegel presented us with a profoundly self-defeating but unconscious Plato, vainly battling against a principle (subjectivity) by which Plato himself is actually being motivated. In other words, Hegel can conceive of the possibility that “a great mind” could fail to realize that the principle it *opposed* was in fact *its own principle*. Consider in this context Hegel’s failure to realize that his own second proposition—i.e. that the last system is necessarily the truest—will eventually annihilate the truth-claims of his own. Hegel evidently fails to realize that the principle that he has proposed—chronological development, Time, History—will be *the undoing of itself*. Hegel injects Time into Philosophy but he needs it to be Finite; hence the scandal of Chronological Completeness. “The historical consciousness,” in retrospect, unquestionably the *Zeitgeist* of the 19th Century, was clearly the “deeper principle” emerging in Hegel’s day: like Plato, he promotes, advances,

different from what it originally was.”

perhaps even creates it. But unlike his self-conflicted Plato, Hegel is completely unaware that “the spurious Infinite” of the Future, i.e. “The Problem of Time in Hegel’s Philosophy of History,” will undo him in the end.

Only *the hypothesis of self-deception* can explain Hegel’s *third* proposition: that each philosophical system belongs only to its own time and cannot apply to any other.²⁴⁹

The first proposition only threatened Hegel *potentially*; the third requires no Future in order to render Hegel himself one-sided and irrelevant.²⁵⁰ Can the philosopher of Absolute Knowledge really be saying that his own System is merely a creature of his specific place and time? Naturally Hegel does not address this issue directly. But the self-referential implications of this blanket charge of historical relativism are even more obvious than was the case with the first proposition. Hegel is prepared to pay a heavy price to diminish the stature of his predecessors:²⁵¹ the first proposition—from which the second and therefore the third logically follow—is important enough to risk all their ugly consequences. Except, of course, if there was no risk to Hegel involved: *he simply failed to see the self-defeating consequences*. If we ask: “How can such a thing be possible? How can a

²⁴⁹ LHP, p. 45 (emphasis mine): “Now, as in the logical system of thought each of its forms has its own place in which alone it suffices, and this form becomes, by means of ever-progressing development, reduced to a subordinate element, each philosophy is, *in the third place*, a particular stage in the development of the whole process and has its definite place where it finds its true value and significance...Therefore every philosophy belongs to its own time and is restricted by its own limitations, just because it is the manifestation of a particular stage in development” For the omitted passage, see two notes below.

²⁵⁰ LHP, p. 45: “Every philosophy is the philosophy of its own day, a link in the whole chain of spiritual development, and thus it can only find satisfaction for the interests belonging to its own particular time.”

²⁵¹ LHP, p. 45 (emphasis mine): “Its [i.e. each “particular stage in the development of the whole process”] special character is really to be conceived of in accordance with this determination, and it is to be considered with respect to this position in order that full justice [an ironic choice of words since GWFH’s account of the *Republic* has omitted consideration of the fact that the dialogue is about Glaucon’s *choice* to lead the life of justice] may be done to it. On this account nothing more must be demanded or expected from it [i.e. an outdated philosophical system] than what it actually gives, and the satisfaction is not to be sought for in it, which can only be found in a fuller development of knowledge [i.e. in GWFH]. *We must not expect to find the questions of our consciousness and the interest of the present world responded to by the ancients; such questions presuppose a certain development in thought.*” Note that this is the passage omitted between the sentences quoted two notes above.

great thinker be so blind?” we have only to remember what Hegel has already told us about Plato.

Hegel gives himself a typically Hegelian way out of these potential problems. In developing the third proposition, he states:

On this account an earlier philosophy does not give satisfaction to the mind in which a deeper conception reigns. What Mind seeks for in Philosophy is this conception which already constitutes its inward determination and the root of its existence conceived of as object to thought; Mind demands a knowledge of itself.²⁵²

How extraordinary that it is precisely Mind's *knowledge of itself* that Hegel believes has made—and will forever make—his System the *ne plus ultra*. Only *Geist* that knows itself as *Geist* has achieved the Logical Completeness of the “consciousness of freedom.” Whenever Mind seeks the *Begriff* that “already constitutes its inward determination,” it will find this in Hegel's System but not in the works of even the most astute among the Ancients, like Plato. Only in Hegel will the reading Subject find its own Substance in what it reads. This is not the case with the other great philosophers:

But in the earlier philosophy the Idea is not yet present in this determinate character. Hence the philosophy of Plato and Aristotle, and indeed all philosophies, ever live and are present in their principles, but Philosophy no longer has the particular form and aspect possessed by that of Plato and of Aristotle.²⁵³

It is particularly interesting to listen to Hegel undermine the foundation of the Renaissance: there can be, he claims, no genuine revival of the dead philosophical systems of the past.²⁵⁴ But even his attack on the Renaissance appears to leave room for an important exception:

Mind had for long possessed a more substantial life, a more profound Notion of itself, and hence its thought had higher needs than such as could be satisfied by these philosophies.²⁵⁵

The thought of the past is therefore not rejected merely because it is past but because it fails to have arrived at a *Begriff* of itself.

²⁵² LPH, p. 45-6.

²⁵³ LHP, p. 46.

²⁵⁴ LHP, p. 46.

²⁵⁵ LHP, p. 47.

With the three propositions now laid out, Hegel reveals his hand: he begins the peroration of his Introduction with the object of his real concern: the appeal of Plato today:

When modern times are in the same way called upon to revert to the standpoint of an ancient philosophy (as is recommended specially in regard to the philosophy of Plato) in order to make this a means of escaping from the complications and difficulties of succeeding times, this reversion does not come naturally as in the first case.²⁵⁶

Already proved a failure during the Renaissance, the contemporary revival of Plato ignores all three of Hegel's propositions: it is necessarily incomplete, it is impoverished by its primitive concerns, and it has no real relevance to any but its own time. We would do just as well to live the life of a Native American or a Palestinian Shepherd.²⁵⁷ The return to Plato would be a barren experience.

On the other hand, the return of the developed, enriched Mind to a simplicity such as this—which means to an abstraction, an abstract condition or thought is to be regarded only as the escape of an incapacity which cannot enjoy the rich material of development which it sees before it, and which demands to be controlled and comprehended in its very depths by thought, but seeks a refuge in fleeing from the difficulty and in mere sterility.²⁵⁸

What a fascinating text! With a rich philosophical development already immanent within us, modern students can only find the abstract, because not conceptualized, content of the lifeless past a mere escape from *the liberating constraints* of Modern (i.e. Hegelian) thought. Mind must not faint before “the rich material” of its own development and “demands to be controlled and comprehended in the very depths” by its own thought, present in the Modern Philosophy as both Substance and Subject. If reading Hegel is an exercise in self-recognition, what more can possibly be expected in the way of development? We know more than we thought we did and the Ancients know much less than their fame suggests.

²⁵⁶ LHP, p. 47.

²⁵⁷ LHP, p. 47: “This discreet counsel has the same origin as the request to cultivated members of society to turn back to the customs and ideas of the savages of the North American forests, or as the recommendation to adopt the religion of Melchisedec which Fichte has maintained to be the purest and simplest possible, and therefore the one at which we must eventually arrive.”

²⁵⁸ LHP, p. 47-8.

There slumber in the Mind of modern times ideas more profound which require for their awakening other surroundings and another present than the abstract, dim, grey thought of olden times. In Plato, for instance, questions regarding the nature of freedom, the origin of evil and of sin, providence, &c., do not find their philosophic answer.²⁵⁹

But Hegel mentions these interesting topics only in passing. As his earlier comments about self-consciousness and Mind recognizing itself as Mind have indicated, the real issue that makes his System the *ne plus ultra* is the development of Absolute Idealism in the mutual self-recognition of Substance and Subject.

The case is similar with regard to questions regarding the limits of knowledge, the opposition between subjectivity and objectivity which had not yet come up in Plato's age. The independence of the within itself and its explicit existence was foreign to him; man had not yet gone back within himself, had not yet set himself forth as explicit.²⁶⁰

Although Hegel suggests that this is simply one more philosophical topic where Plato shows his inadequacy, this is in fact the crux of the matter. Plato had resisted the revolution of Subjectivity: consciousness *qua* the "explicit existence" of "the within itself" had not yet made itself its own principal object. Without knowing—through the mediation of Hegel's "Christ"—that the χωρισμος between Man and God had been abrogated, Plato could not have realized that a search for Truth in the externality of a super-sensuous beyond was merely arid abstraction in comparison with the rich content made possible by a restless and all-inclusive Logical Completeness!

But the final proof of Plato's unconsciousness is visible even to a child. Hegel saves his simplest but strongest argument for last: the Greek and Roman Worlds—and Plato among them—knew only that *some* are Free.

But the fact that man is in and for himself free, in his essence and as man, free born, was known neither by Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, nor the Roman legislators, even though it is this conception alone which forms the source of law. In Christianity the individual, personal mind for the first time becomes of real, infinite and absolute value; God wills that all men shall be saved.²⁶¹

²⁵⁹ LHP, p. 48.

²⁶⁰ LHP, p. 48-9.

²⁶¹ LHP, p. 49.

It is therefore as a liberal Christian committed to progress that Hegel draws to a close:

It was in the Christian religion that the doctrine was advanced that all men are equal before God, because Christ has set them free with the freedom of Christianity. These principles make freedom independent of any such things as birth, standing or culture.²⁶²

With no need to tell his audience about the underlying principles of the Hegelian State—in unquestioning obedience to which they will, as citizens, find themselves just as reflected as they do in his own System—they are thus left with a most uplifting message. Although Plato and the rest are certainly well worth studying—we owe so much to these important way-stations on the long path to our own self-knowledge!—they knew not *that man as such is free*. Imagine listening to the last words of this inspiring speech without any prior acquaintance with the rest of Hegel’s System!

The progress made through them is enormous, but they still come short of this, that to be free constitutes the very idea of man. The sense of this existent principle has been an active force for centuries and centuries, and an impelling power which has brought about the most tremendous revolutions; but the conception and the knowledge of the natural freedom of man is a knowledge of himself which is not old.²⁶³

Their brilliant Professor is prepared to show them, through both the History of Philosophy and the Philosophy of History, that all of the Past has been progressing towards this wondrous End; the “natural freedom of man” he inspiringly calls it. The *self-conscious certainty* of this wondrous vision is doubtless young: Hegel himself has only just discovered it. But no matter how many years may come and go, it is difficult to see how anything could possibly happen that would make such a vision grow old. This, at any rate, is what Hegel wishes his youthful audience to believe.²⁶⁴

Although “Hegel the deceiver” deserves our serious attention,

²⁶² LHP, p. 49.

²⁶³ LHP, p. 49.

²⁶⁴ Consider the conclusion of his “History of Philosophy” lecture course at LHP, p. 553-4 (Volume 3): “I have to express my thanks to you for the attention with which you have listened to me while I have been making this attempt; it is in great measure due to you that my efforts have met with so great a measure of success. And it has been a source of pleasure to myself to have been associated with you in this spiritual community; I ought not to speak of it as if it were a thing of the past, for I hope that a spiritual bond has been knit between us which will prove permanent. I bid you a most hearty farewell.”

especially given the enduring political danger posed by Right Hegelianism, there is now another Hegel and another audience to be considered. Although he may have been able to persuade those eager young Heidelberg students in 1817²⁶⁵—and the even more impressionable youths entrusted to his care at the *Gymnasium* in Nürnberg—that he was a pious Christian, a political Liberal, and a proponent of Progress, he has become, thanks to his quarrel with Plato, something quite different *for us*. Without intruding on the ethical questions involved, I would like to suggest that Hegel’s ability to deceive others is firmly rooted in his own logically and chronologically prior capacity for *self-deception*.

In the context of Berthold-Bond’s dilemma, the hypothesis of an unconscious Hegel makes the conscious Hegel not only the mirror-image of his self-defeating version of Plato *but identical to him*.²⁶⁶ Hegel’s unconscious Plato is at war with himself and with “the deeper principle” emerging in his time. But the creator of the Hegelian System is just as unconscious of the deeper principle emerging in *his*: Hegel’s Plato is thus best understood as Hegel’s *projection*. Just as Hegel’s Plato is unconsciously motivated by the deeper principle of his time (i.e. subjectivity), so also is the unconscious Hegel a product of the nineteenth century *Zeitgeist*, and that in a *double* sense of that term: the spirit of Hegel’s time *was Time itself*. The *conscious* Hegel battles against this incipient *Zeitgeist* at the same time that he unconsciously aids and abets its eventual triumph. On the conscious level, he is the brilliant and caustic critic of Time and in his System, there is no place for this ceaseless process, open-ended towards the future, relativizing all certainties *including his own* in its wake, this *spuriously* infinite, perpetually becoming but never conceptualized thing we call “time.” He *opposes* Time just as his Plato allegedly opposed “the free independent personality” in the *Republic*: he creates his allegedly atemporal System as a circular bulwark against its destabilizing presence.²⁶⁷

²⁶⁵ Six of the seven times that he offered his “History of Philosophy” were in Berlin. See editor’s note at LHP, p. 554 (Volume 3). For student reaction, see NICOLIN, Günther, *Hegel in Berichten seiner Zeitgenossen*, Hamburg: Felix Meiner, 1970, p. 245-56 (Heinrich Gustav HOTH0).

²⁶⁶ BERTHOLD-BOND, p. 117 (emphasis mine): “...Hegel took a wrong turn, an unnecessary and *self-defeating* turn, when he came to suggest an absolute completion of history...”

²⁶⁷ Thus BERTHOLD-BOND, p. 146 (emphasis mine) has lost sight of GWFH and confused him with the *Zeitgeist*: “The main conflict in Hegel is between the view of history and becoming which asserts an “absolute validity” that comes with the ultimate fruition of the teleological development of spirit, and a second view of history and becoming which asserts validity *within* a process of development that goes “ever on and on.” When we actively advocate the second view, and are willing

Thanks to his analysis of Plato, Hegel opens the door to a similar analysis of himself: his defenders are thus in no position to deny the pertinence of a philosopher's unconscious motivations in Hegel's own case. He considers himself an astute enough psychologist to see what Plato is unconsciously doing but in the process, he proves himself to be perfectly blind to his own unconscious motivations. *In fact, he misunderstands entirely what Plato is doing but projects his own situation onto his rival with perfect accuracy.*²⁶⁸ While lecturing on the Philosophy of History and the History of Philosophy, he thinks he can let the genie called "Time" out of its bottle with no ill effects on his own timeless project to know the True as the Whole. But the Future *will out* and there's no way to know what it will bring.²⁶⁹ He so underestimates Time's power that he thinks he can apply Logical Completeness to a Chronological Process like History without scandalous equivocation. He so misunderstands the wellsprings of his own greatest innovation—the Hegelian Dialectic—that he never allows himself to grasp that the dialectical *movement* characteristic and indeed constitutive of *der Begriff* must always already presuppose Chronological Priority. *The Right Hegelians are right about the conscious Hegel.* But the Left Hegelians weren't entirely wrong: it just requires psychopathology to *prove* it.

as a consequence to view the affronting first view **as an unnecessary wrong turn in Hegel's system**, we will be able to move beyond indignation to a logically consistent and philosophically profound view of the nature of history and the meaning of its (episodic, perpetually reoccurring) fulfillment."

²⁶⁸ For PLATO as rival, consider the reference to "Platonists" (the last reference to any specific philosopher) in the concluding lecture on "The History of Philosophy," found at LPH, p. 552-3 (Volume 3): "The latest philosophy contains therefore those that went before; it embraces in itself all the different stages thereof; it is the product and result of those that preceded it. We can now, for example, be Platonists no longer."

²⁶⁹ I continue to be struck by the etymological presence of the Future in *Werden*. Perhaps BERTHOLD-BOND, who is inclined to finding "internal tension" (p. 115) everywhere in GWFH, is on the right track when he describes "Hegel's notion of substance" as an attempt to "synthesize Heraclitean becoming with Spinozistic permanence." (BERTHOLD-BOND, p. 116). If the river ran in a circle, perhaps you *could* step in the same river twice. *But rivers don't run in circles*; thanks to gravity, they flow home to the sea.

Chapter 14 (II.3.3) The Return of the Repressed

Aside from the Oedipal Complex,²⁷⁰ the most useful application of Freud's theories to Hegel directly implicates "The Problem of Time in Hegel's Philosophy of History." By attempting to conceptualize a chronological process in logical terms, Hegel was forced by the temptations of the Logical/Chronological Parallel to presuppose "The End of History"—i.e. Chronological Completeness—in the case of a process that he persuaded himself could be made rational in the only way that anything could be rational: in the context of Logical Completeness. Despite being a pioneer in what we would now call "the application of philosophical thought to historical developments unfolding in time," Hegel's entire mode of thinking remained, at least on the conscious level, profoundly and even radically atemporal.²⁷¹ He persuaded himself that the dialectical process was strictly logical even when he was conceptualizing the events of the past: Time was nothing more than the Logical Idea's negative externalization of itself in Nature, always already restored to eternal unity with itself in Spirit.

Left Hegelians would have none of this scandalous nonsense. Hegel's Philosophy of Nature, including its bizarre conception of Time, was tossed aside while what remained was made to stand on its feet instead of walking on its head. The End of History was postponed until the day after tomorrow and the Future burst forth from the shackles in which Hegel had brilliantly but unsuccessfully attempted to constrain it: it re-emerged as "the return of the repressed." Left Hegelianism was therefore the inevitable result of Hegel's scandalous solution to "The Problem of Time."

²⁷⁰ The ultimate scandal in GWFH's thought—i.e. the substitution of "Absolute Knowledge" for God—is hardly accessible or persuasive in the anti-theological intellectual climate that has been dominant since the First World War (see p. 168 above); if this were not the case, the application of FREUD's categories could be usefully expanded. In absolute indifference to the man "HEGEL" and his earthly father, it would be interesting to show how *the Hegelian System as a whole* represents a murderous assault on "the God of our fathers." Lest I be misunderstood as a Freudian, it should suffice to point out that the author of *Moses and Monotheism* likewise suffered—unconsciously, to be sure—from this particular form of the Oedipal Complex.

²⁷¹ DÜSING, Klaus, *Dialektik und Geschichtsmetaphysik in Hegels Konzeption philosophiegeschichtlicher Entwicklung* in Hans-Christian Lucas and Guy Planty-Boujour eds., *Logik und Geschichte in Hegels System*, p. 127-145. Stuttgart-Bad Canstatt: Fromann Holzboog, 1989; especially p. 142-3.

Bibliography

ABOULAFIA, Mitchell. *The Self-Winding Circle: A Study of Hegel's System*. St Louis: Warren Green, 1982.

ADORNO, Theodor, *Negative Dialectics*, translated by E.B. Ashton, New York: Continuum, 1973.

AHLERS, Rolf, Hegel's theological Atheism, *Heythrop Journal* v. 25, p. 158-177, 1984.

_____. The Dialectic in Hegel's Philosophy of History in Robert L. Perkins ed., *History and System: Hegel's Philosophy of History*, p. 149-166. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1984.

ALTMAN, William H.F. "Platão, Democrata?" Lecture at UFSC; 24 May, 2006.

_____. The Alpine Limits of Jewish Thought: Leo Strauss, National Socialism, and *Judentum ohne Gott*, *Journal of Jewish Thought and Philosophy*, v. 17, p. 1-46, 2009.

_____. *The German Stranger: Leo Strauss and National Socialism*. Lanham: Lexington Books, 2010.

ARANTES, P. A., *Hegel: A ordem do tempo*. Tradução e prefácio de Rubens Rodrigues Torres. Sao Paulo: Hucitec, 2000.

AUSTIN, J.L. A Plea for Excuses, the Presidential Address, *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* (n.s.) 57, p. 1-30, 1956-1957.

AVINERI, Shlomo, Hegel Revisited in Alasdair MacIntyre ed., *Hegel: A Collection of Critical Essays*, p. 329-348. New York: Doubleday, 1972.

BAEKERS, S.F. Geschichte, Zeit und versöhnende Ewigkeit bei Hegel, *Hegel-Studien* v. 29, p. 158-169, 1994.

_____. Die Zeit als Mitte der Philosophie Hegels, *Hegel-Studien* v. 30, p. 121-143, 1995.

BAPTIST, Gabriella. Ways and Loci of Modality: The Chapter "Actuality" in the *Science of Logic* between its Absence in Jena and its Disappearance

in Berlin in George di Giovanni ed., *Essays on Hegel's Logic*, p. 127-143. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1990.

BAUM, Manfred. Zur Vorgeschichte des Hegelschen Unendlichkeitsbegriff. *Hegel-Studien* v. 11, p. 89-124, 1976.

_____. *Die Entstehung der Hegelschen Dialektik*, Bonn: Bouvier, 1986.

_____. Metaphysischer Monismus bei Hölderlin und Hegel, *Hegel-Studien* v. 28, p. 81-102, 1993.

BECK, Lewis White, *A Commentary on Kant's Critique of Practical Reason*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960.

BEISER, Frederick C. *The Fate of Reason: German Philosophy from Kant to Fichte*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1987.

_____. *The Cambridge Companion to Hegel*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1993.

BERTHOLD-BOND, Daniel, Hegel's Eschatological Vision: Does History Have a Future?, *History and Theory* v. 27, no. 1, p. 14-29, 1988.

_____. *Hegel's Grand Synthesis: A Study of Being, Thought, and History*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1989.

BLOOM, Allen, Responses to Fukuyama, *National Interest* 16, p. 19-21, 1989.

BODEI, R. Die "Metaphysik der Zeit" in Hegels Geschichte der Philosophie in Dieter Henrich and Rolf-Peter Horstmann (eds.), *Hegels Logik der Philosophie*. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, p. 79-98, 1984.

BONSIEPEN, Wolfgang. Hegels Raum-Zeit-Lehre; dargestellt anhand zweier Vorlesungs-Nachschriften. *Hegel-Studien* v. 20, p. 9-78, 1985.

BORGES, Maria de Lourdes Alves. *História e Metafísica em Hegel: Sobre a Noção de Espírito do Mundo*. Porto Alegre: EDIPUCRS, 1998.

_____. War and Perpetual Peace: Hegel, Kant, and Contemporary Wars, *ethic@*, v. 5 n. 1, p. 81-90, 2006.

_____. *A Atualidade de Hegel*, Florianópolis: Editora da UFSC, 2009.

BORSCHÉ, Tilman, "Moment" in *Historisches Wörterbuch der Philosophie*, edited by Joachim Ritter and Karlfried Gründer, Basel / Stuttgart: Schwabe & Co, 1984, volume 6, p. 100-108.

BOURGEOIS, Bernard, *Éternité et Historicité de L'Esprit selon Hegel*. Paris: J. Vrin, 1991.

_____. *Hegel; les actes de l'esprit*. Paris: J. Vrin, 2000.

BOUTON, Christophe, Éternité et present selon Hegel, *Revue philosophique*, n. 1, p. 49-70, 1998.

_____. *Temps et Esprit dans la philosophie de Hegel de Francfort à Jéna*. Paris: J. Vrin, 2000.

BRAUER, Oscar Daniel, *Dialektik der Zeit: Untersuchungen zu Hegels Metaphysik der Weltgeschichte*, Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Friedrich Frommann, 1982.

BRAUN, Hermann, Spinozismus in Hegels Wissenschaft der Logik, *Hegel-Studien*, v. 17, p. 53-74.

BUCK-MORSS, Susan, *Hegel, Haiti, and Universal History*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2009.

BURBIDGE, John W., Concept and Time in Hegel, *Dialogue* v. 12, p. 403-22, 1973.

_____. *On Hegel's Logic: Fragments of a Commentary*. Atlantic Highlands: Humanities Press, 1981.

_____. Where is the Place of Understanding in George di Giovanni ed., *Essays on Hegel's Logic*. Albany: State University of New York Press, Albany, 1990.

_____. *Hegel on Logic and Religion: The Reasonableness of Christianity*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992.

_____. Hegel's Open Future in BAUR, Michael and RUSSON, John (eds.), *Hegel and the Tradition: Essays in Honour of H.S. Harris*, p. 176-189, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997.

BURY, J.B. *The Idea of Progress: An Inquiry into its Origin and Growth*. New York: Dover Publications, 1987 (reprint of 1932 original).

BUTLER, Clark, *Hegel's Logic: Between Dialectic and History*, Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1996.

BUTLER, Clark and SEILER, Christiane, *Hegel: The Letters*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984.

CIRNE-LIMA, Carlos, *Beyond Hegel: A Critical Reconstruction of the Neoplatonic System*, <http://www.cirnelima.org/>, 2006.

COOPER, Barry, *The End of History: An Essay on Modern Hegelianism*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1984.

CORNEHL, Peter, *Die Zukunft der Versöhnung: Eschatologie und Emanzipation in der Aufklärung, bei Hegel und in der Hegelschen Schule*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, no date.

CHAFFIN, Deborah G. A Reply to Gabriella Baptist in George di Giovanni ed., *Essays on Hegel's Logic*, Albany: State University of New York Press, 1990.

CRITES, Stephen, For the Best Account of What Hegel Thought (or Should Have Thought) the Next Stage of History, After his Own, Would Be Like, *Review of Metaphysics* v. 16, p. 144-46, 162-63.

DAHLSTROM, Daniel O. Between Being and Essence in Di Giovanni, George ed. *Essays on Hegel's Logic*, p. 99-111. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1990.

DE BOER, Karin, *Thinking in the Light of Time: Heidegger's Encounter with Hegel*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2000.

_____. Begriff und Zeit: Die Selbstentäußerung des Begriffs und ihre Wiederholung in Hegels spekulativem System, *Hegel-Studien* v. 35, p. 11-49, 2002.

DE LAURENTIIS, Allegra, Metaphysical Foundations of the History of Philosophy: Hegel's 1820 Introduction to the "Lectures on the History of Philosophy", *Review of Metaphysics*, v. 59, n. 1, p. 3-31, 2005.

DeVRIES, Willem, The Dialectic of Teleology, *Philosophical Topics*, v. 19, n. 2, p. 51-70, 1991.

DESMOND, William, Rethinking the Origin: Nietzsche and Hegel in Shawn Gallagher ed., *Hegel, History and Interpretation*, Albany: State University of New York Press, 1997.

DI GIOVANNI, George ed. *Essays on Hegel's Logic*, Albany: State University of New York Press, 1990.

_____. A Reply to Cynthia Willett in Di Giovanni, George ed. *Essays on Hegel's Logic*, p. 93-98. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1990.

DUDLEY, Will, *Understanding German Idealism*, Stocksfield: Acumen, 2007.

DUQUETTE, David A. (ed.). *Hegel's History of Philosophy: New Interpretations*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2002.

DÜSING, Klaus, Dialektik und Geschichtsmetaphysik in Hegels Konzeption philosophiegeschichtlicher Entwicklung in Hans-Christian Lucas and Guy Planty-Boujour eds., *Logik und Geschichte in Hegels System*, p. 127-145. Stuttgart-Bad Canstatt: Frommann Holzboog, 1989.

_____. Ontology and Dialectic in Hegel's Thought in LIMNATIS, Nectarios G. (ed.), *The Dimensions of Hegel's Dialectic*, p. 97-122. London: Continuum, 2010.

FACKENHEIM, Emil L. *The Religious Dimension in Hegel's Thought*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1967.

_____. On the Actuality of the Rational and the Rationality of the Actual, *Review of Metaphysics*, p. 690-698, 1970.

FEUERBACH, Ludwig, *Vorlesungen über Logik und Metaphysik (Erlangen 1830-1831)*, edited by ASCHERI, Carlo and THIES, Erich, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1976.

FLEISCHMANN, Eugène, *La Science Universelle ou La Logique de Hegel*, Paris: Librairie Plon, 1968.

FOSTER, Michael, *Hegel's Idea of a Phenomenology of Spirit*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998.

FOUCAULT, Michel, *The Order of Things; An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*. New York: Pantheon, 1971.

FREY, Christopher, *Reflexion und Zeit: Ein Beitrag zum Selbstverständnis der Theologie in der Auseinandersetzung vor allem mit Hegel*, Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1973.

FUKUYAMA, Francis, The End of History? in *The National Interest* 16, p. 3-18, 1989.

_____. *The End of History and the Last Man*. New York: Avon, 1992.

FULDA, Hans Friedrich, *Das Problem einer Einleitung in Hegels Wissenschaft der Logik* (2nd edition), Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1975.

GEACH, Peter, Cambridge Philosophers III: McTaggart. *Philosophy*, v. 70, n. 274, p. 567-579, 1995.

GRIER, Philip T. Abstract and Concrete in Hegel's Logic in Di Giovanni, George ed. *Essays on Hegel's Logic*, p. 59-75. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1990.

_____. The End of History and the Return of History in STEWART, Jon (ed.), *The Hegel Myths and Legends*, p. 183-198, Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1996.

GUYER, Paul, *Kant on Freedom, Law, and Happiness*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000.

HARRIS, Errol E. *An Interpretation of the Logic of Hegel*. Lanham: University Press, 1983.

_____. A Reply to Philip Grier in Di Giovanni, George ed. *Essays on Hegel's Logic*, p. 77-84. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1990.

_____. Hegel's Theory of Sovereignty, International Relations, and War in STEWART, Jon (ed.), *The Hegel Myths and Legends*, p. 154-180, Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1996.

HARRIS, H.S. *Hegel's Development: Towards the Sunlight 1770-1801*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972.

_____. *Hegel's Development: Night Thoughts (Jena 1801-1806)*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983.

_____. The End of History in Hegel in Jon Stewart (ed.), *The Hegel Myths and Legends*, p. 223-236, Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1996.

HAYM, Rudolf, *Hegel und seine Zeit*, Berlin: Rudolf Gärtner, 1857.

HEDWIG, Klaus, Hegel: Time and Eternity in *Dialogue* v. 9, p. 139-53, 1970-71.

HEGEL, G.W.F. *Philosophy of Right*. Translated by T.M. Knox. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1942.

_____. *Early Theological Writings*, translated by T.M. Knox. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948.

_____. *Lectures on the History of Philosophy*. Translated by E.S. Haldane and Frances H. Simson. London: Routledge, 1955.

_____. *The Philosophy of History*. Translated by J. Sibree. New York: Dover, 1956.

_____. *The Phenomenology of Mind*. Translated by J.B. Baillie. New York: Harper & Row, 1967.

_____. *Hegel's Science of Logic*. Translated by A.V. Miller. London: Allen & Unwin, 1969.

_____. *Werke in 20 Bänden*, Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1970.

_____. *Hegel's Philosophy of Mind*. Translated by William Wallace and A. V. Miller. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971.

_____. *Hegel's Logic; Being Part One of the Encyclopaedia of the Philosophical Sciences (1830)*. Translated by William Wallace. Third Edition. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975.

_____. *The Phenomenology of Spirit*. Translated by A.V. Miller. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977.

_____. *The Difference Between Fichte's and Schelling's System of Philosophy*. Translated by H.S. Harris and Walter Cerf. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1977.

_____. *Faith & Knowledge*. Translated by Walter Cerf and H.S. Harris. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1977.

_____. *Political Writings*. Edited by Laurence Dickey and H.B. Nisbet; translated by H.B. Nisbet. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

HEIDEGGER, Martin, *Sein und Zeit*, Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1976.

_____. *An Introduction to Metaphysics*. Translated by Ralph Manheim. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1959.

_____. *Being and Time*. Translated by Joan Stambaugh, Albany: State University of New York Press, 1996.

_____. 25 Jahre nach unserem Abiturium in *Gesamtausgabe*, Bd. 16, Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 2000.

HENRICH, Dieter, *Between Kant and Hegel: Lectures on German Idealism*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993.

HESPE, Franz, "Die Geschichte ist der Fortschritt im Bewußtsein der Freiheit"; Zur Entwicklung von Hegels Philosophie der Geschichte. *Hegel-Studien* v. 26, p. 177-192, 1991.

HOFFMEYER, John F. *The Advent of Freedom: The Presence of the Future in Hegel's Logic*, Rutherford: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1994.

HORSTMANN, Rolf-Peter, Jenaer Systemkonzeptionen in PÖGGELER, Otto (ed.), *Hegel: Einführung in seine Philosophie*, p. 43-58, Freiburg/München: Karl Alber, 1977.

_____. Hegel's *Phenomenology of Spirit* as an Argument for a Monistic Ontology, *Inquiry*, v. 49 n. 1, p. 103-118, 2006.

_____. The Metaphysics of the self: Hegel's Metaphysical of Self-consciousness, Lecture at UFSC, 14 March 2006.

HÖSLE, Vittorio, *Hegels System: Der Idealismus der Subjectivität und das Problem der Intersubjectivität*. 2 vols. Hamburg: Felix Meiner, 1987.

HOULGATE, Stephen, *Hegel, Nietzsche and the Criticism of Metaphysics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

_____. *Freedom, Truth and History: An Introduction to Hegel's Philosophy*. London: Routledge, 1991.

_____. *The Opening of Hegel's Logic: From Being to Infinity*, West Lafayette, Purdue University Press, 2006.

HYPPOLITE, Jean, *Genesis and Structure of Hegel's Phenomenology of Spirit*. Translated by Samuel Cherniak and John Heckman. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1974.

_____. *Logic and Existence*. Translated by Leonard Lawlor and Amit Sen. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1997.

INWOOD, Michael J., *Hegel*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985.

_____. *A Hegel Dictionary*. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 1992.

JACOBI, Friedrich Heinrich, *Concerning the Doctrine of Spinoza in Letters to Herr Moses Mendelssohn in The Main Philosophical Writings and the Novel Allwill*, translated by DI GIOVANNI, George, Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1994.

JAESCHKE, Walter, World History and the History of Absolute Spirit in Robert L. Perkins ed., *History and System: Hegel's Philosophy of History*, Albany: State University of New York Press, 1984.

JANET, Paul, *Études sur la dialectique dans Platon et dans Hégel*, Paris: Librairie philosophique du Ladrance, 1861.

JARCYK, Gwendoline, *Système et Liberté Dans la Logique de Hegel* (2nd edition), Paris: Éditions Kimé, 2001.

JUSZEZAK, Joseph, *Hegel et la Liberté*, Paris: Société d'édition D'enseignement Supérieur, 1980.

KIESEWETTER, Hubert, *Von Hegel zu Hitler; Eine Analyse der Hegelschen Machtstaatsideologie und der politischen Wirkungsgeschichte des Rechthegeianismus*, Hamburg: Hoffmann und Campe, 1974.

KIRK, G. S. and RAVEN, J. E. *The Presocratic Philosophers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1957.

KLEINGELD, Pauline, Kant, history, and the idea of moral development, *History of Philosophy Quarterly*, v. 16, n. 1, p. 59-80, 1999.

KOJÈVE, Alexander, *Introduction à la Lecture de Hegel. Leçons sur la Phénoménologie de l'Esprit professées de 1933 à 1939 à l'École des Hautes-Études*, Paris: Raymond Queneau, 1947.

_____. *Introduction to the Reading of Hegel, Lectures on the Phenomenology of Spirit*. Translated by James H. Nichols Jr. and Allen Bloom. New York: Basic Books, 1969.

KOSOK, Michael, The Formalization of Hegel's Dialectical Logic in Alasdair MacIntyre ed., *Hegel: A Collection of Critical Essays*, New York: Doubleday, 1972.

KOYRÉ, Alexandre. Hegel à Iéna in *Études d'histoire de la pensée philosophique*. Paris: Gallimard, 1971.

KRONER, Richard. *Von Kant bis Hegel*. Two Volumes. Tübingen: J.D.B. Mohr, 1921-24.

KÜNG, Hans, *The Incarnation of God: An Introduction to Hegel's Theological Thought as a Prolegomena to a Future Christology*. Translated by J.R. Stephenson. New York: Crossroad, 1987.

LAKEBRINK, Bernhard, Hegels Metaphysik der Zeit in *Studien zur Metaphysik Hegels*, p. 135-148, Freiburg: Rombach, 1969.

LIMNATIS, Nectarios G. (ed.), *The Dimensions of Hegel's Dialectic*, London: Continuum, 2010.

LOSURDO, Domenico, *Hegel et les libéraux*. Translated by François Mortier. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1992.

LOVEJOY, A.O. *The Great Chain of Being: A Study of the History of an Idea*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1936.

LÖWITH, Karl. Einleitung to *Die Hegelsche Linke*, Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Friedrich Frommann, 1962.

LUCKNER, *Genealogie der Zeit: Zu Herkunft und Umfang eines Rätsels*, Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1994.

MAJETSCHAK, Stefan, *Die Logik des Absoluten. Spekulation und Zeitlichkeit in der Philosophie Hegels*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1992.

MALABOU, Catherine, The Future of Hegel: Plasticity, Temporality, Dialectic. Translated by Lisabeth Doring. *Hypatia*, v. 15, n. 4, 196-220, 2000.

MARCUSE, Herbert, *Hegel's Ontology and the Theory of Historicity*, translated by Seyla Benhabib, Cambridge: MIT Press, 1987.

MAURER, Reinhart Klemens, *Hegel und das Ende der Geschichte; Interpretationen zur »Phänomenologie des Geistes«*, Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1965.

McTAGGART, John and McTAGGART, Ellis, *A Commentary on Hegel's Logic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1910.

McTAGGART, J. Ellis, Time and the Hegelian Dialectic. *Mind* (n.s.) v. 2, n. 8, p. 490-504, 1893.

_____. The Unreality of Time, *Mind* (n.s.), v. 17, n. 68 (Oct., 1908), p. 457-474, 1908.

MEINECKE, Friedrich, *Cosmopolitanism and the National State*, translated by Robert B. Kimber, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1970.

_____. *Die deutsche Katastrophe: Betrachtungen und Erinnerungen*, Wiesbaden: E. Brockhaus, 1947.

MOURELATOS, Alexander P.D. *The Route of Parmenides*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1970.

MURRAY, Michael, Time in Hegel's *Phenomenology of Spirit*, *Review of Metaphysics*, v. 34 n. 4, p. 682-705, 1981.

NICHOLS, James H. Jr., *Alexander Kojève: Wisdom at the End of History*, Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2007.

NICOLIN, Günther, *Hegel in Berichten seiner Zeitgenossen*, Hamburg: Felix Meiner, 1970.

NIETZSCHE, Friedrich. *The Will to Power*. Translated by Walter Kaufmann and R.J. Hollingdale. New York: Vintage, 1968.

NUZZO, Angelica, Dialectic, Understanding, and Reason: How Does Hegel's Logic Begin? in LIMNATIS, Nectarios G. (ed.), *The Dimensions of Hegel's Dialectic*, p. 12-30. London: Continuum, 2010.

O'BRIEN, George, *Hegel on Reason and History*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.

OHASHI, Ryosuke, *Zeitlichkeitsanalyse der Hegelschen Logik; Zur Idee einer Phänomenologie des Ortes*. Freiburg/München: Karl Alber, 1984.

PARKINSON, G.H.R. Hegel, Pantheism, and Spinoza, *Journal of the History of Ideas*, v. 38, n. 3, p. 449-459, 1977.

_____. Hegel's Concept of Freedom in Michael Inwood, *Hegel*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985.

PATTEN, Alan. *Hegel's Idea of Freedom*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

PELCZYNSKI, Z. A. ed., *Hegel's Political Philosophy: Problems and Perspectives*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971.

PEPERZAK, Adriaan, *Philosophy and Politics: A Commentary on the Preface to Hegel's Philosophy of Right*, Dordrecht: M. Nijhoff, 1987.

_____. Hegel contra Hegel in his *Philosophy of Right: The Contradictions of International Politics*, *Journal of the History of Philosophy*, v. 32, n. 2, p. 241-263, 1994.

PERKINS, Robert L. ed. *History and System: Hegel's Philosophy of History*, Albany: State University of New York Press, 1984.

PETRY, M.J. (editor and translator), *Hegel's Philosophy of Nature*. Three Volumes. London: Allen and Unwin, 1970.

PINKARD, Terry, *Hegel; A Biography*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

PIPPIN, Robert B. *Hegel's Idealism: The Satisfactions of Self-Consciousness*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

PLANT, Raymond, *Hegel*. New York: Routledge, 1999.

PÖGGELER, Otto, "Between Enlightenment and Romanticism: Rosenzweig and Hegel" in MENDES-FLOHR, Paul (ed.), *The Philosophy of Franz Rosenzweig*, Hanover: Brandeis University Press, 1988, p. 107-123.

RAMETTA, Gaetano, *Il Concetto del Tempo: Eternità e «Darstellung» speculative nel pensiero di Hegel*, Milano: Franco Angelo, 1989.

REDDING, Paul, *Hegel's Hermeneutics*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1996.

_____. Hegel. *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (online).

REISS, Hans (ed.), *Kant's Political Writings*. Translated by H.B. Nisbet. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970.

RIEDEL, M. Fortschritt und Dialektik in Hegels Geschichtsphilosophie in I. Fetscher ed., *Hegel in der Sicht der Neueren Forschung*, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1973.

RITTER, Joachim, *Hegel and the French Revolution*. Translated by Richard Dien Winfield. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1982.

ROCKMORE, Tom, *Hegel's Circular Epistemology*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986.

ROSEN, Michael, *Hegel's Dialectic and its Criticism*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.

ROSEN, Stanley, *G. W. F. Hegel: An Introduction to the Science of Wisdom*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974.

ROSENFELD, Denis L. *Política e Liberdade em Hegel*. São Paulo: Editora Brasiliense, 1983.

_____. *Politique et liberté; Une étude sur la structure logique de la Philosophie du droit de Hegel*, Paris: Aubier Montaigne, 1984.

ROSENZWEIG, Franz, *Der Stern der Erlösung in Der Mensch und sein Werk; Gesammelte Schriften II*, Haag: Martinus Nijhoff, 1976.

_____. *Hegel und der Staat*, München / Berlin: R. Oldenbourg, 1920.

RÜHLE, Volker, Jacobi und Hegel; Zum Darstellungs- und Mitteilungsproblem einer Philosophie des Absoluten, *Hegel-Studien* v. 24, p. 159-182, 1989.

RUSSELL, Bertrand, *History of Western Philosophy*, London: George Allen and Unwin, 1946.

SCHACHT, Richard L. Hegel on Freedom in Alasdair MacIntyre ed., *Hegel: A Collection of Critical Essays*, New York: Doubleday, 1972.

SCHMITT, Carl, *The Concept of the Political*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996.

SCHULZ, Walter, Hegel und das Problem der Aufhebung der Metaphysik in Günther NESKE (ed.), *Martin Heidegger zum siebzigsten Geburtstag*, Pfullingen: Neske, 1959, p. 67-92.

SMITH, Steven B. *Hegel's Critique of Liberalism: Rights in Context*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989.

SOLOMON, Robert C. *In the Spirit of Hegel*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983.

SPEIGHT, Allen, *The Philosophy of Hegel*, Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2008.

STERN, Alfred. *Philosophy of History and the Problem of Values*. The Hague: Mouton, 1962.

STRAUSS, Leo, *The Political Philosophy of Hobbes; Its Basis and Genesis*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1952 (first published Great Britain in 1936).

_____. *Persecution and the Art of Writing*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1952.

_____. *Natural Right and History*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953.

_____. *What is Political Philosophy?* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1959.

_____. *Spinoza's Critique of Religion*, New York: Schocken Books, 1965.

_____. *Studies in Platonic Political Philosophy*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983.

_____. *The Rebirth of Classical Political Rationalism*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989.

_____. *On Tyranny; Including the Strauss-Kojève Correspondence*. Victor Gourevitch and Michael S. Roth eds. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.

_____. *Gesammelte Schriften*, edited by Heinrich Meier, with the editorial assistance of Wiebke Meier, Volume 3: *Hobbes' Politische Wissenschaft und zugehörige Schriften; Briefe*, Stuttgart and Weimar: J. B. Metzlar, 2001.

TAYLOR, Charles, *Hegel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975.

_____. *Kant's Theory of Freedom in Philosophy and the Human Sciences: Philosophical Papers 2*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.

THEUNISSEN, Michael, *Die Verwirklichung der Vernunft: Zur Theorie-Praxis-Discussion im Anschluss an Hegel*, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1970.

_____. *Hegels Lehre vom absoluten Geist als theologische-politischen Traktat*, Berlin: De Gruyter, 1970.

TRENDELENBURG, Adolf, *Logische Untersuchungen*, Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1862.

TUGENDHAT, Ernst, *Selbstbewußtsein und Selbstbestimmung; Sprachanalytische Interpretationen*, Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1979.

TUNICK, Mark. Hegel's Justification of Hereditary Monarchy, *History of Political Thought*, v. 12, p. 481-496, 1991.

UTZ, Konrad, *Die Notwendigkeit des Zufalls; Hegels speculative Dialektik der »Wissenschaft der Logik«*, Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 2001.

VIELLARD-BARON, Jean-Louis, *Platon et l'idéalisme allemand*, Paris: Beauchesne, 1979.

_____. *Hegel et l'idéalisme allemand; Imagination, speculation, religion*. Paris: J. Vrin, 1999.

_____. L'Idee Logique, L'Idee de la Philosophie et la Structure Théologico-Historique de la Pensée de Hegel, *Hegel-Studien* v. 38, p. 61-82, 2003.

VINCENT, Andrew, The Hegelian State and International Politics, *Review of International Politics*, v. 9, p. 191-205, 1983.

WALLACE, Robert M. *Hegel's Philosophy of Reality, Freedom, and God*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

WALSH, W.H. Principle and Prejudice in Hegel's Philosophy of History in Z. A. Pelczynski ed., *Hegel's Political Philosophy: Problems and Perspectives*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971.

WANDSCHNEIDER, Dieter and HÖSLE, Vittorio, Die Entäusserung der Idee zur Natur und ihre zeitliche Entfaltung als Geist bei Hegel. *Hegel-Studien* v. 18, p. 173-199, 1973.

WANDSCHNEIDER, Dieter, *Raum, Zeit, Relativität: Grundbestimmungen der Physik in der Perspektive der Hegelschen Naturphilosophie*, Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1982.

WENDT, Alexander, Why a World State is Inevitable, *European Journal of International Relations*, v. 9, n. 4, p. 491-542, 2003.

WESTPHAL, Merold, Hegel and the Reformation in Robert L. Perkins ed., *History and System: Hegel's Philosophy of History*, Albany: State University of New York Press, 1984.

_____. *History and Truth in Hegel's Phenomenology* (3rd edition), Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1998.

WILKINS, Burleigh Taylor, *Hegel's Philosophy of History*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1974.

WINFIELD, Richard Dien, The Theory and Practice of the History of Freedom: On the Right of History in Hegel's Philosophy of Right in Robert L. PERKINS ed., *History and System: Hegel's Philosophy of History*, p. 123-144. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1984.

_____. Space, Time and Matter: Conceiving Nature Without Foundations in HOULGATE, Stephen (ed.), *Hegel and the Philosophy of Nature*, p. 51-69, Albany: State University of New York Press, 1998.

YOVEL, Yirmiyahu, *Dark Riddle: Hegel, Nietzsche, and the Jews*, University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1998.