

Lordship and Servitude

The being of self-consciousness, in and of itself for itself, can be considered as in a relationship between two others living for one another as is revealed by Hegel. That is, self-consciousness is only for itself when having to do with another and through mutual acknowledgement. The master-slave relationship would reveal a scenario of an oppressed individual that actually has a better understanding of self through his humble circumstance to the master-oppressor. Both individuals may displace each other as equal beings to the point that they require the assertion of their existence by nearly killing each other to prove the case that both are essential self-conscious individuals. This text serves to elaborate on the limited scope of Hegel's argument that "Self-consciousness exist in and for itself when, and by the fact that, it so exists for another; that is, it exists only in being acknowledged," and expands on a less hypothetical, and more real solution to the recognition of all self-consciousnesses as essential.

The act of two individuals passing each other while walking down a hallway or on the street is illuminating to what Hegel is expounding upon in the Notion of recognition. Each individual 'I' sees himself as in like a mirror representation of himself in the other to the point that each recognizes itself as essential, but considers the other as inessential in the moment. The individuals mutually recognize each other recognizing one another through the relation of movements of self-consciousness that is a coming out of itself while being for itself crossing over to being for the self of the other. Hegel expresses that in this immediate mediation of crossing over existence, that each unites with itself for itself and for the other.

There is little problem with these assertions thus far other than the argument having a basic two dimensional hypothetical nature. What is meant by a basic two dimensional hypothetical nature is that the argument examines the relation between only two individual self-consciousnesses, which is in hard to conceive of accurately in the context of the matter of reality; that individual self-consciousness should be considered in its relation to everything else. Hegel's examination does serve as a good analogy for a starting point, but may be too limited in scope and sample size for a less hypothetical and more real approach to the acknowledgement of all essential self-consciousness individuals. Hegel's definition of self-consciousness itself helps to express this mistake in that he says Self-consciousness is "simple being-for-self, self-equal through the exclusion from itself of everything else."

For the moment we have at least established what is 'I' insofar as related to what's not-I, and generally we should be able to consider the value of other forms of 'I' as in others to have the same essentiality as individual Self-conscious actors. This is generally the case in reality, but Hegel lumps the not-I all together and says that in immediacy the other passer-byer is characterized negatively as an inessential object. Hegel continues with saying that, each individual in the immediate has not seen beyond the immediacy of the being in the moment to realize or expose their form of "pure being-for-self." The next part of Hegel's argument begins to show a sociopathic interpretation in the consideration of the value of individual Self-conscious essentiality. The continuation is sociopathic, because in reality most people to some degree consider other individual's lives or life in general to be precious.

To present the pure form of being-for-self to the other is through pure negation of objective mode to the point of testing or "showing" that one is not attached to being or "individuality common to existence." Basically the two individual's must make certainty of their

being-for-self through a life-and-death struggle. By staking one's life, is freedom won and shows "being for themselves." Hegel expresses that an individual who doesn't risk his life in this struggle may still be considered a person, but lacks truth in the Notion of recognition as self-conscious. The end result or death in the life-and-death struggle does away with the extremes of wanting to be "for themselves, or to have an existence of their own." What becomes of this immediate moment is a revelation that two individual self-consciousnesses pass each other and have a want to be certain of their essentiality. Thus they struggle together to assert being for themselves to the point of splitting into two opposite roles of dependent and independent which reveals a unity. In this union, Hegel describes the independent as a Lord, or the individual being for itself, and the dependent as a Bondsman, or the individual being for the other.

For Hegel, the ability of the Lord to be for itself is mediated through another consciousness in relation to moments of independence and "thinghood." By the fact that there is not a total annihilation or negation between the Lord and Bondsman brings about the recognition. The truth for Hegel, is that the bondsman who could be seen as inessential is actually the opposite because in the immediacy the essential nature of the lord and bondsman is reversed, and the Lord cannot be certain of being-for-self of an "unessential consciousness and its unessential action" in the bondsman.

The problem with the above argument is that indeed in the moment between two individuals in the given relation may work to be for themselves, but even if that trial endures between them another trial may begin between new actors in the hypothetical scenario. Having to reassert oneself to prove certainty as an essential self-conscious individual over and again would continue endlessly. In reality, must self-conscious individuals consider the value of other human beings based on their individual conception and establishment of 'I'-ness. In

contemporary times our advanced social organization puts us more in a position as slaves to a system or institution, or slaves of our desires. The capacity of being for one self more readily seems to be associated with a level of awareness than through ignorant passive acceptance of stereotypes. That is to say, allowing one self to be defined by the environment, this includes the assertions of peers as a slave to the arrangement of formal factors and features of the individual. Though one may be keenly aware of racial profiles in which they keep are acting as a “being for themselves,” but as a means to what ends is uncertain and irrelevant in this discussion. An individual, who doesn’t realize that they are fitting a social stereotype, continues in ignorance as being defined by their peers and is a slave to the arrangement while also enslaving the definers of said stereotypes. Ignorance may beget ignorance in that an individual who is subject to definition allows others to reinforce their own enslavement to the arrangement by participating in the definition.

Certain contextual memberships are inescapable though, and as long as we continue perceiving thusly as we are, will be incapable of seeing otherwise. In the context of the totality we as self-conscious actors are human beings, and as such our capacity to be for one self is continually developing. In the moment, or in one moment we may act self-consciously as being for oneself, until the next moment comes our once heightened awareness is now once again nominal and we accept re-enslavement. Just as the relationship between a lord and bondsman is once broken a new trial with these individuals may begin between others to assert their self-conscious essentiality. Universal and individual conscious awareness seems to be increasing, which makes being for oneself a developing project for as long as being in our currently manifesting is-ness continues.

Through some not-so fancy neo-New-Age-like thought and inter-mingling and finagling of theism and science, we can conceptualize a solution that is manifesting. To begin with, it is important to understand the power and consideration into the actuality of human thoughts. Human thoughts have been in more contemporary times proven to be readily transformed into psychical nature. The idea of Creative Visualization is the act of imagining oneself, let's say, running. What has been proven to us is that this "imagery" playing out in the mind activates the actual parts of the brain associated with running and stimulates the muscle fibers, or in a sense is meta-physical training. [Individual's running a race incidentally performed better through this so-called meta-physical training than those who physically trained.]

Applying this understanding to the faith in the relationship between God and the practice of actively meditating on the word of God through the Bible reveals an interesting situation in comparison to Hegel's Lordship and Bondage situation. Even down to the reversal of roles as the individual servant of the Lord seeks to act on his behalf and is thus being for himself. If what we accept from the Creative Visualization studies is true, then the believed forming relationship between the disciple and the Lord is as real as any other physical bond between another, if not more real as indicated by the results. Being associated with God, who is otherwise known for being constant and unchanging, provides for an answer to being for oneself as part of the ultimate form of awareness through service to God.