

# Tiago da Costa e Silva

---

## The universe, human and growth: Charles S. Peirce's contributions to a culture of love

---

Studia Kulturoznawcze nr 1 (7), 213-225

---

2015

Artykuł został opracowany do udostępnienia w internecie przez Muzeum Historii Polski w ramach prac podejmowanych na rzecz zapewnienia otwartego, powszechnego i trwałego dostępu do polskiego dorobku naukowego i kulturalnego. Artykuł jest umieszczony w kolekcji cyfrowej [bazhum.muzhp.pl](http://bazhum.muzhp.pl), gromadzącej zawartość polskich czasopism humanistycznych i społecznych.

Tekst jest udostępniony do wykorzystania w ramach dozwolonego użytku.

TIAGO DA COSTA E SILVA

Universität der Künste, Berlin  
Graduiertenkolleg "Das Wissen der Künste"

## **The universe, humans, and growth: Charles S. Peirce's contributions to a culture of love**

### **Introduction**

The term *culture* has over the last century gained broader, multi-layered, and multi-disciplinary meanings: on the one hand there is the more general meaning of *culture*, being the description of the human capacity to create signs from acquired experiences, as well as to achieve higher degrees of abstract and creative thinking. On the other hand there is a more specific description of distinct sets of individuals and communities, their potentialities, conducts, beliefs, their economic, political and social aspects, as well as their religious usages and practices.

Although these definitions may elucidate many aspects of human nature, they come up against some disciplinary difficulties, since for example they come from different fields of research, such as Anthropology, Sociology, Economic Sciences, History, and Cultural Studies, and are bound to a dichotomy, which renders the problem of comprehension of these distinctive aspects difficult to solve. The first difficulty is that the concept of culture is restricted to the realm of the human and its dichotomy: community-individual. These are clearly present in the very essence of the definitions of culture as a byproduct of human actions. The human is therefore placed at the center of inquiry. Community, nations – everything collective – is formed by a collection of definite individuals. The human individual is regarded as the minimal element of this inquiry. These considerations are based on apparent symptoms of human societies and relations; but they are not the entirety. As symptoms, they function as indexes.

The individual, no doubt, is that through which these ideals, triggering the cultural process, become embodied. However, the human is not the end of the cultural process, but a phase of perception and embodiment of the ideals. Per-

haps it was this vision of the creation and transmission of culture that caused Ernst Cassirer, in *An Essay on Man*, to state that the human is to be defined as a being that creates symbols and through a broader range of symbols is able to attain a more complete relation with others and with the surrounding environment. Therefore the concept of Reason – in the exact sense of Kant and of the 18th-century Enlightenment – is extremely inadequate to comprehend the forms of human culture in its totality and complexity (Cassirer, 2010).

In this paper I aim to avoid the pronounced dichotomy between a particular set of individuals and a general community by analyzing the phenomena from a different standpoint. Instead of arguing from a rather anthropocentric perspective, by placing the human as the producer of culture, I shall investigate the formation of culture – the action of cultivation – from the perspective of the ideals that induce culture. Charles S. Peirce's philosophy will provide the major framework for the task at hand: while starting from the ideals that will trigger the cultural process, it will be necessary to discuss the theory of habit-formation, which permeates Peirce's thought. His theory of habit-formation is the cornerstone that joins the individual – as a beam of habits – and the general. By studying this genetic aspect of cultural formation, the question of the formation of new habits will also be addressed. What kind of process allows the formation of a culture that leads individuals to be more in consonance with other individuals, as well as with their world? The answer to this question – which will shed light upon the problem of formation of culture and the act of cultivation, upon the relation between individual and community – will require the application of Peirce's Agapism, that is, his hypothesis of growth and evolution through a law of love.

The argument, presenting the formation of culture through growth from a law of love, will be developed in two sections. First, I shall present and develop the concept of evolutionary love according to Peirce's ontological hypothesis. In the second section, I concentrate on the discussion between individual and community through the light of normativity and ideals. Here it will be necessary to briefly outline some of the most important aspects of Peirce's ideas with which I work, with special emphasis on his theoretical conception of ideals of conduct and the normative sciences. The concluding section of this paper will discuss the practical bearings of this hypothesis of a culture of love and its consequences relating the human and the universe towards the growth through love.

## **Section I**

### **Evolutionary love, agapism and continuity**

Helmut Pape, in his paper *Love's power and the causality of mind*, propounds a vigorous argument concerning the formation and development of culture.

“Love as agape, the sympathetic attraction exerted on us by people, things or ideas, is an attitude that creates the habits of the heart” (Pape, 1997: 59). I agree with Pape’s view that this sympathetic attraction creates habits of heart. However, I would like to develop this argumentation more in relation to culture.

Agape, for Peirce, is the ultimate creative love, the most powerful form of creation and evolution: it creates forms, sends them into their existence and draws them to a form of continuously evolving harmony between these elements. In Peirce’s words:

The movement of love is circular, at one and at the same impulse projecting creations into independency and drawing them into harmony. This seems complicated when stated so; but it is fully summed up in the simple formula we call the Golden Rule (W 8: 185).

Agape is the ontological creative and uniting power; it is the conducting force behind cultural evolution, which motivates individuals to embody something which is beyond their current actuality, their mind configuration and the structure or form of conduct of their lives. Helmut Pape states that “human culture is governed by mental factors because it is governed by the final causality of purposes, plans, intentions, goal-directed behavior and the desire to be related to people and the world by the life one leads” (Pape, 1997: 59–60).

Indeed, the highest evolutionary principle, which accounts for the development of both nature and culture, is, according to Peirce, Love, in one particular sense, which operates as guideline for coalescence and fusion between ideas towards a generative evolution, and hence towards the complexification of the cosmos. The movement of this cosmic love is “circular,” that is, in one blow it projects its creations into independency and draws them into harmony (W 8: 185). And this process should be understood in the light of continuity. With his “Monist” series of 1891–1893 Peirce conceived his evolutionary cosmology and placed the highest principle in the theory of *Agapism*, i.e., the proposition that the law of love is severally operative in the cosmos (W 8: 194). It is a principle that begets order and thus forms new paradigms, as Peirce describes it (EP 2: 145–159).<sup>1</sup> With Peirce’s general conception of mind, and thus pushing

---

<sup>1</sup> In the second Harvard Lecture, “On Phenomenology,” delivered in April 1903, Peirce maintains his position which will be one of his leading arguments in terms of principles of evolution, that is, the tendency of forming habits. In the text *Evolutionary Love*, from 1892, Peirce had already developed this evolutionary theory in this famous metaphysical series of 1891–1892 and also in the eight Cambridge Lectures of 1898. This theory, which will be developed in detail further in this study, shows that there is an operative tendency of the mind in expanding itself and acquiring habits, and that chaotic and irrational ideas tend [...] to become more determinate and ordered under the influence of an evolutionary teleology. This metaphysical and cosmological basis will be crucial for the development of the very notion of a summum bonum in the later phase of Peirce’s philosophy. See also for example W 8: 184–207.

his cosmology and ontology towards a sophisticated form of logical idealism, as discussed before, he then places the evolutionary principle within a special form of Lamarckism,<sup>2</sup> which is a form of “growing by exercise,” where “mental commissures are habits” (W 8: 193–194). The cosmos, as Peirce says, because it is mind, and therefore has life, is capable of further evolution, growth. “Love, recognizing the germs of loveliness in the hateful, gradually warms it into life, and makes it lovely” (W 8: 185–186). Growth by exercise takes place in the mind and is what it means *to learn* (W 8: 193–194). In order to learn, or to acquire new chosen habits, the mind must have been attracted to those ideas – neither heedlessly, nor by mere forces of circumstances, but by an immediate attraction for the idea itself, which seems to have a divine power within. In the case of culture, growth comes only from love, from “an *ardent impulse to fulfill another’s highest impulse*” (W 8: 193–194, italics are mine). As Peirce puts it, love motivates to “sacrifice your own perfection to the perfectionment of your neighbor” (W 8: 185).

It seems to me that the meaning of culture is embedded with the aforementioned dynamic: epistemologically, the term culture, which defines what we, humans, today have and seek to defend and develop, is derived from a simple, but very significant Latin verb, *colere*. In ancient times this meant the act of cultivation of an acre, to cultivate and prepare the earth in order to create a plantation. I will consider not only the actual usage of the term culture – which still bears this more original meaning, as in a plantation – but also the more abstract meaning which has come to represent the state of development of a certain human group. I will take the term culture in its more logical-relational meaning, as aforementioned, and also as in the following passage:

Suppose, for example, that I have an idea that interests me. It is my creation. It is my creature; [...] it is a little person. I love it; and I will sink myself in perfecting it. It is [...] by cherishing and tending them as I would the flowers in my garden (W 8: 185).

Peirce’s mature philosophical and scientific inquiries had led him to believe that the only plausible metaphysical model, which would comprise an evolutionary form of cosmology, would be some form of an objective idealism, which holds that matter is but a specialization of *mind*, effete mind so to speak, and that mind is older than matter. In other words: the inner world, which is *mind*, is older than the outer, in which the matter, as a special phase of mind,

---

<sup>2</sup> I believe that a thorough discussion of the main aspects of the most prominent and influential theories of evolution will be useful in order to fully grasp the meaning of the three forms of evolution described by Peirce. He also associates these three forms of evolution with his categories, and especially a special form of Lamarckism with his thirdness, with evolutionary aspects and with Agapism.

has been defined and specialized. Peirce clearly defends this position by stating that “if you were to call my philosophy Schellingism transformed in the light of the modern physics, I should not take it hard” (W 8: 185).<sup>3</sup>

Moreover, Peirce develops and maintains a specific form of objective idealism, also called *logical idealism*, as the only possible and arguable philosophical position which allows the development and operation of an evolutionary principle, without which it would be impossible to conceive either an intelligible theory of the universe or a sound philosophy (W 8: 106). In this particular version Peirce develops the concept that logical idealism, now structured as a variation of the wider objective idealism, comprises the conception of mind as a process, which has been thoroughly and deeply modified through mathematical and logical concepts, especially the ones derived from the logic of relatives, thus modifying and renewing the old tradition through modern scientific developments that render it possible to be thought generally in terms of an architectural and evolutionary philosophy.<sup>4</sup>

The major difference between the traditional form of objective idealism and Peirce’s own version of it is that while the traditional objective logic holds that the identity between mind and matter at the very beginning of the process of inquiry can be assured, Peirce accounts for this identity – or connaturality between mind and matter – by placing it as a hypothesis at the very end of an ideal process of inquiry (Pape, 1997: 361). According to Peirce, “every attempt to understand anything – every research – supposes, or at least hopes, that the very objects of study themselves are subject to a logic more or less identical with that which we employ” (RLT: 257). Since Peirce does not accept any kind of transcendental argument, it becomes necessary to hold that it *may be*, in the process of inquiry, ascertainable. If the connaturality of mind and matter should be held as a sound hypothesis that explains some events – for example

---

<sup>3</sup> In one particular passage it is possible to perceive why he said that he would not “take it hard” if his philosophy were to be identified as a form of Schellingism. He says: “I may mention, for the benefit of those who are curious in studying mental biographies, that I was born and reared in the neighborhood of Concord – I mean Cambridge – at the time when Emerson, Hedge, and their friends were disseminating the ideas that they caught from Schelling, and Schelling from Plotinus, from Boehm, or from God knows what minds stricken with the monstrous mysticism of the East. But the atmosphere in Cambridge held many an antiseptic against Concord transcendentalism; and I am not conscious of having contracted any of that virus. Nevertheless, it is probable that some cultured bacilli, some benignant form of the disease was implanted in my soul, unawares, and that now, after long incubation, it comes to the surface, modified by mathematical conceptions and by training in physical investigations” (W 8: 135, italics are mine).

<sup>4</sup> The very conception of a “final purpose,” a “final state” or “highest principle,” i.e. of a form of *summum bonum*, plays a major and a decisive role in Peirce’s later philosophy. His conception of this final idealization is quite singular in the modern philosophical tradition; moreover it is somehow abandoned nowadays, as if it were nothing more than a curious piece of some useless philosophical decoration.

our ability to guess the secrets of nature, the security of general forms of instinct, the connaturality between some natural processes and some processes of the human mind – the community of inquiry must verify it *in the long run* in order to ascertain it scientifically – with a sound method of inquiry – and then to be able to hold this hypothesis as a reality of nature (Pape, 1989: 361).<sup>5</sup>

It follows then that the root of all being should be *One*; and if two elements of a given state of things possess the same characteristics, they partake of an identical being. Second, if we make an analysis of the observed facts, drawing a general induction from them, we find that all realization of existence lies in some form of opposition, such as attractions, repulsions, visibilities, and centers of potentialities generally. Finally, we find the law that the *end of being* and *highest reality* are the living impersonation of the idea that *evolution generates* (CP 1.487).

The agapastic development of thought is the adoption of certain mental tendencies, not altogether heedlessly [...], nor quite blindly as the mere force of circumstances or of logic [...], but by an immediate attraction for the idea itself, whose nature is divined before the mind possesses it, by the power of sympathy, that is, by virtue of the continuity of mind (W 8: 196).

Conclusively, love is not only a religious or a personal emotional feeling, but is also a logical living principle that requires the continuity of its application for the purpose of developing itself in the world. In this sense I will further develop Peirce's concept of love in order to render it applicable within the domain of culture. In the next sections I will further develop the concept of love, its relation with the individual and with the community, and its importance for the idea of culture.

## Section II

### Individual, community, normative ideals

As was noted in the introduction, there is a dualistic tension between the terms "individual" and "community" in most discussions of culture. The term "individual" is used as a minimal unity within social studies. It is equivalent to say that an individual is a person, and a set of persons within a cultural context forms a community. Most cultural studies take it for granted that the human,

---

<sup>5</sup> Helmut Pape affirms that: "Obwohl Peirce also mit Schelling und Hegel die These teilt, dass Geist und Materie identisch sind, so unterscheidet sich sein Idealismus vom absoluten Idealismus in der Beurteilung der Bedingungen, unter denen diese Identitätsaussage sich als wahr zu erweisen hat. [...] Von Schelling [...] unterscheidet Peirce sich genau dadurch, dass er die notwendige Identität von Geist und Materie nicht als Voraussetzung an den Anfang stellt, sondern an das Ende eines Evolutionsprozesses."

as person, i.e. singular, particular, and the community, as a general aspect of it, are the object of inquiry. It is not my intention in this paper to develop this argumentation, for it would require a whole new line of research within the subject matter of cultural studies. I shall bypass it by introducing a new connection in terms of forming and shaping culture towards an aim, which is the agape.

In order to be able to apply the hypothesis of the agape within the conduct of a person, and therefore construct the argumentation for a culture based upon love, it is necessary, first, to discuss within Peirce's philosophical background the meaning of these terms "individual" and "community." What in fact, in the light of Peirce's philosophy, is an "individual"? To clarify this, I make reference to a passage in his writings where he affirms: "I, myself, properly speaking, do not exist. It is only a replica of me that exists, and I exist in that replica as the effect of my being as a law" (NEM 3/2: 368).

Peirce means by this that an *individual* is, in his understanding, a form of actualization, that is, an embodiment of a conduct, which exists "here-and-now" and is a replica of his whole being as a law, or as a bundle of habits. While every person gathers experience in the course of life, that person will develop a set of particular habits of conduct. These habits will be a disposition to act in a certain way. This disposition to act is what Peirce calls a bundle of habits. But to act, that is, to embody the habit in the world of existents, is an actualization of the habit, of that being as a law. Peirce explains the relation between individual and community in the following passage:

[...] a person is not absolutely an individual. His thoughts are what he is "saying to himself;" that is, is saying to that other self that is just coming into life in the flow of time. When one reasons, it is that critical self that one is trying to persuade; and all thought whatsoever is a sign, and is mostly of the nature of language. The second thing to remember is that the man's circle of society (however widely or narrowly this phrase may be understood), is a sort of loosely compacted person, in some respects of higher rank than the person of an individual organism (CP 5.421, 1905).

Following this passage, it is possible to draw some conclusions as regards the *continuity* (CP 6.173)<sup>6</sup> between person, individual and community. In this sense, there is a connecting principle between these two elements within the social organization. From a sheer biological perspective, there must be a living condition to embody life; but one individual organism is not an individual nor a person, but an instance of the embodiment of one's bundle of habits. Life manifests in several forms, and, as Peirce argues within his philosophical

---

<sup>6</sup> This logical principle, *synechism*, derived from the Greek word *synechismós*, *synechés*, "is that tendency of philosophical thought which insists upon the idea of continuity as of prime importance in philosophy and, in particular, upon the necessity of hypotheses involving true continuity."



context, life cannot and does not reduce itself to a set of particular organic individuals. Rather, the several organic individuals are the manifestation of life, of a broader form of mind, which is life. And it is the same with the social and cultural context. In this regard, Peirce explains:

Now you and I – what are we? Mere cells of a social organism. Our deepest sentiment pronounces the verdict of our own insignificance. Psychological analysis shows that there is nothing which distinguishes my personal identity except my faults and limitations – or if you please, my blind will, which it is my highest endeavor to annihilate (CP 1.615; Aydin, 2009: 438).

With this, Peirce introduces his own version of community.<sup>7</sup> To explain it he takes the direction of scientific development, which was Peirce's first concern. But in time he will have developed his own fruitful theory of community; this theory will have its pinnacle with the latest developments of his semiotic pragmatism in the early part of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Peirce suggests that the development of thought through research is a sort of social phenomenon, if it is considered that thinking is not a singular capability of some particular and isolated brain inside a skull. As an argument for this, Peirce conceives from early on that researchers in different places at different times could reach the same results or develop the same processes of inquiry without knowing each other; and this is a well-known phenomenon in both the scientific and artistic worlds. Moreover he considers mind as a general entity, whose capabilities for seeking the truth will be best embodied in some community of inquirers, which he regards as the more important reasoning entity, and as we shall see, even taking into account the philosophical reformulations and changes in Peirce's thought, he will hold this general concept of *mind* almost unchanged.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> Peirce's conception of a community has not however reached the same maturity as, for example, Josiah Royce's concept of community. In Royce's monumental work *The World and the Individual*, he develops a mature conception of community and individual, although not based on semeiotic principles as Peirce tried to do.

<sup>8</sup> See, for comparison, the latest conceptions of mind, consciousness and semiosis in: Peirce, 1983. This book is a complete German translation from the manuscripts of the "Syllabus of certain topics of Logic" (1903) by Helmut Pape. See especially pp. 170–171. See also EP 2: 371–397, "The Basis of Pragmatism in the Normative Sciences." These manuscripts, which have been partially published, some in "The Monist" (1906), offer one of the latest rearrangements of the role of pragmatism, normative sciences, and the concept of semiosis in Peirce's later thought. Those modifications, however, present no antagonism whatever to Peirce's earlier notions of a community of inquirers and semiosis. I particularly agree with Helmut Pape when he states that there is no point in dividing Peirce's philosophical developments into three or four distinct phases. What has to be considered is the very continuity of his thought, which presents progressive corrections in its development. I also agree with Andre de Tienne, when he affirms that if one wants to understand Peirce's philosophy seriously, it would be wise to include in one's studies Peirce's earlier notions on scientific inquiry, in order to understand

As a remarkable feature of medieval thought and its *modus operandi* Peirce emphasizes the greatness of the cultural and intellectual products of that age, in which the individual gives room for the community, revealing the “complete absence of self-conceit on the part of the artist or philosopher,” whose works were designed not to conceive his ideas but the universal truth (W 2: 465). Generally Peirce also believes that “all the greatest achievements of mind have been beyond the powers of unaided individuals” (W 8: 203). Furthermore, he adds that “apart from the support this opinion receives from synechistic considerations, and from the purposive character of many great movements,” there would be “a direct reason for so thinking in the sublimity of ideas and in their occurring simultaneously and independently to a number of individuals of no extraordinary powers” (W 8: 438).

Peirce’s first formulation of what would be known as the semiotic pragmatic maxim reinforces his anti-transcendentalism, for he argues, firstly, that being is one thing and being represented is another, and secondly, that whatever that can be represented to have being, has its being in the practical effects it could produce in some mind (Parker, 1998: 17). Furthermore, Peirce attaches to this the value of a general method of inquiry based in the general idea of “progressivity” of knowledge, a continuous form of inquiry having its *télos* in some ideal final of a given process of inquiry, which, if held long enough, should approximately reach the truth. He often calls it the third grade of clearness, which “consists in such a representation of the idea that fruitful reasoning can be made to turn upon it, and that it can be applied to the resolution of difficult practical problems” (Peirce, 1987). In order to achieve this grade of clearness of apprehension, Peirce formulated a general rule, which runs as follows: “Consider what effects, which might *conceivably* have *practical bearings*, we conceive the object of our conception to have. Then *our conception* of these effects is the *whole of our conception of the object*” (W 3: 266, italics are mine).<sup>9</sup>

However vague it may seem to be, Peirce’s argumentation in defense of this community states that a scientist must recognize the logical necessity of a self-identification with the interests of the community. In order to discover some secrets of nature one must strive to develop the way of thinking of a truly committed scientist. The views of this scientist reveal some scientifically valid inferences which must be adopted by someone who wishes to discover some secret aspects of nature. Finally Peirce affirms that this ideal perfection

---

how he deals with early philosophical problems, which furnished him with answers and mature ideas with which to deal with the later problems of his system.

<sup>9</sup> This is the famous maxim of the pragmatism in its inaugural formulation of 1878; it first appeared in the article *How to Make our Ideas Clear*, published in “Popular Science Monthly” January 12, 1878, pp. 286–302.

of knowledge – by which we should suppose that reality is constituted – must thus belong to a community in which this identification is complete (W 2: 271). And this early conception of science and community led him to develop his idea of science as being the concrete body of the proper activities of the inquirers, “in seeking such truth as seems to them highly worthy of life-long devotion, and in pursuing it by the most critically chosen methods, including all the help both general and special that they can obtain from one another’s information and reflection” (EP 2: 372).

Although this concept of the community of inquiry, along with its attached notion of an infinite hope (EP 2: 271–272), has a great potential to be a successful and logically sound *Erkenntnislehre*,<sup>10</sup> or theory of knowledge, it nonetheless presents some problematic and counterfactual operational aspects. However, Peirce will rely on the regulative principle of synechism, or continuity, which will guarantee the continuity of the possibility of knowledge by investigating what sort of hypothesis is fit to be entertained and examined in the process of inquiry (CP 6.173).<sup>11</sup> The ultimate purpose of thought is, in this sense, according to Peirce, quite beyond actual human comprehension. But it can be approached asymptotically: that is, through the indefinite replication of self-control upon self-control, the human’s feeling, conduct and thought can be developed through experience and learning and he thus grows a general highest ideal – not for himself as an individual, but to be part of a greater evolutionary plan, or as Peirce puts it, to take “the share which God permits him to have in the work of creation” (CP 5.402, 1906). The highest ideal, as Peirce stated, appears to us as a thoroughly developed bearing towards a disposition that will enable one to develop a feeling towards which ideals one has to orient themselves, and which determines further habits of feeling, habits of conduct, and habits of thought which one has to establish and to grow towards the discovery of further better ideals. By following this path, one – a person – embodies these ideals further and further, thus shaping her as well as the community’s life.

This ideal is conceived as a qualitative form of the unity of reality and will be conceived, in Peirce’s later philosophy, as a part of the development of concrete reasonableness in the world (EP 2: 377–378).<sup>12</sup> Here a strong link is sug-

<sup>10</sup> In this work I will translate the German concept *Erkenntnislehre* as theory of knowledge, for the use of the word epistemology would present some technical complications.

<sup>11</sup> An excerpt of Peirce’s 1902 definition of Synechism in *Baldwin’s Dictionary of Philosophy and Psychology*, vol. 2, The Macmillan Co., New York 1902, p. 657.

<sup>12</sup> Esthetics turns out to have the most general aspect of an axiological echelon within the normative sciences: this particular science must deliberately conceive the highest ideal, which appears as a habit of feeling that reasonably recommends itself in itself, and is therefore worthy of being identified, pursued and inquired upon, aside of any ulterior consideration, regardless of anything else.

gested between Peirce's conception of "growth of concrete reasonableness" and "continual increase of the embodiment of the idea-potentiality," and his theory of Agapism. There are similarities of principles that suggest a logical connection and their continuity in his thought, and those similarities should be better explored.

With this framework it is possible to consider a propaedeutic for esthetic, moral and logical self-control, also of prime importance for the applicable ideals within a community. The esthetic, moral and logical instances by which the highest ideal becomes perceivable and applicable become improved through the iteration of self-control upon self-control, for in this continual process they correct, organize and add content to one another (Kent, 1987: 280–281). In this manner the comprehension and the structural relations of the ideal will also be continually augmented. This evolutionary development of the esthetic, moral and logical instances shows the purposive character of the highest ideal; or in other words, makes more apparent some particular feature of the ideal that should be regarded as admirable – though not completely, but within a process that reveals it continually. Regarding the action of an ideal and its purposive character, Peirce states that "every purpose, although it relates to action upon an individual subject, is in itself general. In the inception of its first fulfilment, whether in reality or in imagination, it is broadly general and simple. But in the process of working itself out, it necessarily becomes successively more and more definite and complex, and each of these determinations may usually take one or another of several forms" (Manuscript no. 1343 from the year 1902: 14–15). Thus, the only way to define ourselves as persons is by virtue of our interactions with others in a form of cultivation. And humans can only become persons by going through a process of rendering generality and embodying general forms in their interactions. That is to say, humans become persons only through the formation and interactions of social habits, i.e., "by virtue of the belief in the embodiment of common ideals, which are no less than concrete, physical events" (Aydin, 2009: 440).

### **Conclusion... or rather: further notes on continuity**

As I have set out, the highest ideal as conceived by Peirce, which shares similarities with the agapastic form of development, is able to modify the rules of self-control and therefore modifies action and experience as well. And this modification occurs not only for the one individual that embodies and develops a higher ideal; other humans will also be part of and play a significant role in this development. As Peirce says, the centrifugal movement of an ideal rebounds in a new centripetal movement, and so on. But even if Peirce gives

a strong emphasis to the generalization process, i.e., creating general social habits and developing general ideals, the perception and the incorporation of ideals themselves can only be accomplished in the concrete conduct of persons within a society or a community. Peirce's concept of concrete reasonableness, as we have seen, implies that the particular lives, conduct and development of persons are in a sense means to the fulfilment of a general evolutionary process, which escapes actual human recognition.

As Ciano Aydin affirms, Peirce can be considered, because of this particular consideration of human beings and highest ideals, as an anti- or post-humanist thinker in the particular sense that he does not hold the human being to be the final product of the evolutionary process. What makes human beings human is their ability actively – or I should say deliberately, guided by higher ideals – to contribute to something higher and more developed.

In order to achieve this, it is necessary for human individuals as well as human communities to seek beyond the actual, present and individual lives and existences and become a part of an evolutionary process which goes beyond our human limitations. Only by overcoming the fragmentary existence of a human individual can that individual become a person, thereby creating culture. Perhaps it is this view that makes Peirce a humanist in a different and even better sense, as stated by Aydin. A culture of love is not only a culture based on a moral rule from a general form of Golden Rule. Far more, to conceive such a culture, one has to develop a deep belief and self-control towards the *admirable*. The perception, development and embodiment of highest ideals welds persons together into a community. A Culture based in love is, then, the pinnacle of the logical movement of the Agape, which manifests itself culturally in the form of an *ardent impulse to fulfill another's highest impulse*, from each individual to the whole, having these aspects of love, unconditionally, as bearings for future conduct. This is, I believe, the only possible way to create an evolutionary and self-controlled culture based on Agape, or *evolutionary love*.

## References

- Aydin, C. (2009). On the significance of ideals: Charles S. Peirce and the good life, *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society*, 45(3), pp. 422–443.
- Cassirer, E. (2010). *Versuch über den Menschen. Einführung in eine Philosophie der Kultur*. Hamburg: Felix Meiner Verlag.
- De Tienne, A. (2007). The flowing stream that carries pragmatism: James, Peirce, and Royce. *Cognitio: Revista de Filosofia*, 8(1), pp. 45–68.
- Kent, B. (1987). *Charles S. Peirce: Logic and the Classification of the Sciences*. Kingston – Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Pape, H. (1989). *Erfahrung und Wirklichkeit als Zeichenprozess: Charles S. Peirce Entwurf einer Spekultativen Grammatik des Seins*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

- Pape, H. (1997). Love's Power and the causality of mind: C. S. Peirce on the place of mind in cultural evolution. *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society*, 33(1), pp. 59–90.
- Pape, H. (2002). What thought is for: the problematic identity of mental processes with chance events in Peirce's idealistic metaphysics. *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society*, 38(1/2), pp. 215–251.
- Parker, K. (1998). *The Continuity of Peirce's Thought*. Nashville: The Vanderbilt University Press.
- Peirce, C.S. (1897). The Logic of Relatives. *The Monist*, vol. 7, pp. 161–217.
- Peirce, C.S. (1983). *Phänomenologie und Logik der Zeichen*, edited and translated by H. Pape. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Potter, V. (1997). *On Norms and Ideals*. New York: Fordham University Press.
- Robin, R. (1967). *Annotated Catalogue of the Papers of Charles S. Peirce*. Cambridge Mass.: The University of Massachusetts Press, [www.iupui.edu/~peirce/robin/robin.htm](http://www.iupui.edu/~peirce/robin/robin.htm) [21.01.2009].
- Santaella, L. (1999). Peirce and Biology. *Semiotica*, 127(4), pp. 5–22.

### Works of Peirce

- Collected Papers of Charles S. Peirce* (CP) (1931–1935). Vol. I–VI, ed. by C. Hartshorne, P. Weiss; (1958). Vol. VII–VIII, ed. by A.W. Burks. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Reasoning and the Logic of Things* (RLT) (1992), ed. by K.L. Ketner, H. Putnam. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- The Essential Peirce: Selected Philosophical Writings* (EP) (1998). Vol. I–II, ed. by N. Hausser, A. De Tienne. Bloomington – Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- The New Elements of Mathematics by Charles S. Peirce* (NEM) (1976). Vol. I–IV, ed. by C. Eisele. Berlin – New York: Mouton Publishers.
- Writings of Charles S. Peirce: A Chronological Edition* (W) (2010). Vol. I–VIII, ed. by N. Hausser, A. De Tienne (et al). Bloomington – Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

### Summary

The aim of this paper is to develop hypothetical guidelines for a cultural development based on the law of growth by love. For that purpose I discuss first the concept of love according to Peirce's ontological hypothesis in his doctrine of Agapism. In the second section, I discuss the implications of individual and community within Peirce's philosophical framework, with special emphasis on Peirce's theory of ideals. The concluding section discusses the practical bearings of this hypothesis of a culture based on the law of growth by love.

**Słowa kluczowe:** agapizm, miłość ewolucyjna, kultura, zbiorowość i jednostka, kosmologia, pragmatyzm, najwyższy ideał

**Keywords:** agapism, evolutionary love, culture, community and individual, cosmology, pragmatism, the highest ideal