BEYOND APOLLO AND DIONYSIUS

THE CRISIS IN PERCEPTION OF REALITY

BISHOP PAULOS GREGORIOS (formerly Fr. Paul Verghese. Principal of the Orthodox Seminary, in Kottayam, Kerala, India)

It is widely recognized, even in the textbook psychology, that perception is a selective process. So much data hits our senses, but we perceive only what we select as significant. And, of course, so much data misses our sense-organs, since these are built to cope only with limited data. A simple example of missed data are radio and television waves in the air which our eyes and ears are not equipped to pick up. Only special equipment can receive and transform them into data with which our sense organs can cope.

But not all people recognize the fact that our perception is also a matter of social consensus and training. If you are a poet or an artist you perceive reality differently from the way a scientist or a historian or an economist sees reality.

Every culture shapes perception in its own way. There is no reason at all to suppose that the perception of our forefathers of four or five centuries ago was the same as ours today. For one thing, we see very few "miracles" these days. We are more rational, we expect reality to behave in a rational and systematic way, and strangely enough, most of the time it does. Our forefathers anticipated more irrational or "supernatural" behaviour on the part of reality, and if we credit them with some measure of honesty, it would appear that reality did behave differently then.

Are we not somewhat naive in our assumption that our perception of reality is more accurate because it is more "scientific and objective"? On what philosophical grounds do we insist that scientific-objective perception is more conformant to reality than the poetic-visionary perception? Because it works in every case? Because it gives consistent results every time? But are not pragmatism and consistency arbitrary standards for truth?

A distorted reality ?

It would appear that the scientific-technological mind or "objective reason" distorts reality at ~~two~~ three different points.

First there is the reification or Verdinglichung of reality. The object of perception is externalized and made into a thing to

be watched and studied. It is brought under "control" for the sake of observation. It is deprived of all freedom, and is made to exist merely as an "object" of our study and observation. In that process the "object" becomes denatured. It can no longer speak to us in its own right, as it can to a poet or to an artist. It can speak only within the limits of its predictable repeatable characteristics.

Secondly there is the distortion that takes place in the perceiver as a result of this objective-scientific perception. The perceiving subject is expected to set aside his personal or subjective whims and fancies, and make himself an impersonal receiver of objective information. Of course the perceiver never wholly succeeds in diverting himself of his subjectivity. Yet in true "scientific" knowledge the effect is always to eliminate any "distortion" of reality by the subjective feelings and emotions of the perceiver. The subject is dispassionate, unbiased, almost passive (or at least that is the ideal) like a mechanical instrument in receiving and recording information. Here the subject too is denatured.

It is in the context of this double distortion of subject and object that we gather scientific data. The data are supposed to be so neutral and value-free that the knowledge itself can become reified into information that can be stored away and programmed into computers. Knowledge thus becomes depersonalized, quantified, banked, hoarded, etc. Here is a triple reification, of subject, object and knowledge.

Further, precisely because such knowledge can be made operational, it gives birth to a technology in which the attempt is to use the knowledge of the object in order to control and manipulate the external object to our advantage. Scientific reason thus gives birth to technological reason. And the basic purpose of technological reason is to see how external reality can be controlled and manipulated.

When a whole culture and civilisation grows up where the dominant values are scientific-technological, it is to be expected that the capacity to eliminate the subjective-personal by reifying the object and de-subjectivising the subject as well as the ability to control and manipulate the objective reality

through technology would become high values. Imagine these same principles, developed in the context of knowing objects and using them, being extended to the realm of human relations! What would happen if we treat people as "things" to be studied and analyzed and as "objects" to be controlled and manipulated!

That is precisely what has been happening in our civilisation. Human relationships are becoming depersonalized and manipulative.

The Search for Cosmic Security

The Enlightenment in Europe is a symbol of the movement from passion to reason, from poetry to prose, from imagination to discursiveness, from fantasy to down-to-earthness.

Behind that transition, however, there lies a radical alteration of our understanding of the universe itself. The static geo-centric universe of pre-enlightenment perception, while capricious and control-defiant, was in the hands of a just but compassionate God, who could be appealed to, cajoled, and persuaded. Now with the Enlightenment man moved into a vast, unbounded, dynamic, centre-less universe, where western man found himself a stranger, vulnerable and insecure. As the universe of his perception became more and more enormous, western man's cosmic insecurity also began to increase proportionately.

It is in coping with this cosmic insecurity that European humanity sets out on the twin path- of at once bringing external reality under conscious control through science and technology on the one hand, and, on the other, the imperialistic expansion into all accessible territory on the planet and outside in order to bring it under the control of European humanity.

The twin efforts were mutually reinforcing. Early science and technology (cartography, nautics, gunpowder) helped the imperialistic expansion. And the colonial plunder and pillage helped the build-up of capital in Europe which in turn reinforced the scientific-technological thrust. As time went on science-technology received major support from military endeavours for conquering and territory or defending the acquired ones.

The key to the difference between the kinds of security sought by pre-enlightenment Europe and post-enlightenment Europe lies in this: In the first case, the basic ingredient was reliance on God's knowledge and power, in the second the

[illegible] them from the con-

trust is in Man's knowledge and power.

It is in this shift of the basis of one's security that there occurs also the shift in one's perception of reality. Spiritually one most significant symbol of this shift in perception is Descartes' Cogito, ergo sum. The basis and starting point of this Apollonian rational philosophical system is the thinking and knowing "I". Of the three realities God, Man and the World, Descartes could not be sure of either God or the World as a starting point. It was the "I" that is the centre from which all else is seen and evaluated. Descartes was not interested in the question which Sartre later revived, about the basis of the existence of this thinking "I".

It was a fairly unknown French painter Albert Gleizes who spoke in our own time about the mistake of trying to create a human curve independent of the cosmic curve, of an "I" that starts "thinking" as if it existed independently of all reality, rather than as part of it, contingent upon the whole. Gleizes said a generation ago:

"If we expect a reliability they do not possess from those senses of ours which are the embodiment of uncertainty, restlessness and anxiety, we will ourselves become the impersonation of these very attributes. The senses are able only to grasp some of the moments and spaces of the cosmic sphere which contains them; and they are thus adequate for the purpose of our practical and rational requirements, but they could be of service to body and spirit alike, only if intelligence were in control."[1]

Sense-based Security

Sense based certainty can never provide ultimate security. Not only was the west insecure and restless in its scientific knowledge. It is from that very insecurity and restlessness that there springs the overwhelming desire to impose this scientific pseudo-certainty on other peoples and cultures. The brutality

---

1. Albert Gleizes, Life and Death of the Christian West, Eng. Tr. Aristide Messinesi, London, Denis Dobson, 1947, p. 18.

the Crusaders and the Conquistadores was accompanied by an equally brutish disdain for other cultures and religions. Cortez and Pizarro in the Americas, Almeida and Albuquerque in the Indies, as well as the later conquerors form Holland or Britain, had only the utmost contempt for the civilizations they encountered, whether they be Aztec or Inca, Indian or Chinese. This uncomprehending disdain and domineering cultural imperialism had their roots in the deep levels of subconscious uncertainty which made it dangerous to recognize elements of truth and beauty and humanity in other civilizations.

Or take that other western prophet of the non-Apollonian, Dionysiac type- Nietzsche. His Götzen-Dämmerung[2] is a clarion call for the affirmation of this world under the domination of man. The passionate parochialism with which Nietzsche insisted, and many modern theologians seem to concur, that this world, open our eyes is the only world that there exists, can only be seen as a pathetic outburst of that same basic subconscious insecurity about man's plight in the world.

Non-ordinary Reality

These who are acquainted with the work of Carlos Casteneda [3] know that there are closed doors of perception, which, when opened and cleansed, reveal vistas of reality that defy all attempt at description or explanation within the canons of this world's ordinary knowledge. Ultimates of our perception like time, space, matter and energy, become so muted in this other perception that all our basic certainties about this world dwindle to vanishing point.

Casteneda has given us material on which we can draw conclusions which may be different from his. Some things are clear

1. Our ordinary perception of reality is to a significant extent induced by a social consensus that dominates the culture. A different social consensus about the nature of reality can significantly alter our perception of it.

2. Hallucinogenic chemicals can induce states of non-ordinary reality which radically call in question the ultimate reliability of so-called ordinary reality. Casteneda speaks of his "perception that non-ordinary reality was a perfectly defined area, a realm separate from ordinary, every-day life whose inherent properties were revealed as I went along". [4]

3. Casteneda's work also shows that there is nos si ple dualism between this world and one other world, between "ordinary" reality and one non-ordinary reality. Reality has so many levels and facets, the major part of which is inaccessible to us in ordinary perception. What is revealed to us of this reality through our senses (supported by all that is at the disposal of our kind of science-technology) can only be a fragment, a facet, a phase of reality and it would be foolish to draw the meaning of existence from this very limited understanding of reality. The experience of humanity has already gone well beyond the level of reality known to science-technology, and our various cultures embody insights about other levels of reality.

Questions facing us

The crisis of perception thus seems to raise four fundamental questions about civilization:

1. How do we educate our peoples and liberate them from the confining bondage to the view that reality can be known only

through our kind of science? How do we generate a mass awareness of the blindness that has come over people's minds as a consequence of the scientific-technological civilization?

2. How do we reassess the knowledge gained by modern science and reintegrate it in a crative way with the basic insights of our inherited cultures, in order to renew our cultures? What criteria will we use to assess our inherited cultural insights in order to separate genuine vision and delusion? How do we create a society whose perception is able to use science-technology, but can always use scientific-technological knowledge as one element only in a poetic-visionary perception?

3. How do we create an atmosphere in which there is genuine cross-fertilization between the various cultures so that every culture is always open and perennially renewed?

4. How do we muster resources and organize competent people for new research into the techniques for gathering and evaluating information about other levels of reality?

These are big questions with big consequences. Only time will reveal how revolutionary these questions are. The choice in the crisis of perception lies beyond the rational-Apollonian and the fervent-Dionysiac alternatives. The final question is: How do we recover the Sanity, the Sanctity, and the cleansed intelligence necessary for penetrating the depths of reality sufficiently to move forward into a new cultural creativity that makes humanity more human? How do we without detracting from the pressing urgency of seeking justice in the world, also at the same time deepen our quest for the meaning of existence?

Limits to Systems Analysis

It is clear that we cannot abdicate our human responsibility by programming these questions into a sophisticated fifth or sixth generation computer and waiting for a printed answer on tape. Systems analysis depends so heavily on the reification and quantification of information that is is not likely to be able to cope with the fundamental questions, which demand perceptive insight and creative risk-taking. The factors to be taken into account for the future of man go beyond the questions of popul tion, food, nergy, gr

energy, growth-rates, resources and pollution. By feeding just these into a computer and expecting to find solutions to our deep-going civilisational problems, we are merely reinforcing the blindness of our perception.

Nor do I believe that the task before us is a purely intellectual one, i.e. one that can be accomplished by gathering up all the information stored in diverse human cultures and subjecting them to exhaustive analysis and sorting out. The Banking Concept of information and knowledge, wherein we think that knowledge can be accumulated, stored and distributed at will, is as much mistaken as medieval dogma of the Treasury of Merits. True knowledge and vision are intensely personal experiences, not to be reified, quantified and traded or exchanged or distributed.

Questions of Fundamental Ontology

There are, however, certain questions of fundamental ontology involved. The basic one is about the mutual relationship of Man, God, and the Universe. The Cartesian temptation of regarding these as three disjunct realitites needs to be resisted. The objectifying tendency of science has led to fundamental alienation in the three basic relations of Man - to the ground of his being, to the world of his existence, and to his own self. The sickness of our civilisation is this three-fold alienation! Its beginnings, as we have traced them, are in the Enlightenment, in the rational scientific temperament which seeks to build certainty on the basis of the sense experience of external reality reified and objectified, the knowledge itself later being quantified and objectified, verified and recorded by externalisation and "thingification".

The corrective to this erroneous entology cannot come through intellectual effort alone. The unity and conjunction between God, Self and the world has to be experienced in forms which transcend the consciously intellectual. Meditation, worship, a new life-style fasting, prayer, community experiences of repentance and cleansing - these may prepare us for a new vision and a new perception in which all creation is seen to rest in God, with ourselves, along with the rest of mankind, as intermediaries between the Creator and the Creation, participating in both, but never to be totally identified with one or the other. But these experiments will have to be undertaken by people with a scientific technological training and formation, in order that the results may be of value to the whole of our civil

of our civilisation and that a new civilisation may spring i... the new vision and the new perception.

Such a new vision will reveal how parochial are the alternatives about which we debate in our civilizations. The issue is not even between ..., harmonious, Apollonian rationality and a chaotic, turbulent Dionysian emotionality. The point is to seek liberation from that fundamental captivity of the ego. Caught in a dead alley, unable to find its way out because of the blindniss created by our own science and technology. The quest is for a new social discipline, that can cleanse the doors of our perception and lead us to the vision that liberates, to a new social consensus that opens the way to a new civilisation and to life beyond history.

Is God totally other?

God is not wholly other either to Man or to the Creation. If these two realities, i.e. Man and the Universe, were so wholly other than God, and therefore unrelated to Him, they could not have existed at all. The word has become flesh. God has become man. The three realities are now one, united to each other in Christ.

The Creation is the will of God concretely manifested. All matter and energy not only have their source in God, but are sustain by God's will, and are the forms in which God's will and wisdom are mediated to us. And we ourselves who are proud of this matter-energy in space, time, have the special role of being free manifestations of Godhood. It is in us and in the Creation that God dwells and manifests himself. If this is true, our attitude to other human beings and to creation will have to change. Neither the inhumanly unjust society which destroys the dignity of rich and poor alike, nor the repacious, plundering imperialistic attitude of man to the creation can be tolerated.

It is this perception, alone, with some awareness of levels of reality not open to our senses, that can create the new vision that liberates. But that vision requires a discipline of body and mind a discipline in Community, the forms of which we must soon begin experimenting with. Neither the cold rationality of our academic enterprises and sophisticated cpmputers, nor the fervent and fra... outbursts of revolutionary radicalism can be adequate substitutes the discipline that leads to a new vision and a new creation.

On Cleansing the Doors of Perception

(Paul Verghese)

If the doors of perception were cleansed,
Everything would appear to man as it is, infinite
For man has closed himself up, till he sees
All things thro' narrow chinks of his cavern.
(William Blake, in *The Marriage of Heaven and Hell*)

But how can perception be cleansed and how is infinity to be seen through a wider window than the "chinks of our caverns"?

Our civilization ~~has lost its~~ suffers from a dimmed power of perception. Science has helped us to sharpen our detailed and objective perception, but in that process ~~killed~~ blunted our power to perceive the whole with poetic imagination and profound creativity.

William Blake perceived - perceived heretically, unscientifically. But in fighting against both dogmatic religion and scientific dogma, he perceived more profoundly, more creatively, ~~albeit~~ though in a manner bordering on the bizarre.

The vision that he saw, as a western man protesting against science's blindness to the whole, against technology's crazy greed that closed or dirtied the doors of perception, ensues in the gospel and mission expressed in Blake's *Jerusalem* this way:

"Go, tell them that the Worship of God is
honouring his gifts
In other men and loving the greatest men best,
each according
To his Genius which is the Holy Ghost in Man,
there is no other
God than that God who is the intellectual
fountain of Humanity."

Blake is a westerner well worth listening to before you look to the so-called "Third World" for "salvation." ~~There are a dozen others, some of whom I would presume to recommend to you, since they are perhaps much easier for you to comprehend than any purely Eastern thought.~~

Blake insists that God's being and existence is only in the being and existence ofhuman beings (Marriage of Heaven and Hell), and in the processes of creation in nature.

Whether you agree with Blake or not, one thing is clear. The movement from the fanciful and poetic imagination to the precise, prosaic, discursive analytical reason is the price paid by the west for its scientific-technological civilization.

I. The Search for Science-based Certainty

The Enlightenment is a symbol of the movement from passion to reason, from poetry to prose, from imagination to discursion, from fanaticism to toleration, from dogma to discernment. Behind this transition there lies a radical alteration of the vision of God-Man-World relationship. The static geocentric universe gave place to a vast, enormous, dynamic, centre-less universe, in which Man still finds himself a stranger. As the dimensions of the universe increased, man became increasingly insecure. But the coming of this cosmic insecurity became both the occasion and the spur for a new search for security based on assurances coming from the thought and knowledge of man.

When Descartes said 'cogito, ergo sum', he did not stop to ask the deeper questions 'Why am I?' or 'Who amI?'. He was interested only in making sure of that "I" on the flimsy basis of his own thinking activity. He should have started it the other way: 'I am, therefore I think', and then gone on to ask 'et qui sum?'. If Descartes had not presumed to take the simple fact that 'I think' as a starting point without presuppositions, perhaps the West would have retained its intellect and

not fallen prey to the seductive charm of an obscurantist intellectualism which chooses to ignore what is inconvenient to know.

A French painter, Albert Gleizes, wrote already in 1928 about the startling duel then going on between intellectualism and intellect.

> "If we expect a reliability they do not possess from those senses of ours which are the embodiment of uncertainty, restlessness and anxiety, we will ourselves become the impersonation of these very attributes. The senses are able only to grasp some of the moments and spaces of the cosmic sphere which contains them; and they are thus adequate for the purpose of our practical and rational requirements, but they could be of service to body and spirit alike, only if intelligence were in control." [1)]

Gleizes speaks about the mistake of trying to create a human curve that is independent of the cosmic curve, of an "I" that starts "thinking" without recognizing itself to be part of the mighty miracle of existence. How can an "I" exist without reference to the Self-Existent I? How can man say "I am" without reference to that ultimate "I am"?

II. The Acquisitive Explosion

But the sickness of the west goes much further back than the "cogito" of Descartes. When the west embarked on a Trade and Commerce expedition around the world in the 13th and 14th centuries, spurred on by the spirit of adventure kindled by the Crusades, powered by the greed and rapaciousness which were also awakened during those campaigns of self-righteous plundering and pillage, this explosion of the west laid the foundations of both empire and city, the banes of modern civilization.

---

1) Albert Gleizes, Life and Death of the Christian West, Engl. Transl. Aristide Messinesi, London, Denis Dobson, 1947, p.18

Greed ~~led~~ leads to possessiveness, possession to pride, and pride of knowledge ~~led to~~ brings in self-sufficiency. Possessiveness and self-sufficiency are both equally alienating.

And now living in a civilization sick to the core with fundamental alienation, a few Christians talk about "reconciling the vertical and the horizontal". How did the vertical ever come to be pried loose from the horizontal? I submit, by acquisitive greed, by the quest for certainty based on sense-knowledge, and by an imperialist urban industrial civilization built on greed and sense-knowledge.

Without rectifying that civilization and its alienating way of life, it is futile for theologians to seek verbally to reconcile the vertical and the horizontal. Without finding a style of life in which consciousness of our origin by creation is accompanied by the awareness of our mediating position between creator and creation (with participation in both), there is no way either to reconcile the vertical with the horizontal, or to "save" the western world. Intellectuali will not show the way. The human intellect, the Spirit in Man, is still the light that must show us the way, but only when it is once again illuminated by the unapproachable Light of God.

III. The Primacy of Repentance

The first stage in the retransition from intellectual back to the light of the intellect is a true repentance - not a political repentance to please or appease the victims of injustice and rapacity. Such repentance on the part of the west would mean an honest self-understanding, not a dishonest self-demeaning.

Such self-understanding means first a re-interpretation of that brutal statement by Gibbon in his "Decline and Fall" that Christianity is an "oriental superstition" still pervasive in the west. The west will have to reexamine its claim to be the bastion of civilization. It will have to recognize the fact that it was the presence of this "oriental superstition" in combination

with other "oriental superstitions" like Hellenism and Arab culture that civilized the medley of barbarous people that was Europe. It may be painful for the west to recognize that it is the waning away of this oriental element that now causes the decay of the west and it will have to become modest enough to acknowledge the fact that it is swindling the whole world even now by presuming to set before all the standards of economic growth, industrial development and scientific objectivity as the true measures of humanity.

IV. The West and the Rest

The West should make itself aware not only of the barbarian character of European expansion into the world as exemplified in the brutality of Cortez and Pizarro in the Americas, Almeida and Albuquerque in the Indies, but also of the sense of cultural superiority inherited from the great disdain of the Conquistadores for the civility of the Aztecs and the Incas, the Chinese and the Indians. Along with the naked, well-organized, massive, unprincipled force that Europe used in its expansion into the world was this uncomprehending contempt for other civilizations. The Latin peoples were perhaps more barbarian in their aggressiveness than those whom the Romans called barbarian. It is in this context of naked aggression and false sense of superiority that western science and technology grows from the use of the navigator's compass (in the 13th century) and gunpowder to the development of jet planes and the atomic bomb (in the mid-20th century).

It is out of this same massively and nakedly aggressive and domineering elan of the west that arose the modern western missionary movement - the one and only large-scale religious colonialism ever known by the Christian Church. But neither the missionary colonialism nor the cultural imperialism which is its matrix has been pervasively effective except in patches of western Europe and in native America and other the territories of the Aztecs, the Incas and the Mayas, Elsewhere the native civilizations have managed to offer

stiff resistance to the strident aggression of the west till this day. China has perhaps been the most successful in resisting, but in their own various ways, ~~the~~ Arab countries, African nations, and many Asian countries have withstood the impact of the west, its religion and culture while absorbing however, part of the shock.

Even China has had to use a western ideology in order to offer that massive resistance to the west. Those who have totally refused to come to terms with the world view of the west were the native Americans; and their civilization has been brutally wiped out by the west. The others have taken mild doses of western civilization as a sort of inoculation that develops resistance to the west. It is in this form that western civilization has worked its way into all cultures and civilizations existing today, from Haiti to Japan. Some of us in Asia suspect that we have an overdose of the western vaccine, and are ~~developing~~ manifesting ~~the~~ symptoms of the disease rather than developing immunity to it.

My own country, India, is a classical case of advanced sickness due to an overdose of the western vaccine. In our new mythology in India, Jawaharlal Nehru is becoming the villain of the piece, who deflected India from the path of simplicity and self-reliance shown us by Gandhi, and led us on to this superficial quest of affluence, this humiliating and frustrating effort to catch up with the Joneses of the west.

V. Catharsis and Vision

My main contention is that "salvation" can come to the western world, not through some miraculous cure brought from the East, but through honest self-understanding and modest openness to all on the part of the west itself.

This "salvation" requires two basic elements - catharsis and vision.

Catharsis or cleansing can come only through repentance - national, cultural, ethnic repentance.

No use trying to hide one's head like the ostrich in the sands of futurism. We must all face our own past. Otherwise we will perish hopelessly in our stubborn pride which sometimes uses a so-called eschatological future-oriented theology to escape the inescapable demand for a painful repentance - a pre-condition for deep-going divine forgiveness. Until this repentance becomes authentically effective, the west will neither attain freedom from its restless anxiety nor gain any deep credibility with the rest of the world. Eschatology as a way out from facing the reality of one's own cultural past leads only to a closed door or a blank wall.

Without this repentance and this catharsis, we will never find our way to reconciliation between the vertical and the horizontal, nor be enabled to overcome that fundamental alienation which walls off the transcendent and renders the inner emptiness so painful, the fundamental anxiety and fear of condemnation so poignant.

VI. The Distorted Vision of Nietzsche

As for the vision that reconciles, the best way for me to refer to it would be in the form of a commentary on the Four Theses of Nietzsche in "Twilight of the Idols". I offer no apology for criticizing Nietzsche, knowing full well that it is more fashionable to commend him than to question him. But let me also make clear that in criticizing Nietzsche I am not accepting the position which he criticizes.

(1) The First Thesis of Nietzsche says:

> "The grounds upon which 'this' world has been designated as apparent establish rather its reality - another kind of reality is absolutely undemonstrable." [1]

Another kind of reality has, however, been demonstrated. New doors of perception have been opened both by the drugs and by experiences like Carlos Casteneda's [2] with

---

[1] Twilight of the Idols, (Götzen-Dämmerung), Engl.Transl. Penguin, 1972, p.39

[2] See The Teachings of Don Juan: a Yaqui way of knowledge, New York, Ballantine, 1968
A Separate Reality, N.Y. Simon and Schuster, 1970

the wise men of other civilizations (in this case the Yaqui Indians of Mexico). There is no use getting angry with Kant as Nietzsche often does. Nor should we be angry with Nietzsche for he did not know the trauma of modern physics which is now unable to make sense of matter-energy, or time-space which were supposed to be the immutable co-ordinates of 'this World'. The 'smug finalities' of late 19th century physics were but a short-lived luxury based on fantasy. We know now that our "immutable laws of nature" operate only within a very limited range and are extremely mutable. We thought once that sense-perception, sharpened by science, would open all doors. Now we know what a limited and limiting thing sense-perception is. Let us abandon Nietzsche's thesis with a sense of liberation and say with hearty cheer: thank God, this little universe known to our senses and our science is not the whole story!

(2) Nietzsche's Second proposition is that people attribute characteristics to the "other world" which are the opposite of the actual world, i.e. they refer to non-being. The "kingdom of God" becomes the opposite of "life". Or in Nietzsche's own words "The Saint is a castrate."

Nietzsche has a point here. There has developed in the Christian tradition an ideal of sainthood which is so like death that it becomes repellent. But this is not necessarily the Christian ideal. Christ himself was no pale shadow of ~~a man~~ death, but a real he-man with vigour and vitality, capable of satire, humour and anger. He could eat and drink to the point of being called a glutton and a wine-bibber. He went to marriage-feasts, which Christian monks are forbidden to attend in many orders.

But one should not carry the point too far. Jesus Christ was no Bohemian reveller spending all his time in dance-halls and nightclubs. He could eat, but he

could also fast. He spent the whole day with people, but he also spent whole nights alone in prayer. The attempt to make Jesus Christ "a regular guy" goes too far in overlooking the fact of an intensely disciplined and prayerful life, which most of our regular guys and gals do not live. To fast and pray is not life-denying. It is the only way to exorcise demons and come into the direct awareness of the transcendent. Some things which are pleasurable and desirable have to be brought under control, in order to remove the distortion in our humanity. Nietzsche goes fundamentally wrong in equating life with animal life. The Christian saint has often gone wrong in failing to recognize that man is also an animal. But man becomes man only by bringing the animal in him under disciplined control. The negation of animality need mean death only if the life we have is nothing more than animal life.

(3) Nietzsche's third proposition is that we conjure up "another" world because of our desire to slander and disparage the life that has been given to us. Nietzsche makes the fundamental error of the western tradition which deifies Nature. What is given is not therefore to be worshipped. In fact neither human life nor nature is given as a finished product or as a predetermined machine, but both are committed to us as a task. Denial of what is seems to be the only way to hope for and to create something new. Therefore the disparagement of life as it is becomes not only not culpable but ~~really~~ in fact necessary for salvation. Even Nietzsche has to rail madly ~~against~~ at life as it is, though in a different direction. There is no way for Man to become fully human without accepting the fact that this world is only a womb, a place of gestation where we are prepared to live in a different dimension, as different as life outside the womb is different from life inside.

(4) Nietzsche's fourth proposition is that the division of the world into 'real' and 'apparent', whether in theology or in philosophy, is a sign of decadence.

I can agree with Nietzsche only up to a point. But I must recognize the fact that such religious movements that deny all reality to this world have sometimes risen in the midst of a flourishing civilization - Sankara in India being the classical example. We should agree with Nietzsche that the distinction between appearance and reality is not Christian. But a distinction such as "inside the womb and outside" or "two interlocking realms of reality" does not speak of two worlds or of appearance and reality. Reality as experienced inside the womb is not appearance, but it certainly is not the only aspect of reality. In fact the key to Christian cosmology is that it refuses to accept the Platonic distinction between ideal and phenomenal, and seeks eternal significance in the phenomenal. But the meaning of the phenomenal is not exhausted by the phenomena.

VII. The Vertical, the Horizontal and Casteneda

The problem about the vertical and the horizontal as experienced by Christians in the west today comes from this intensive desire to see the world open to the senses as the only aspect of the world. This confidence in "sense plus science" as the only possible organ of perception has begun to wane today.

Casteneda has given us material on which we can draw conclusions that are different from his. Some points are already clear:

(a) Our ordinary perception of reality is to a significant extent induced by a social consensus. A different social consensus about the nature of reality can substantially alter our perception of reality.

(b) Hallucinogenic chemicals can induce states of non-ordinary reality which fundamentally call in question the finality of so-called ordinary reality. Casteneda speaks of his "perception that non-ordinary reality was a perfectly defined area, a realm separate from ordinary, every day life whose inherent properties were revealed as I went along."[1)]

---

1) The Teachings of Don Juan, p. 249

(c) Casteneda's work also shows that there is no way of positing a dualism between ordinary reality and non-ordinary reality. Reality is multi-faceted, and chemical changes in the brain give one access to more than one different or non-ordinary reality. Once we accept in principle that non-ordinary reality is more than one, we can go on to conclude in principle that there need be no limit to the types of perceptions possible, and therefore to the types or levels of realities experienceable.

(d) If this is so, it is naive to speak of vertical and horizontal as just two dimensions of reality. It is also naive to speak either of two worlds, or of an "apparent" world and a "real" world. Reality is multi-dimensional, and our present perception, i.e. sense supported by science, reveals only one level of this reality. We must cleanse the doors of our perception in order to be open to new levels of reality.

(e) Casteneda's work brings additional confirmation to the position that any perception of reality is a combination of three elements. On the one hand there is the correlation between sense and sense-object. Our senses are adapted to detect only certain limited sense-objects. Normally we make sense of experience only by severely filtering sensations emanating from the external world through the sieve of the limited capacities of our senses. There is so much colour that escapes our naked eyes, some of which can be captured through other mechanical devices (e.g. ultra-violet or infra-red); there are so many sound and light-waves that escape our naked eyes and ears (television captures some of these for us). The limits of our senses shape our perception of the external world. There is much more out there than meets the eye or the ear - even when augmented by science. Ordinary perception is a dialectic between limited senses and limited sense-objects.

VIII. Perception and Social Consensus

Even more important is the fact that social consensus plays such a leading role in perception. The anthropologist Casteneda had to move out of our western perception consensus into the Yaqui Brujo's perception consensus before the new reality became sufficiently clear to him. Perception is a community affair. Our civilization has a faulty perception consensus which must be changed fairly soon if we are not to perish.

Our perception of reality is fundamentally affected not only by the kind of senses with which we are endowed and which we cultivate according to our interests and according to our science-technology, but also by the socio-economic goals that we choose as societies. If ours is a greedy acquisitive social choice, then we will develop those senses and those forms of science which we think will help the attainment of our goals.

If on the other hand our social consensus is that there are values other than a full stomach, comfort, and sensations of pleasure or power that are worth pursuing, then our perception will change accordingly. If there is a hiatus today between the vertical and the horizontal, the remedy is not to be sought in the realm of theology, but rather in our comprehensive vision of reality.

Altering that social consensus and that perception of the world is a gigantic task that calls for a concerted effort on the part of all:

(a) the struggle for socio-economic justice is the road that can lead us to the new vision, but there are many unexpected turns to be taken on this road,

(b) massive and convincing repentance on the part of white western people and others like the Japanese as well as the rich in all lands will be a necessary precondition for the new vision. This repentance will have to be expressed in concrete action, and the Christian churches could initiate the process, which has ultimately to be socio-economic and public

(c) a radical re-structuring of the world so that the present economic and cultural dominance pattern is overturned and a new order is established where all humans

(men and women, white and black, rich and poor, peasant and landlord, manager and labourer, the toiler and the intellectual from all climes and cultures) have equal opportunities to work, to live, and to create culture.

(d) Such re-structuring is not possible without a radical revision of our goals as people. Science-technology at the service of rapacious greed has become radically distorted and dehumanizing. A new kind of science-technology can be born only out of a community with high and varied competence and a radical commitment to a new humanity.

IX. A Marxist Post-Script

Is this not an escapist solution - an essentially bourgeois-idealist solution? Are not our problems basically generated by distortions in the relations of production rather than from wrong philosophical notions? Is it not a symptom of the disease rather than its cure, that this paper finds the solution in the realms of feeling (repentance) and thinking (vision) rather than action? Is this not an attempt to focus our attention away from the crux of the problem - the exploitative and oppressive nature of our society's relations of production and distribution?

The crux of the problem is <u>not</u> in the relations of production, but in what is happening to human beings, their society and their destiny. The relations of production and distribution are primary indicators of fundamental alienation, but the crux of the problem is alienation itself. And it is at this point that Marx's own words have to be taken quite seriously:

> "Just as philosophy finds its material weapon in the proletariat, so does the proletariat find its spiritual weapon in philosophy." [1]

---

[1] Karl Marx, F. Engels, <u>Collected Works</u>, (Russian Ed.) Vol.I, p.428. Engl.Transl. in I. Khlyabich, <u>An Outline History of Filosophy</u>, Moscow, Progress Publishers (n.d.) p.88

But Marx insisted that the problem was not in the realm of ideas but basically in the relations of production, for ideas were conditioned by the class system. Lenin was, however, quite clear that the achievements of a bourgeois civilization were not to be totally discarded. He claimed, in fact, that Marxism had already "assimilated and reshaped the more valuable elements accumulated in the course of more than two thousand years of development of human thought and culture." [1]

There in that statement again one sees the symptoms of European Hybris expressed in a different milieu. Marxism too can speak so glibly about "two thousand years of development of human thought and culture" because it too regarded Europe as the bastion of all human culture and has been profoundly ignorant of and unreceptive to other cultures and civilizations. Marxism is primarily a western philosophy, western in ethics and vision. Marxism is a path which the west and the rest will have to traverse, but it is only a very small part of the pa th, and we should not hesitate to pass through it, for the bypasses are all even more difficult.

We should give high priority to restructuring the relations of production, but this will be no substitute for cleansing the doors of perception. On the other hand we should not fall into the other temptation - that of saying that both free enterprise capitalism and Marxist socialism are western systems and therefore to be rejected. That is no option open to us. The road from capitalism towards salvation necessarily passes through Marxist territory. Marxism is not on the same level as capitalism. Capitalism is necessarily acquisitive-aggressive and therefore to be categorically rejected. Marxist socialism on the other hand is basically a humanism, albeit a somewhat transitory and time-conditioned European variety of humanism. Its insistance on man as basically a social being and its

---

1) Lenin, On Socialist Ideology and Culture, p.63

demand for social justice are two elements which western civilization has to accept before it finds its salvation. Marxist insights into the roots of human alienation can be ignored by the west only at its own peril. Even its basic philosophical tool of 'dialectic' will have to be ~~increasingly~~ more extensively used, in this sense that while we comprehend and affirm the world as it now exists to our senses, we will need also to develop the power to negate it as something to be 'dissolved' and to disappear, giving place to something that grows out of it but is yet radically new.

In fact Marxists themselves will have to go back to Marx and Engels at two fundamental points, and start again to build a new vision that takes into account both one century of western experiences and many centuries and even millenia of experience of other cultures and civilizations in building a new theoretical vision.

Even China, with all her most impressive, gigantic, positive achievements in the realm of social relations, has not begun to take up this basic intellectual task before world marxism. In the first place dialectical materialism was a comprehensive philosophy, especially for Engels. His Dialectics of Nature sees the universe as a system of interconnections and inter-dependence in continuous motion and change, not only in space, but in time as well. Subsequent Marxism has too often concentrated on problems of the relations of production and the configurations of political and economic power. This is a sort of reduction that a faithful Marxism cannot condone for too long. There is need in Marxism for a new vision that relates nature and history once again in the light of our recent experience in science-technology, in industrial society, and in the "socialist" states of Europe.

Marxism ~~would also~~ will have to come to better terms with other civilizations and cultures as well. It will have to break out of its European shell. China, it was hoped, would show the way at this point. But the recent

Chinese campaign against Confucianism has shown how one-sided and lacking in basic integrity even Chinese Marxism has become. It insists on an ideological dogmatism that is parochially western even though it goes under the name of Mao, one of the greatest of Asian theoreticians and men of action, excelling even Mahatma Gandhi.

For Marxism, it is true, to come to terms with other civilizations and cultural experiences at this stage of conflict with reactionary ideologies, can be extremely backsetting and perilous. But for those of us who are not Marxists, and are yet basically not threatened by Marxism, belonging as we still do to the class which has nothing to lose but its chains, it is important to seek to effect this synthesis of the results of a profoundly Marxist socio-economic analysis purged by a going back to fundamental reflection a la Marx-Engels, with the insights gained by all cultures - Tibetan or Mayan, African or Japanese, Indian or Arab, Carribbean or native Australian, Yaqui or Yoruba.

If philosophy is genuinely to be an ideological weapon of the oppressed, it must also be faithful to the experience of the majority of the oppressed people of the world, and not merely to the experiences and aspirations of the European proletariat.

If such a perspective is seriously assumed this will entail a revision of some of the very pre-suppositions of Marxism which are now related only to either affirmations or negations of European experience like materialism-idealism, scientific-unscientific, subjective-objective, etc.

While it is true that the bourgeoisie of the world will have to ~~abandon~~ go on questioning ideologies like American Pragmatism, Anglo-Saxon positivism, Germanic Neo-Kantianism, Franco-Saxon phenomenology and existentialism, the Marxists also of the world will have to take a second look at Lenin's critique of Machian empirio-criticism.

While Lenin may have been right in criticizing the use of empirio-criticism to absolutize relativism and pluralism, he was certainly blind to the fact that he was himself guilty of absolutizing dialectical materialism as a final and objective scientific fact. Relativism and pluralism are lazy doctrines which seek mostly to blunt the edge of threatening dogmatisms and therefore should be suspect as ideological tools of the oppressor. Dialectical materialism is much more realistic in that it recognizes that all truth is relative and approximate; but it does not slip into the liberal fallacies of relativism and pluralism which by making all doctrines relatively valid or partially true, tries to blunt its edge of decisive opposition to certain pernicious doctrines like Capitalism. Without such decisive opposition there is no salvation, and therefore pluralism and relativism in any absolute form should be resolutely rejected and decisively opposed.

But Lenin himself went wrong in ascribing an absolute character to the laws of science or the laws of 'nature'. Lenin actually believed that 'nature' 'existed' 'outside' the mind. He may have been right in believing that every relative truth represented a reflection of absolute truth which was not created by the human mind, but he certainly went too far in assuming that the sum of relative truths in their development would yield absolute truth.[1] Lenin's understanding of matter was quite profound. He recognized that matter was basically a philosophical category in that famous definition of his:

> "Matter is a philosophical category denoting the objective reality which is given to man by his sensations, and which is copied, photographed and reflected by our sensations, while existing independently of them."[2]

We need not criticize Lenin for not having seen the problem created by words like 'nature', 'objective',

---

1) Lenin, Collected Works, Vol.14, p.309 ff

2) Ibid. p.130

'reality' and 'exist'. Lenin's philosophical acumen could have enabled him to raise certain fundamental questions about all these words, especially the word 'exist'. But he was too busy changing the world to waste much more time explaining it. And he tailored his philosophy to suit his strategy for changing society.

Today we need the help of other civilizations to raise some of these fundamental questions which are decisive for our strategy for changing society, and for the direction in which we want to change our society.

The reality-status of historical experience is the fundamental and primary question. We are passing through a period where 19th century historicism in its Diltheyan and Marxist forms has already fulfilled a useful critical function in correcting the excessive idealization of reality, and is today itself in need of a second look. The very dialectical process of all historical thought should on the one hand warn us against moving towards an empty individualist ahistorical existentialism on the one hand, and also at the same time against the absolutisation of any particular historical understanding of the nature of historical reality.

X. A Peep into the Indian Vision

The religious vision of ancient India has often been lampooned or caricatured as 'life-and-world-denying' or 'other-worldly' or monistic. This caricature which dates from the colonial era, was drawn over in charcoal by that character of doubtful nobility - Albert Schweitzer, whose paternalistic pose of pseudo-repentance and pseudo-openness to other cultures is a far cry from what I am proposing. On the positive side of openness, if not repentance, is that other Germanic giant less well-known in Europe than in the East, Max Müller, the scholarly translator of "The Sacred Books of the East".

The most classical of all Indian visions is that of Sankara, the unequivocal non-dualist. "The world is vain, ultimate reality (Brahman) is alone true, the individual soul is none other than ultimate reality." Sankara thus stands at the opposite extreme from Nietzsche, boldly affirming that the world open to our senses has no abiding or very significant reality at all. He traces all evil to avidya nescience or wrong perception. Man does not have to become something else than what he is; he needs only to realize Who he is, and all the fetters of evil fall away. His basic error is in giving credence to his senses. The whole effort is to cleanse the doors of perception in such a way that the dream of the sense-world ends and we wake to reality, beholding the total identity and unity of all that there is. There is neither the duality of Man and World nor that of Man and God. There is neither subject nor object.

This can be totally misunderstood if seen as a theoretical speculation or as a philosophically demonstrable logical argument. The affirmation of ~~duality~~ non-duality comes from experience, not from discursive reasoning. One of Sankara's seminal treatises is entitled Direct

Perception (aparokshanubhuti).

"The universe of sense is unreal like a dream..
Just as one sees a castle in the air, or a giant in space, or two moons instead of one in the sky, so do ignorant persons see the universe as apart from Brahman" (Stanzas 58 and 62)

The whole of Sankara's effort is directed towards non-ordinary perception of non-ordinary reality. He is not trying to convince us of the truth of non-duality by argument. Rather he concentrates on the techniques of non-ordinary perception. Perception is not automatic. It is something to be achieved through a struggle against illusion and ignorance.

This vision of Sankara is expressed in more modern forms by Hindu sages like Aurobindo, Tagore and Krishnamurti. Each of these (of whom only the last mentioned is living today, but all lived in our century)

SOME ROOTS OF HUMANITY'S HYPER-ANXIETY TODAY.

(Bishop Paul Gregorios)*

"Little knowledge, but much joy

Is given to mortals.....", said the poet Hoelderlin almost two centuries ago. And today the reverse has become true: much knowledge, but little joy.

This absence of joy, or the anxiety underlying it, could thus not be a universal or perennial phenomenon. It is the times that have brought us much knowledge and taken away most of our joy, filling us with foreboding anxiety and intangible fears.

But is there a constant relation between the quantity of knowledge and the measure of joy so that when the one increases the other has necessarily to decrease? Hardly. It is not the quantity of knowledge that is decisive, but rather its quality, the reason for which it is sought and the way in which it is pursued.

Why do we seek knowledge? To walk by its light, and to be in its warmth, or to grab what it shows up, so that in our 'having' we can possess our 'being'? What kind of knowledge - calculating and controlling, or knowledge that frees us from the need to calculate and control in order to be? What kind of truth does it pursue? veritas est adaequatio intellectus ad rem, according to the Hellenic tradition of Aristotle. But can we put intellectus and res in the same class, with the latter as something objectively ideal, to which the intellect has to achieve some measure of adequacy or approximation? When knowledge becames fixed on things, the knowing mind itself undergoes a subtle change that denatures it.

And that, by and large, is the ground of the anxiety of modern man, especially Western man. The subtle change in the manner of pursuing knowledge seems to have come about, at least in the case of Western man, by almost an accident. When did it begin? Perhaps already in the days of the schoolmen.

We can today laugh at our medieval ancestors who sincerely believed that there was no security to be had in this fleeting and transitory world, the only security being in the unchanging and unseen world which was fixed and immutable. What Cardinal Newman called the Benedictine Age (Seventh to 12th century?) was one in which security and stability could be associated only with eternity and the unseen world. The value of things on earth was directly related to their connection with the eternal and the unseen. How else do we explain the fact that the preciousness of Charlemagne's

---

* Formerly Fr.T.Paul Verghese, Assoc. General Secretary of the W.C.C.

throne in Aachen (built to the specifications of Solomon's) came not so much from the diamonds and pearls adorning it as from the relics hid in its many cavities?[1] The relics belonged to those who had become united with eternity, and it was their power that operated in them. Hence the relics in the throne or on the crown or on the necks of kings moored the kingdom to eternity, thus providing it with stability and security.

And in the so-called Benedictine age, the security of the kingdom was also assured, not so much by fortresses as by monasteries. The real enemy, the source of insecurity, was in the unseen world, where the powers of darkness, the hosts of satan were waging war against mankind. And the only way to defend the kingdom against the wiles of the Wicked One, was to endow and build large homes for monks who knew the rules of battling with the Devil, through prayers, fasting, vigils, alms, chants, and daily offerings of the mass. The Rules of St.Benedict reflect this belief.

In these castles built to fight Satan, the "Cowled Champions" of St.Benedict waged war with satan, by not only prayers and vigils, but also by the lectio and contemplatio of the sacred texts. They read the scriptures, not to amass knowledge, but to lift up their souls to God. There was no objective knowledge of the scriptures sought, such as our own period with its methods of criticism has learned to create. They learned to read, in order the better to raise their souls into the unseen and abiding kingdom.

It was but a short step from that lectio-contemplatio approach to the scriptures, to a quaestio-disputatio approach, wherein the purpose was to distil a clear and indubitable proposition of truth, which would be 'objectively' true. Paris and Bologna, Oxford and Köln became centres where this 'objective' knowledge was assiduously pursued. New techniques were sought to distil truth into propositions and formulae that brought the task and fruit of knowledge within human control.

This transition in the West's collective psyche was subtle and complex. The moorings of that security in the unseen world became progressively shaken as new forms of security through higher degrees of objective and man-controlled knowledge were achieved. In that Faustian journey, Western man carried with him an uneasy conscience, which remained as the ground of his fundamental anxiety throughout his agressively imperialistic expansion into the world.

---

1. W.Braunfels, ed. Karl der Grosse, Lebenswerk und Nachleben, 5 vols, 1965-68. esp. Vol. iii: 306-307, 452, 464-79 and 501-505, cited by R.W.Southern, Western Society and The Church in the Church in the Middle Ages, Penguin, 1972. p. 30.

That expansion, symbolized most primitively in the Crusades, was both powered by anxiety and generative of new anxiety. The threatening sign of divine judgment took concrete form in the Turkish invasions. Islam was to the West what Israel was to the nations of Palestine in the time following the Exodus. It was a scourge that plagued the West for so long and the threat of being over run by Islam went so deep into the soul of Europe, that the West still finds it difficult to be objective in its evaluation of Islam. R.W.Southern has given us a memorable excerpt from the letter of Roman Pope Clement IV to Byzantine Emperor Michael Paleologus in 1267.

> "The Crusade is being prepared, and the whole of Europe is rising at our bidding. If you will attack the Moslems on one side while the Crusaders attack them on the other, we shall see an end of their damnable religion for ever. And if you say you are afraid the Latins will attack you while your troops are engaged on your other frontier, the answer is simple: return to the unity of the Roman Church and all fears of this kind can be put aside for ever"[2].

Yes, the West could provide the same kind of security it itself had, if only the rest of the world would accept its religion and its command.

Man-controlled security, not only through objective knowledge, through scientia as sapientia, but also through political, economic, religious and cultural control of the rest of the world by this Europe with its superior knowledge. Any "damnable religion", be it Islam or Hinduism, Buddhism or Shintoism, or even Eastern Orthodox Christianity, must simply be "put an end to". There is only one truth and the West had distilled it into dogmas, and all that the world had to do was to give its assent.

The security of Europe thus shifted from the unseen and intangible world to the visible, manageable, manipulable world under Europe's control. The three elements of this new security are:

(a) empirical knowledge based on man's experience and a manipulative technology based on human skills, eliminating the need for religious knowledge or dependence upon God's grace and power;

(b) politico-economic control of the world, through trade expansionism, phasing into imperialism and now into neo-colonialism.

(c) religious-cultural dominance of the world, first through the missionary movements from the Roman Catholic Iberian peninsula, to be followed a few centuries later by Protestant Northern Europe. As religious power dies out, the attempt is to maintain cultural dominance by setting

---

2. Southern, op.cit from A.Potthast, Regesta Pontificum Romanorum, 1874-5. No. 20012.

standards and controlling the terms for all international competition. The technological culture tinged with laissez-faire liberalism or various adaptations of Marxism, becomes the tool of a new cultural imperialism.

x x x x

The fact of the matter, and the root of the prevailing anxiety, lies in the collapse of all three aspects of Western security.

The ecological crisis, the resource depletion menace, and the vague possibility of nuclear self-annihilation have together conspired to undermine Western man's confidence in his science-technology. The alienating character of science-technology is also being increasingly acknowledged by scientists. In objectifying the object of knowledge, reifying it and seeking to manipulate it, science-technology does violence not only to all objects under scrutiny, but also to the knowing subject, the human being who is asked to maintain an objective or non-emotional and uninvolved stand vis-a-vis the object of knowledge.

Besides, it is becoming increasingly clear that 'scientific universality' applies only under certain conditions which include the presence of the observer. The work of Carlos Casteneda has ~~has~~ shown that the world known to our ordinary senses augmented by our science, provides only one alternative version of reality. With change of perception through chemical changes in the brain, new, consistent and alternate patterns of reality emerge. The world of science-technology thus fails to give the certainty and security it used to provide.

As for the political-economic domination of the West in the world, our half-century began with political decolonization, which was itself a traumatic experience for the West, shaking the very foundations of its security. The loosening of political control was, however, compensated by a tightening of military and economic control, through trade and price regulations, the direct defiance of the UNCTAD, the escalation of armaments manufactured and trade, and through military interventions when necessary as in the case of Chile. In spite of all this the OPEC nations dealt a heavy blow which has thoroughly un-nerved the West. The financial crisis coming in its wake makes the peril seem really momentous. No wonder Western anxiety is becoming more and more irrational and in some cases hysterical.

This collapse of the confidence in science-technology and the breakdown of economic-military domination in the world, are now accompanied by a loss of nerve on the part of the West in

relation to its cultural superiority. Even after they had assigned the world cultures and civilizations to the third-rate status of the 'Third World', they are surprised to see these cultures now affirming themselves over against the West. The West's own young people are going in for Yoga and Zen, for Transcendental Meditation and Instant Tranquillity a l'orientale, in a big way. The new generation is questioning the accepted values of the dominant bourgeois civilisation-love of comfort, avoidance of conflict, personal sexual morality, acquisition of wealth, cultural rigidity and so on. With the collapse of the value system, fundamental anxiety wells up to the surface, threatening to paralyse Western man's self-esteem and self-assurance.

x x x x

Much knowledge, but little joy. Miguel de Unamuno said more than half a century ago to Spanish youth caught up in the fervour to recreate Europe by recreating a European kulture:-

> "Now to you, the younger generation, bachelor carrascos of a Europeanising regenerationism, you who are working after the best European fashion, with scientific method and criticism, to you I say : Create wealth, create nationality, create art, create science, create ethics, above all create or rather, translate - kultur, and thus kill in yourself both life and death, Little will it all last you!"[3].

We are now one stage beyond the debate between rationality and feeling, a debate of the giants, which resulted in the fading flower of a personalist existentialism. Unamuno was strongly onthe side of feeling, along with such stalwarts like Nietzsche and Bergson, Schopenhauer and Schelling. If John Macmurray's distinction between maturity and immaturity is as basic as he claims"4, the debate itself has to be resolved in terms that were not properly visible when the debate was at its hottest.

A new maturity demands a new break-through. Three elements seem to be basic in making such a breakthrough.

---

3. Unamuno: Tragic Sense of Life. Eng. Tr. J.E.Crowford Flitch, Dover, 1954. pp 329-330.

4. Reason and Emotion, Faber, 1935 p. 233

1) A collective repentance. The West has grievously sinned against the world by:

a) plundering its resources
b) trampling upon the dignity of its people
c) building up a system of exploitation in which wealth and the choicest of goods flow to the West
d) a cultural imperialism seeking to impose a pragmatic, science-technology-based utilitarian civilisation on the peoples of the world, which is destructive of their own inherited values.

A collective repentance does not mean essentially a beating of the breast or a new addition to the already unbearable burden of guilt, but a sincere change of mind, resulting both in remedies for past injustices and a new attitude in building new relational structures which are non-exploitative and non-repressive.

2) A restructuring of the religions. Most religion today, and especially the Christian religion, suffers from the estrangement or alienation (Entfremdung) of Man from his own true self. New theologies cannot reintegrate man. The problem is not primarily intellectual, but one of practice. The practice of religion will have to be based in a community where

a) personal relations between human beings receive priority of attention over correct statement of truth - i.e. the being of the community must be true and faithful, only then can its words also be true and faithful. The priority of love over dogma should not itself degenerate into a dogma, but be manifested in practice;

b) worship receives higher priority than mission. Worship does not degenerate into a series of exhibitive new verbal gymnastics or attention-getting new gimmicks; worship is not ancillary or preparatory to anything else, including mission; worship is the highest activity of man in acknowledging the true source of all being and goodness and rejoicing in that presence;

c) the actions of the community, whether in terms of love, worship or service, are not overly self-conscious or too rigidly structured. Spontaneity of human existence is destroyed where there is too much structure or too much self-consciousness and focussing upon oneself. Intellectual effort as well as prayers should also become not only more spontaneous, but also calling less attention to the personality of the person leading in prayer. There

should be less verbal productivity and more ritual, rhythmic, liturgical action with silence, meditation and contemplation, but also para-verbal, non-exhibitive experiences of the senses of touch, taste, seeing, hearing and smell as well as body movement. The transcendent can seldom be experienced in self-consciousness and rigidity.

3) A new vision of the universe. What is meant here is not a conceptualization, but an experience of the partial and distorted nature of our perception of the universe. We have need to get rid of the basic dualism in our thinking about "this world" and "other world"5. The vision of the universe (a) as one, (b) as upheld by God & (c) as including me in it, has to be achieved through a way of experiencing reality which is mature and goes beyond the confining boundaries of the scientific-technological reason. Such a vision is a religious experience and can be induced only as a result of years of striving and self-discipline. Society itself needs a new kind of training. The educational systems we now have bear a major share of the responsibility for killing the power of vision. A totally new educational approach with much more integration of feeling and thought, of worship and love will have to be devised.

This may result in a temporary stagnation in the multiplication of scientific knowledge and technological skills. That may very well be necessary in order to gain more wisdom and sensitivity. Without the vision that heals and helps us to strike our roots again in the transcendent dimension of the world, we will never overcome the anxiety of our civilisation.

Much joy, even with little knowledge, seems not only possible but preferable. The little knowledge will not be so much ignorance as an awareness of our present ignorance.

---

5. John MacMurray had said a half century ago: The failure (of 'emotional reason' to achieve maturity) expresses itself in the sense of estrangement between two worlds between the natural and the supernatural, this world and another world. The development of religion to maturity will be the fusion of the two - for they are but one. What our childishness thinks of as another world, a supernatural world, is merely the reality of this world which is hidden from us by the imperfection of our sensitiveness". op cit. p.65

4) A Restructuring of Science-Technology. This is likely to prove to be the hardest break-through. A change in the objectifying and reifying approach to reality would mean a radically new consciousness. The "secular" approach to reality which regards this world as a self-contained and self-regulating entity working according to certain mechanical rules will have to be abandoned. The vast and uncharted realms of non-objective life-experiences will have to be taken into account, and the laboratory may have to recede into the background. Research will take new lines into the psychic and cosmic forces, and a new integrated scientific theory will have to be developed which goes beyond the materialistic-mechanistic view of the world.

5) A restructuring of world relations. Europe will have to accept a position, not necessarily on the periphery, but no longer at the dominant centre. It will have to accept a poly-centric, multi-cultural socio-economic and political structure in the world. Europe need not fear marginalization; but it will have to accept the fact that it is no longer at the top or at the centre.

These are far-reaching changes, indeed. Anxiety can activate creativity or paralyse it. Kept within limits, Europe's very anxiety may become the matrix of a new creativity.

KNOWING AS STRIVING TOWARDS UNITY, P.Gregorios

Let me first give expression to my gratitude to the Free University of Amsterdam both for organizing this conference on concern about science, and for inviting me to participate. I believe that a Christian University is an excellent setting in which the issues about science and the future of humanity can be most profitably and creatively discussed, provided our Christian outlook and our scientific attitudes are not too narrow or parochial.

In speaking about ways in Knowing in Science and other ways of knowing I wish to refer first to five somewhat distinctive approaches to the problems of thruth, meaning and knowledge, in different regions of the North-West world where modern Science is most advanced. Secondly I would like to make some reference to one other cultural tradition, namely that of my own country, where modern Science, though a newcomer, is fairly developed. I would then like to say something about the role of community, tradition and interest in knowing, and to conclude by indicating certain lines of orientation for future development of human knowledge and life.

Five Western Approaches

We can here only list these approaches in a general way and not treat them adequately. But I feel that scientists all over the world have a responsibility to supply themselves with the understanding of these issues which their scientific training most likely neglected.

a. The English-speaking World in general

In a 1970 London symposium chaired by Karl Popper, the debate between Popper's 'cumulative' vision of scientific development and Thomas Kuhn's distinction between 'ordinary science' and scientific revolutions' 1) was focussed. Popper thinks that scientific knowledge grows by an evolutionary process in which scientific theories are advanced as bold 'conjectures', which are then subjected to rigorous 'refutation' 2), those theories which survive the critical process finding acceptance within the scientific cummunity; the accepted body of conjectures thus constitute a cumulative, growing body of scientific knowledge, which then exists as a 'third world' of 'objective knowledge' distinct from the world 'out there' and the world in subjective consciousness.

Kuhn's view is that behind all theories are paradigms or structures of understanding which are themselves chosen by the scientific community out of its cultural background for the purpose of understanding. At any given time one or more accepted paradigms serve the scientific community as common basis - Newtonian Mechanics and the Quantum-Relativity paradigm of our century being clear examples. The major part of science is ordinary science, most scientific workers seeking to refine or illuminate some one or more aspects of an accepted paradigm, while more speedy advance in scientific knowledge comes through scientific revolutions like the Copernican one.

The main papers of the Symposium and Kuhn's reply to his critics are published in Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge 3). Which to cite only some major conclusions. Prof. Lakatos states clearly that the two major assumptions of recent western culture, i.e. that scientific knowledge is non-subjectively objective, and that it is indubitably proved knowledge,

are no longer tenable, and with this there is a largely unnoticed foundation collapse in science-based western culture. It is also clear that there is no agreement among scientists as to the demarcation criteria between scientific knowledge and other kinds of knowledge. Even on the nature of scientific methodology, which Lakatos labels 'sophisticated methodological falsificationism' there is no agreement.

The inability of even the philosophy of science to solve the epistemological questions in science has led to a group of scientists at Edinburgh University making the distinction between epistemology and epistemics. Epistemology, these scientists think, is a philosophical game which does not actually help in the progress of science, and falls properly outside science. Epistemics, on the other hand is a scientific activity, in which scientists themselves construct paradigms or models in the light of which the scientific enterprise and activity can be scientifically studied. Prof. Mary Hesse of Cambridge University has, for example, advanced and developed the 'Feed-back Controlled Teaching Machine Model' for the understanding of scientific activity. Scientific theories are like the buttons in a teaching machine, one guesses the right answer to a problem and presses the corresponding button; if the proper panel lights up, then the theory is confirmed; if not other theories have to be tried, but then the hits and misses are fed back into the machine, so that more accurate theories can be developed in the 'theory formulater' which forms part of the science-machine.

To sum up, the general situation in the English-speaking world can be characterised as follows:

1. Most scientists are not interested in the philosophy of science, which had not formed part of their academic training, and they are not very much concerned to reflect philosophically on the nature and dependability of the knowledge yielded by science.
2. Those interested in the philosophy of science know that scientific knowledge is neither proven nor objective; that there is no way in science of logically demonstrating that the world 'out there' is as we perceive it in science. All we know is that we can make certain law-like statements which describe, explain, and help predict, other conditions remaining unchanged, how external reality behaves or will behave. These constitute useful operational knowledge and provide humanity with skills to engage in more useful and satisfactory relationships with its environment.
3. The old positivistic assumptions like 'only acientific knowledge is true knowledge', and 'no statement which cannot be verified or falsified by objective criteria can be either true or false', can no longer be sustained. The second proposition, for example cannot be true or false by its own criteria, for it cannot itself be verified or falsified.

b. Polanyi and Personal Knowledge.

Michael Polanyi's view of 'personal knowledge' 4) as distinctive from subjective or objective knowledge, grew up on the English speaking soil, but belongs to a continental ethos. The two major features of this view are (I) the delineation of the knowing process in science or personal relations or faith as one in which creative personal elements of feel and touch and intuition constantly interact with rational reflection and awareness, and (II) that grasping of patterns, gestalts, or wholes in scientific knowing always includes a shifting of focal attention from

the detail to the whole, which then allows one to come back to the detail with a greater sense of illumination.
This view has been more popular among students of theology than among practising scientists. But it is a view which when understood can open some important new doors to knowing how we know. His view of focal and distal perception and pattern intaking have important significance for all theories of knowing.

c. Structuralism in French Thought:

In France the 'dialogue' between Existentialism, neo-Marxism, and Structuralism takes such frequent kaleidoscopic turns that it is difficult to characterise the French view of knowing in any manageable way. Sartre himself has made radical shifts from his earlier existential perpective of 'L'être et le Neant' to a new view of Consciousness and Reality in which the existential way of knowing is only one strand, the other strands being provided by neo-Marxism and a modified Structuralism. Structuralism itself seems to develop as many varieties as the number of its proponents - Jacques Lacan in narrative structures, Lucien Goldmann in sociological structures, Claude Levi-Strauss in mythical-anthropological structures, Roland Barthes in literary structures and so on.
The main thrust of structuralism comes from two sources - literary criticism and cybernetics. Take a piece of poetry. If the poet simply puts down the words of a poem in some random or alphabetical order, the whole thing makes no sense, yields no meaning. It is the particular order, structure, pattern in which the words are put together that creates meaning. In a poem each word has its significance only in terms of its relation to its neighbours and to the total structure.
Here one must take a distinction between the signifying symbol or word and the signified meaning. The signifying element (le signifiant) can actually be words, markers, facial expressions,pictures, mathematical equations and so on. The signified reality (le signifié) is always meaning or idea or thought.
Scientific knowing, according to the Structurialists, lies in two synchronous processes - I. destructuralisation of the structured, and II. structuration of the destructured. But this twin process cannot be governed by rules. Like the poet, by an unconscious creative process, the scientist, knowing the individual elements in their detailed relationship to each other and to the structure in which they yield meaning, puts forward a scientific hypothesis, which is his own creation, on to reality. The meaning-structure of idea or thought, created by the algebra of signifying elements (words, pictures, models, symbols), is projected on to the reality-structure. Semeiology 5) (the science of Semeia or symbols or signs) is the major tool in this science; but it applies also to poetry, anthropology, history or contemporary culture. Science need not be monochromatic. The one-dimensional world-view of 19th century science is one from which we need to be liberated.
Man is a meaning-creator, a structure-creator. Knowing is a way of creating structures of meaning. He does not take in nature in the raw. He cooks his food before he eats it. Nature has to be made into culture by transforming it through knowing and changing nature.
The American Noam Chomsky's epistemological structures or deep grammar of the human mind is related to French structuralism, but it is of independent origin and has its own distinctive ethos, important for the understanding of the way the human mind functions in knowing.

Structuralism has now hit biblical interpretation in a big way, and in French-speaking circles of theology, Structural Exegesis has become the reigning fashion 6).
Structuralism changes colour with every passing month. It is determined to find a unifying methodology for all knowledge. Its possibilities of success can be differently assessed by different people.

d. The German-Language Debate.
Here the debate is exceedingly rich and rewarding, though scientists themselves are seemingly unaffected by it. We cannot do justice to the debate in our short survey here.
If in the English-speaking world the ideal is the unity of all scientific knowledge more or less in terms of the laws of (mechanistic) physics, the German tendency for a long time has been to seek such unity in terms of the historical method. Not only do we have to keep in mind the difference or nuance of meaning between science in English or French and Wissenschaft in German or Wetenschap in Dutch. Ever since Doysen and Dilthey, historical understanding (Verstehen)has been the model of knowledge rather than scientific explanation (Erklärung). The subjective pole in all knowledge is thus not only acknowledged, but deemed central, without denying the objective pole (as later happened in some forms of Existentialism). Husserl, Brentano and Meinong among others had effected a problem shift in developing Phenomenology which sought to become the science of sciences by seeking to see knowledge as a system of meanings in consciousness or eidetic essences. Schleiermacher and Heidegger had contributed in no small measure to making the subjective element both the starting point and the essential locus of all knowledge.
Today the debate is between Hans Georg Gadamer and Jürgen Habermas. Gadamer's Truth and Method is the centerpiece of the discussion. He sees all knowledge as based on fore-knowledge. It is from previous knowledge that the knower, scientific or other, projects possible pre-judgements or pre-judices on to reality, seeking confirmation in the latter. Gadamer sees our very prejudice against prejudice as a prejudice inherited from the Enlightenment which sought to avoid all pre-suppositions of dogma and authority in seeking a knowledge based on pure rationality. This is a quest that has failed. Prejudice is the basis of knowledge and there is no knowledge without prejudice, though there can be bad prejudices unconfirmable by reality and better prejudices receiving higher confirmation. Scientific theories as well as historical understanding are based on apt prejudices.
The knowing subject has his own effective history (Wirkungsgeschichte) which determines the horizon of his prejudices and thus the horizon of his perception and understanding. This Wirkungsgeschichte is determined by one's cultural background, historical locus, and personal training as well as inherited languagestructures created by particular societies. Even in historical understanding one does not step out of one's own horizon to identify oneself with the horizon and understanding of a contemporary observer or participant in an event. One simply reconstructs the horizon of the contemporary or participant, and, without by any means leaving or laying aside one's own horizon, fuses the two horizons, thus constructing a new understanding of a past event which cannot be identical with that of the contemporary or participant.
Jürgen Habermas 8) takes Gadamer to task for not taking sufficiently into account the interest of the knower as an element in his Wirkungs-geschichte. The knower's class interests as well as his transcedent

interest in seeking better and better prejudices are just as important as the evolutionary history which produced the knower's horizon.

Both Gadamer and Habermas recognize the three levels of knowledge in the physical sciences (Naturwissenschaften), the human science (Geisteswissenschaften) and the critical sciences (Ideologiekritiek) like literary criticism or socio-politico-economic ideology.

The debate is far from resolved but what emerges as an important point for us is the non-universality of the horizon of the knower which makes the notion of a non-subjective objectivity even more problematic.

e. The Official Marxist World

Habermas, who is a post-Marxist who came out of the German Marxism of the Franfurtschule, is critized by offical Marxism for being too academic and abstract, and fundamentally in error at the point of not adequately recognizing the epistemological value of labour and the relations of production. For Marxism, which still believes in the objectivity of a world 'out there' independent of the subjective observer, and in the medieval principle of adaequatio rei et intellectus, sees scientific knowledge as a 'reflection' in consciousness of an objective world in the process of a society's seeking to shape that objective world and to humanize it,thereby overcoming alienation between subject and object. Marxism's great achievement is in the unification of all knowledge into a single integral whole with the three laws of the dialectic (i.e. the mutual interpenetration of opposites, the negation of the negation, and the transformation of quantity into quality) as the basic foundation. Not that scientific knowledge can be deduced from the three laws, or that these laws can be succesfully applied in detail at every level of reality. But philosophy or ideology remains inseparable from scientific knowledge and exists in dialectical relation to it. Philosophy itself is scientific knowledge abstracted at a very high level of generalization, spanning several disciplines, and consequently exercises a controlling influence on scientific knowledge.

One must not entertain the idea that Marxist thinking on the problem of knowing is completely out-dated or static. There is a great deal of new thinking in the Soviet Academy of Science as well as in the Polish and other Socialist academies of science. Most western evaluations of current Marxist thinking can be described as prejudices that do not find confirmation in reality 9).

Literature in Western languages is limited but not scanty. A whole new series of publications have recently come out of the USSR Academy of Sciences put out by Progress Publishers, Moscow. Attempts to understand certain dualities in precent science are fascinating if not always successful e.g. the corpuscular-undulatory characteristics of sub-atomic particles.

The quality of Marxist thought in analyzing the ways of knowing does not impress so much by its success in solving the basic epistemological questions (in fact here it seems, is the basic weakness of Marxist philosophical thought) but rather in the construction of an aesthetically pleasing architectonic structure that integrates all knowledge.

Indian Thought- A Plethora of Perspectives

Western thought can be contrasted with the Primal Vision of most of humanity still reflected in not too industrialized societies and also in some pursuits of the 'counter-culture' in the West. There is the whole Middle Eastern thought - world - especially ancient Assyrian and Egyptian, of which we know so little. There is Taoism which remains a dynamic force in at least one-fourth of mankind, especially in Chinese and related societies. Buddhism, in its various forms has different approaches to know

In India itself, the culture has developed at least five major ways of knowing or looking at reality:

a. The Vedic Paradigm,

The Vedic Paradigm, which belongs to the earliest documented level in Indian thought sees the universe as a huge cosmic egg in the process of hatching, but which process can be disrupted by human sin as well as by sin by the Gods. It has to be held together by sacrifice, or by self-giving which is what keeps it from going to pieces. This ritualistic-mythical perception of the universe and of a unity within which the knower stands and which has to be sustained and maintained by the conduct of free beings within it, plays a very limited role in the current intellectual life of India, but has been re-stated in a relevant and interesting way by the Hispano-Indian Catholic Scholar Dr. Paymundo Panikkar.

b. The Secular Dualistic World-View

Arising out of a reaction to the over-ritualization and clericalization (a perennial danger for all sacramental views) of the Vedic view, the Sankhya view seeks to see all reality in terms of an interaction between consciousness and non-consciousness (Purůsa and Prakrti). The Sankhya philosophy showed itself to be extremely dynamic, not only by constant changes within the system itself, but also by giving birth to very stringent systems of thinking and knowing. Logical philosophical systems like Tarka and Nyaya were inspired by it. Nearly all forms of Hinduism and Buddism owe something to the categories and perspectives of the Sankya system. Both consciousness and non-consciousness arise out of a single reality called the Avyakta (means the unclear or indistinct) and reality is a constant interplay between the conscious and the non-conscious. Out of the Indistinct arise the three basic qualities of Tamas (literally darkness), Rajas (literally resplendent, shining forth, active dynamism) and Sattva (literally being, truth, unchanging reality). The purpose of all knowing is to move up the scale from torpid, sensuous, instinct-driven darkness, to the shining and dynamic activism of light and from there to realised being.

c. The Religious Dualistic view

The Religious Dualistic view, similar in some ways to the western religious views, is comparatively modern (13th century) in Indian thought, and may bear the marks of early contact with western travellers and semitic traders. Madhva, whose dualistic system calls itself Dvaita (literally dualism) sees God and the universe as two distinct realities. It sees also ordinary sense-knowledge as real and not as illusory. For Madhva there can be no final external validating authority for knowledge. It is our own internal perceiving centre (Sakshin) that is the final source of conviction, not any external authority or criterion of measurement or experiment. Dividing the universe into the conscious and the non-conscious, he finds three realities. Brahma (God), Jīva (Life or Soul or Consciousness) and Jada (body or non-conscious reality). Knowledge has as its goal understanding the relation and difference between these three realities, i.e. five stes of relations and differences: Brahma-Jīva (God-Soul), Brahma-Jada (God-non-conscious), Jīva-Jada (Soul-body or consciousness-matter), Jīva-Jiva (between conscious being) and Jada-Jada (between various non-conscious entities). Ultimate unification of all knowledge, however, comes through bhakti, or devout and self-giving worship.

d. The Vedantic Non-dual way.

This is the dominant Indian view among Hindu inlettectuals, most of them adhering to the absolute non-dualism (Advaita or Kevalādvaita) of Śankara (8th century), only a minority preferring qualified non-dualism (visiṣtādvaita) of Ramanuja (11th century). Vedanta makes the important distinction between parā-vidya (transcendent knowledge), and aparā-vidya (non-transcendent knowledge), corresponding to two levels of reality, i.e ultimate reality (paramārthika-satta) and practical every-day experience of reality (vyāvahaika-satta). The three-fold difference of knower, known and knowledge relates only to the second level, to which modern science belongs. In the ultimate or transcendent perception of reality, knower, known and knowledge become integrated into one single reality in which there is no duality between self and world or self and God.

Non-transcendent knowledge, including scientific knowledge, in this perception, is valuable as way-station on the path of knowledge, but the ultimate destination is parā-vidya or transcendent knowledge which overcomes all duality. Therefore precise thinking and theoretical reflection can help on the way, but not beyond. Especially helpful is the knowledge of knowledge itself; but one knows reality by measuring it; in order to know the nature of that knowledge, one has to have some perception, not only of the knowing or measuring process (a la Kant or phenomenology in the West), but also the nature of that which is measured (pramēya), the nature of measuring-stick or method used (pramāna) and the nature of the measurer (pramāta). It is in the analysis of these that the limitatic of non-transcendent knowledge (aparā-vidya) are revealed.

This is a very valid insight in relation to contemporary science, the deliverances of which we accept without too deep analysis, because it 'works ' - works to gratify some of our desires and drives.

e. The Buddhist Middle Way.

Buddhism, followed only by a very small minority (less than 1%) in India was for many centuries a most vigorous intellectual and spiritual system in India. I would particularly commend one school within Asian Buddhism, The Middle Path or Mādhyamika philosophy. Its founder and most important thinker, Nāgārjuna, seems to me one of the most powerful thinkers the human race has produced, comparable to Plato or Aristotle, Sankaa or Thomas Aquinas, Kant or Hegel. In contradistinction with, say, Heidegger Nāgārjuna insists that the conceptual approach to truth and our present kind of scientific approach to reality cannot apprehend reality in its ultimate dimension. He does it on a logical basis, calling in question our accepted notions of causality, space and time, basic to all conceptu understanding. Nāgārjuna would not say that things are like this or are not like this. Things do not come into being, or cease to exist; neither do they not come into being, nor do they not cease to exist. The positiv statement and the negative statement are equally untrue or unfalse.

Such thinking is of course very frustrating to the neat binary western logic of non-contradiction and excluded middle to which the west claims to adhere.

But two concepts in Nāgārjuna's thought - Reality as Sūnyata (Void) and its appearance as pratītya samutpāda (conditioned co-emergence) deserve special attention in the light of recent developments in Western scienc The concept of Sūnyata (sūnya means zero or non-being) does not mean that reality is non-existent; it affirms that concepts are not true-reflections of reality and are not adequate guides to dealing with

reality. The concept of pratītya samuttpāda insists that reality as it appears is neither real nor unreal, but an experience that arises under certain conditions within the knower and within the known.
The questioning of the ultimate reality of the world perceived by our senses and dealt with in our science is a common characteristic of the Vedantic Māya doctrine and of Buddhist Mādhyamika doctrine of Śūnyata. This should not be confused with plato's two worlds - the cosmos noétos which is one, perfect eternal and unchanging, and the ordinary world of particulars which is manifold, imperfect, temporal and changing. The Indian view may have somewhat similar intent to Plato's two worlds; but it is more radical. It does not say, as western popular over-simplifications often picture Māya or Śūnyata doctrines, simply that the world is an illusion. What it says has some relation to the Biblical affirmation that the things open to our senses (ta blepomena) are only passing or for the time being (proskaira), while those not open to our senses (ta mē blepomena) are lasting or eternal (aiōnia) - (2 cor 4:18).

My purpose in setting forth a listing of five different Indian approaches to reality was only to exemplify other possible perspectives still unexamined by educated people in the so-called modern world. There are dozens of other possible perceptions, and there is no guarantee at all that the scientific perception of the west has sufficient validation within itself to judge and condemn other perceptions. This is an exceedingly important point, and I think that the cocksure arrogance of modern science, which I regard not only as unjustified but also as a major and destructive malady, can find some hope of healing only by being deeply exposed to these other cultural perceptions and the experiences which underlie them. I am also suggesting that the contribution of these other perceptions can not be limited to merely the application of science, but to a radical questioning of the assumptions on which modern science is based, and therefore, hopefully to a radical re-orientation of future scientific development.

From my perspective it becomes increasingly clear that all scientific knowledge is a subject-object kind of knowledge that has a very meaningful function in this time-space universe of our existence and perception, but that it can serve the true purpose of human existence only when it moves forward in two directions at once. One direction is the social dimension becoming more closely integrated with the practice of science so that science and the technology based on it serves the truly human ends of justice, peace, human dignity and the unity of the human race. If I may say so without antagonising the scientific community, that community is at present too sadly alienated from social and political-economic reality. The development required demands that our universities and schools integrate the study of the interaction between science and society into the training of not only scientists but of all educated people. The scientific enterprise cannot be analyzed as if it existed independently of society. Future research and training must devote at least ten percent of humanity's scientific resources to research and training in the understanding of how science and technology functions in society.

The second direction for the development of the future science, I believe, should be towards transcending the subject-object kind of knowledge towards transcendent wisdom and meaning. The claims once advanced by modern science to have access to impersonal, non-subjective, objective, proved knowledge, stand largely discredited. The import of developments in science in our century - including quantum mechanics and the special theory of Relativity, the uncertainly principle, the Michelson-Mosly experiment, the Einstein-Podolski-Rosen paradox and Gödel's theorem - is to show up the highly

problematic character of our earlier scientific certainty based on the observable regularities of newtonian mechanics which we once took to be the 'immutable laws of nature', independent of human perception, universally valid and objective.

We have also come to a stage in modern physics where our theories are recognized to be limited by the categories of language. We try to understand light or electrons as particles or waves, both concepts drawn from a commonsense or mechanistic language. We find neither of them by itself adequate to describe the behavior of light or electron. At least at the sub-atomic level, we have to affirm: a) that naive realism cannot account for the experimental dat; b) that we have no knowledge of how a particle behaves independently of our observation and measurement; c) that there is no pictorial representation of the atomic world that is adequate; d) that the usual notions of time, space and causality by which we understand reality in the mechanistically conceived universe cannot be applied to the sub-atomic world; e) that the world is not a whole composed of discrete material parts, but is a system of inter-connected probability waves; and finally f) that the knowing process affects the known object, and that knowing is thus an action which generates a reaction. If all data are thus theory-laden and all properties which we ascribe to the 'objective' world so observer-dependent 10); if there is no one given model by which reality can be understood; if even the sub-atomic particles are not individuals with their seperate identity but manifestations within a system which is more than the sum of its parts; if matter itself is composed of energy-waves or vibratory patterns in time, rather than of inert particles; and if, as one interpretation 11) of the uncertainty principle would have it, reality itself is non-objective, or at least conceivable in terms of alternate particles co-existing as probability waves, then our certainty of the given-ness of the world as we now experience it rests only on an extremely questionable epistemological basis; we can take more seriously alternate views of reality like māya or śūnyata for whatever cogent sense they can make We can abandon our old superior and condescending characterisations of Oriental thought as world-and-life-denying while regarding our own thought as nobler and world-and-life-affirming.

The fundamental affirmation of Oriental thought can be put in one sentence: 'any knowledge in which the knower, the known and the knowledge remain separate is not true knowledge; and conversely, that alone is true knowledge where the subject, the object and their relation in terms of knowledge become a single unit'. This is the essence of the Vedic, Upanishadic or Buddhist as well as Taoist vision of reality. And to this vision christians as well as people trained in the ways of western science ought to pay greater attention than we have in the past.

Community, Tradition and Interest

Scientific research is a community enterprise, based on tradition, oriente by certain interests.

Our conception of the world is in need of revision; so is our conception of the knowing individual as autonomous subject.

No scientist starts his work from scratch, nor does he carry out that work and bring it to fruition in isolation from the scientific community. Whether in 'ordinary science' or in revolutionary science', to use Kuhnian terms, the creative practising scientist has to take on trust most of the accepted past research of the scientific community. He cannot himself go through all the experiments necessary to establish all the assumptions on

which his own research is based. He inherits from the scientific community a vast body of knowledge, a way of doing research, and some paradigms within which previous work has been carried out. Every scientist is thus the inheritor of a tradition and is heavily dependent on that tradition.

It is not sufficient that his research yields sufficient knowledge for himself. He has to convince the scientific community about his work and its results. They are his judges and their acceptance of his work is crucial. He benefits from their advice and criticism not only at the end of his work but also along the way.

The whole body of scientific knowledge can never be held in one individual mind. It is the whole scientific community who is both the custodian of tradition and the promotor and judge of creativity within that tradition. The failure to recognize the role of community and tradition in scientific work can distort our vision of science.

The same is of course true also in religious knowledge - heavily dependent on community and tradition even in those cases where it is dogmatically held that the individual's faith is independent of church and tradition. The Apostles themselves regarded the faith of the church as something which they had received and transmitted (1 cor 11:23; 15:1). No fundamentalist can declare that Jesus Christ is Lord or that He is risen, without depending on the primary witness of the Apostles handed down from generation to generation in the community of the churches. Non-recognition of tradition does not abolish tradition, either in science or in faith. The great ambition of the western Enlightenment to dethrone tradition and replace it by reason has not proved worthy or capable of fulfilment.

Equally important is the development of science is interest. Pure science, science as knowledge for its own sake, has become, even as an ideal, impossible to achieve. Cultural and economic interests basically influence the choices of problems for scientific research and the financing of them; less than 50% of modern science may be devoted to genuine human problems; most of it is oriented to military defence or offense, or to producing quick profit for the big corporations.

In religion too power interests play such a large role as to obscure and distort its genuineness. The failure of religion to carry conviction is less due to the domination of the scientific world-view than to the betrayal of religion's own authenticity by extraneous interests of economic or political power, domination, property, prestige and so on.

It is the taskof community and tradition to call back science as well as religion to their true and authentic identity. In the scientific community too, dogmatism and the play of interest distort the true identity of science and retard its true development. Perhaps the situation in science is almost as bad as in religion, for it becomes impossible for the scientific community to liberate itself from the enslavement to military and commercial interests, and to find funds and personnel for science to pursue genuine human interests.

Perhaps the place where religion and science cooperate is at the point i.e. in calling both the religious community and the scientific community to reassert their authentic self-hood, and to seek to serve truly human interests of peace, justice, and human fulfilment.

The scientific community is at present alienated from society in many parts of the world. The religious community is even more alienated, largely by its own fault, from the scientific community as well as from the human community in general which it claims to serve.

Communities live by tradition. Tradition becomes sterile when it becomes static, dogmatic and self-satisfied. Tradition, as classical Christianity conceives it, is a striving forward of a community, based on an awareness of the experiences which have shaped it, toward goals which it imperfectly perceives and partially achieves. Tradition cannot stop in its striving; but such striving, if it is to be truly liberating, must be based on a fearless and non-self-justifying self-understanding of communities, and a clearer and deeper insight into the goals which they set for themselves and others.

The play of interest, of desires we cannot master but which drive us, distort both community and tradition. Religious communities and scientific communities have to help each other in understanding and mastering the play of these interests.

It is a fundamental insight of the Eastern Christian tradition that true growth in knowledge and wisdom comes not primarily by greater conceptual clarity, but by the transformation of the being of the knower as the knower becomes freed from alienation and inauthenticity. Science and technology have their role to play in that liberation and transformation, but cannot by themselves achieve either.

Overcoming Alienation and Recovering Authenticity

Some Conclusions

The self becomes inauthentic when it is alienated. Both scientific communities and religious communities today manifest many symptoms of thisalienation and inauthenticity, which prevent it from rightly knowing reality and from being rightly related within reality.

Authenticity requires both identity and relation. Identity involves some distinctiveness or difference from the rest of reality but also requires proper relations with that reality within which that distinctiveness can be maintained. Alienation affects both self-understanding (identity) and relation.

The overcoming of alienation demands changes in understanding and changes in relation. I submit that certain types of dualism which have played a large role in our understanding and relation need to be analyzed and overcome or corrected. I wish only to mention some examples here:

1. Man and Nature dualism with which is connected the subject-object dualism, where Man is subject and Nature object;
2. Nature-Supernature dualism, appearing also as Nature-Grace dualism. The basic error is in the very conception of nature as an autonomous realm (whether created by God or self-existent) subsisting by its own laws where God does not intervene and which constitutes the realm of science; while 'Supernature' is conceived as the realm of God's activity, the realm within which religion operates.
3. Creation-Redemption dualism: By placing a disjunction between the creation which was held to be autonomous and a finished act of God, and conceiving Incarnation and Redemption as an act of intervention for which creation serves merely as back-drop and raw material or support-system, we have again separated revelation and reason, justified our lack of Christian 'concern about (and for) science'. If on the other hand we conceive creation as an ongoing act within which redemption becomes a central event, then scientific activity itself can be seen as part of God's creative action in which human beings are invited to participate.

One could mention among other dualisms - material - spiritual, christian-non-christian, vertical-horizontal, evangelical-liberal, personal-social, and so on. All of these can be overcome at a higher level of understanding

and apprehension. Failure to do so will increase the alienation between Science and Religion and distort the reality of both.

The scientific community has to help the religious community at this point. Theology is seeking to break out of its alienation by being concerned about socio-economic justice. It must go further to understand the deep problems raised by Science and by the reflection about science, and strive together with scientists, for a comprehensive meaning-structure for religious as well as scientific perception.

Let me conclude by reaffirming three things:

a. that the scientific communities and the religious communities should cooperate in rediscovering their authentic existence and role in society through an analysis of their traditions, of how their activity or in-activity affects society, and through a more clear perception of their goals and purposes, as well as their common commitment to human justice and dignity,
b. that all conceptual dualisms in perception and reflection are to be overcome by relating seperated entities at a higher level; and
c. that all activity, religious or scientific, (knowing, being and acting) should be oriented towards the unity of humanity in God, with the rest of creation; and of manifesting the glory of God in that creation.

Notes

1. See Thomas Kuhn, The Copernican Revolution, New York, 1957 P.T.O. and The Structure of Scientific Revolution, 2nd expanded edition, Chicago, 1970.

2. Karl Popper, Conjectures and Refutations; Objective Knowledge, An Evolutionary Approach, Oxford, 1972.

3. Alan Musgrave and Imre Lakatos (eds), Cambridge, Revised Edition, 1976.

4. Michael Polanyi, Personal Knowledge, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1955, 2nd impression, 1962
The Tacit Dimension, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1967.

5. Roland Barthes, Elements of Semiology, London 1967,
Levi-Strauss, Structural Anthropology, New York, Basic Books, 1963,
Philip Petit, The Concept of Structuralism,a critical analysis, Gill and Macmillan, Dublin, 1975. The literature is truly prodigious.

. See Daniel Patte, What is Structual Exegesis ?, Fortress Press, 1976.

. Wahrheit und Methode, J.C.B. Mohr, Tübingen, English translation Sheed and War, London.

J. Habermas, Knowledge and Human Interests, (Erkenntnis und Interesse), Boston, 1971;
Communication and The Evolution of Society, Heinemann, 1979.
See also the excellent discussion in Thomas McCarthy, The Critical Theory of Jürgen Habermas, Cambridge, Mass. (Hutchinson).

9. Among notable exeptions is the American (non-marxist) Loren Graham's Science and Philosophy in the Soviet Union, Vintage Books, New York, 1974, but recent developments have made the book a bit out of date. For current Soviet literature in English, the best way to be up to date is to write for a catalogue to Progress Publishers, Moscow.

10. N.R. Hanson, 'The Dematerialization of Matter' in Ernan McMullin, ed. The Concept of Matter, University of Notre Dame Press, 1963, p. 549.

11. I have in mind the Heisenberg Interpretation, in Werner Heisenberg, Physics and Philosophy, New York, Harper and Row, 1958, see p. 54.

October 13,1980

Paulos Mar Gregorios

HOW IS MEANING DERIVED? A METHODOLOGICAL EXPLORATION THAT AFFECTS THE CONTENT

INTRODUCTION

I want to begin with a word of deep appreciation for the organising of this conference on "The Meaning of Life — the Meaning of History". I am grateful to Dr. Kuczyński and the authorities of the Polish Academy of Sciences for convening this conference at a time when the forces of reaction threaten the world with near total extinction; and the menacing clouds of war gather in the sky foreboding the loss of all meaning of life and history. I am particularly glad to be with the Polish people at this critical hour of their own history when the same forces of reaction seek to misuse the genuine struggle of the Polish people for freedom and dignity, to serve the interests of counterrevolution and destabilisation. As an Indian I want to reassure the people of Poland of our solidarity with them in their struggle to build a genuinely socialist society and to drive out the forces of corruption and reaction from their midst. May the people of Poland be enabled to pursue unhindered their struggle for human dignity, for freedom from corruption and exploitation, and for a genuinely socialist society where the people of Poland, in solidarity with all people of the world struggling for emancipation from oppresion and exploitation, can be free to build a socialist society that is creative and meaningful.

THE PROBLEM

The methodological question about the meaning of life and the meaning of history can be formulated in different ways. We can here put down four related questions:

a) What exactly do we mean by meaning? or What is the meaning of meaning?

b) Does history or human existence have any meaning at all? Have not others argued that history is "bunk" and has no meaning at all?

c) Does personal or individual life have a meaning apart from the meaning of history, or are the two inextricably related?

d) What is the method for deriving meaning for persons and societies? Does all meaning decisions have to be common to the whole of a society? What is the basis and limit of permissible deviation in personal determinations and group determinations of meaning?

This paper can attempt only a preliminary answer to these important questions — important for all thinking persons and societies.

2. THE MEANING OF MEANING

It is notoriously difficult to settle the meaning of meaning. The English word meaning comes from the same root as "mind" and "mental", related to Latin *mens* and Sanskrit *manas*. Its basic connotation is: an idea that is intelligible, an aim or purpose, the significance that is to be conveyed by words, looks, or other gestures or actions; the understanding of how something fits in with other things and how it functions. The Latin root *sensus* comes from *sentire*, i.e. to perceive through the senses, to feel the import of something, to have in consciousness, to understand the significance of.

We are seeking the meaning of human life and human history, to discover how my existence as well as the existence of others both present, past and future, makes sense in two senses: a) a coherent pattern and b) an over-all purpose. These two meanings of meaning should be kept together, i.e. how human life and history fits into the whole on the one hand, and what its general goal and purpose are.

There may be a third sense in which meaning can be understood — related to the other two: "What accounts for human life and history?" We can take these three aspects together, i.e. a) the origins of human life and history, b) a goal towards which it seems to be moving, and c) a coherent pattern in terms of which we can grasp and understand the functioning of life and history and how it fits in with the whole. To what extent these questions are answerable and what are the methods used for answering these questions, which have several subquestions implied within them, would be basic concern of this paper.

Some of the developments in modern structural linguistics and semiology are relevant here, but we refrain from going into an involved discussion of semantic relations, deep grammar, logical syntax and Carnap's semiotics, or the study of patterned human behaviour in communication in all its modes. I can only pay tribute to the famous Polish logician Alfred Tarski who in the 1930's provided the neopositivists of the Anglo-Saxon world with a workable definition of Truth — a definition which I find unacceptable. I must also pay tribute to the clarifications provided by Roland Barthes' *Semiology*, but regret my inability to follow his over-complex methodology of deriving meaning.

3. THE PROBLEM OF PATTERN IN HISTORY

We need to find a "gestalt", a structure, a pattern, in terms of which we can "make sense" of the welter of contradictory phenomena which we observe about human existence and history. This pattern or gestalt should be composed of rules or laws and principles which are of a general or universal nature.

In the physical realm, at least in Newtonian mechanistic science, we were prone to seek all understanding in terms of the principle of causality and universal laws. In the human realm we may have to introduce a secondary principle of human intention or purposive action as an additional principle of explanation. So if we are to understand human life and history, we need a causal expla- ..
existence

by causal factors (a possible assumption) then integrate such purposive action into the explanation of the meaning of life and history.

There are those who have argued that history has no meaning at all — that it has neither pattern nor coherence, neither laws nor lessons. We will do well to leave these skeptics like Ranke alone, and to pay more heed to Benedetto Croce who advised us to combine philosophy with history. We can listen to Bishop Bossuet [1] who believed that history was the manifestation of Divine Providence, or to Giovanni Battista Vico [2], who having paid tribute to Divine Providence on the first page, proceeded to work out his science of history with laws of history that would be as true as the laws of nature.

Vico is still important, for his basic proposition that history moves through three stages remains popular in the West, particularly in Germanic thinking. The basic pattern of Vico was progress from Savage life, to Barbaric life and then to Civilized Life. Behind this pattern are intuitions about Africa, Asia and Europe, Europe being the home of the only real civilization, with science, law and the state rationally set forth. The idea of progress seems to be an indispensable backdrop to European historiography, which seems to imply also the idea that Europe is the acme of progress. Hegel would even say that in Europe itself the Prussian nation was ahead of the rest.

If we want pattern in history, we must ask the question of Montesquieu [3] about the causes of national greatness and decay — is it the genius of extraordinary human beings or the power of accumulated knowledge in a society? The inventions of scientists and technicians or the blood of superior races? The conditions and relations of economic production and distribution or the pecularities of geographical location, climate and soil?

Montesquieu believed that climate was decisive, that the north was vigorous, the south lazy. So masters came from the North (but why not from the south temperature zones) and slaves from the south. H. T. Buckle [4] corrected him that this applied only to the early stages, before the mastery of science and technology; but still the category of progress is definitely weighted in favour of the West or the North. Even Hegel was something of a geographical determinist, who thought the existence of the Mediterranean Sea as a means of communication accounted for much in ancient history (of the Mediterranean countries, but not exclusively). One could ask why India or Sri Lanka did not develop in the same way, being surrounded with water.

There may be some truth to the assumption that the determining factors of history are not uniform at all times, that new factors emerge in history to change history. The argument, however, seems to be between the relative influence of geographical (and climatic), racial, mental and economic factors: but can one completely ignore the role of religious factors, especially understanding something of current history in Poland?

---

[1] *Histoire Universelle*, 1681.

[2] *Principles of a New Science* (Scienza Nuova), 1725.

[3] *L'esprit des lois, Lettres Persanes; Considerations on the Causes of the Grandeur and Decadence of the R*

Marx himself would see the three stages of human existence as the hunting-pastoral, agricultural-handicraft, and industrial-technological[5]. He agrees with Hegel that reality is in motion and should be understood as such. He also agrees that this motion is not unilinear, but dialectical; on the surface, one may see the identity or the "this-ness" of the process, but without understanding the contradiction and negation of this this-ness which lies underneath, one does not understand the true identity of reality or history. The surface is only face, identity depends on the unity of the face and what lies behind the face. True identity of history is thus an "identity of identity and non-identity", i.e. the unity of the phenomenological surface, and the contradiction underneath.

The surface may hide the reality, and in the course of development, the reality underneath comes out and changes the surface — the *Umschlag* or the abrupt, leaplike transformation which erupts to change the face of society, transforming the face or identity of the whole to its opposite; while underneath, the old contradictions give place to new ones which keep operating beneath the surface. New identity generates new contradictions; the old contradictions are under *Aufhebung*, that is under suspension, not annihilated; they will emerge in new forms later on.

This is Hegel's contribution which Marx generally accepted; but he had to turn Hegel down side up in some other respects, especially in the two false assumptions in Hegel, according to Marx, of the primacy of mind over matter, and in the direct and necessary rather than indirect and conditional identity between the contradictions within any given unity.

Methodologically, these are both very decisive for the detection of pattern in history — the methodological problem of the starting point and the ontological problem of the nature of the identity between contradictories.

4. THE METHODOLOGICAL PROBLEM OF THE STARTING POINT

Can we start, in deciphering and discerning meaning in life and history, with some abstract concept like "Divine Providence" or "Geographical and Racial Determinism" and proceed to illustrate it in specific instances, thereby demonstrating the validity of the category? Obviously such procedure though indulged in by great minds, would be eminently unscientific and unsatisfactory. For the same reason, an abstract principle like "Dialectical Materialism" or "Economic Determinism" would be inadequate, as Marx himself forcefully argued. Marx does not start with an abstract principle and then proceed to analyze society on the basis of that principle.

On the contrary, the introduction to the *Grundrisse* (Notebook M) begins with a phenomenological analysis of the production process[6], which according to him is the ground and the raw material of history.

---

[5] *Grundrisse, Foudations of the Critique of Political Economy*, Eng. Tr. Penguin, 1973, Introduction, p. 107.

[6] Marx actually spoke about the process of material exchange as a social phenomenon *(Stoffwechselprozess)* rather than abstractly about production.

He further stands Hegel on his head, not only by taking process of material exchange rather than ideas as primary and fundamental, but also by changing the moralistic concept of value by relating it directly to the social process of production.

Marx seeks to understand the meaning of history by an analysis, not of concepts, but of concrete reality. But the question remains: is any analysis of the social phenomenon possible without a fairly intuitive selection of a set of categories? How does one adjudicate between one set of categories and another?

Here is the crux of the problem of methodology in deriving meaning.

All categories are derived from human experience and human reflection. The categories used by Marx were derived in relation to those used by Hegel, Proudhon, Ricardo, Adam Smith and a host of other philosophers and economists, whose own category structures have their own histories of development.

In the last analysis the choice of a category structure to discern meaning is a matter, partly of taste, and only partly of demonstrated power to illuminate reality.

Methodologically then, there is no final way of demonstrating conclusively the superiority of one category structure over another. We can use many evaluatory standards, elegance and simplicity of construction, power to explain and predict phenomena more comprehensively and the capacity to be renewed through critical feed-back. Marx's own criterion of meaning for history and for life is basically drawn from Hegel, but radically altered. Within the western discussion at least, Hegel, as modified by Marx may be as good a starting point as any, for developing an appropriate category structure.

If non-western societies can produce another category structure, unrelated to Hegel and Marx, we cannot reject it out of hand as irrelevant. The measure of its relevance would be the degree to which it orients and facilitates creative and meaningful human understanding and activity today. The general impression is that original systematic reflection itself being rather rare among those without a western training, no competing category structure with a high degree of social and historical relevance has come from outside the West — apart from, of course, the Eastern religious perspectives. To these we shall refer later.

MENSCHWURDUNG AS BASIC CATEGORY FOR UNDERSTANDING OF THE MEANING OF HUMAN LIFE AND HISTORY

The "individual", that notorious entity created by the society of free competition, "detached from the natural bonds etc., which in earlier historical periods make him the accessory of a definite and limited human conglomerate", [7] and his consciousness, were not the starting points for Marx. He starts with "material production" and finds the process of human becoming in terms of the forces and relations of production. In fact Marx begins a chapter of Notebook M of *Grundrisse* with an attack on the assumption that the Individual is a *natural* entity. The human

[7] Marx, *Grundrisse*, p. 85.

person is a *historical* entity, arising historically and shaped historically — not a *natural* given.

The idea that meaning is a primarily individual matter, though often erroneously attributed to Christianity, is a creation of the 18th century civil or bourgeois society, which assumed the individual to be primary and society as something existing external to him or her. Equally false is the idea that it is thinking that shapes the human being. As Marx puts it very strongly in the *Grundrisse:*

> The totality as it appears in the head, as a totality of thoughts, is a product of a thinking head, which appropriates the world in the only way it can, a way different from the artistic, religious, practical and mental appropriation of the world. The real subject (the producing society) retains its autonomous existence outside the head just as before; namely as long as the head's conduct is merely speculative, merely theoretical. Hence, in the theoretical method too, the subject, society, must always be kept in mind as the presupposition [8].

Marx's basic category is, unlike Kant or Husserl, neither the individual nor his mind, but the social process of human material exchange, within which reflection has its own role to play. It is Marx's understanding that human beings do not come ready-made as individuals, but are born into a particular natural, social, economic, cultural environment, and become human beings only through interacting with that environment. This is *Menschwurdung,* becoming human, wrongly translated as *humanisation* which to most people means *making* something human rather than *becoming* beings in society.

Marx came to this conclusion through a process which he describes in "A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy" [9]. First he saw, through his study of Hegel's *Philosophy of Law,* that civil laws or the form of the state did not develop in a vacuum or simply in accordance with the development of the human mind,but in direct relation to changes in property relations, and to political economy in general. He states the conclusion of his study on political economy thus:

> In the social production which men carry on they enter into definite relations that are indispensable and independent of their will. The sum total of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society — the real foundation, on which rise legal and political superstructures and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness ... It is not the consciousness of men that determines their existence, but on the contrary, their social existence determines their consciousness [10].

Menschwurdung, or becoming a human being, is thus the result of a social process, determined by the sum-total of the relations of production. Marx sees meaning to human existence and to human nature, in terms of this social determination of it by the relations of production.

---

[8] Op. cit., pp. 101—102.

[9] For an Eng. Translation see Marx & Engels, *Basic Writings on Politics and Philosophy* (ed. Lewis, S. Feuer), Doubleday Anchor, New York, 1959, pp. 42 ff.

[10] Ibid., p. 43.

Economic development and human becoming are depedent on the forces of production, i.e. on the knowledge, skills, tools and production equipment available to humanity. Science, technology, labour and its congealed form, capital — all these are aspects of the forces of production and the *relations* of productions (e.g. land lord-tenant, capitalist-labour etc.) are first conceived in the interests of the better deployment of the forces of production; however, as these forces of production develop there is a conflict between these forces and the existing relations of production which do not serve the needs of the forces of production. This conflict and contradiction are what determine the human consciousness and shape human beings in society.

The power to resolve this conflict or contradiction is already in the forces of production, and as they develop, they will negate the existing relations of production and create a new one.

> No social order ever disappears before all the productive forces for which there is room in it have developed, and new higher relations of production never appear before the material conditions of their existence have matured in the womb of the old society [11].

Or again as Engels would put it, even more succinctly:

> ...I use ... the term 'historical materialism' to designate that view of the course of history which seeks the ultimate cause and the great moving power of all important historic events in the economic development of society, in the changes in the modes of production and exchange, in the consequent division of society into distinct classes, and in the struggles of these classes against one another. [12]

Our question is: Is there an objective standard by which the validity of this category structure for deriving meaning can be proved or publicly demonstrated? This is the age-old problem of the hermeneutical circle — the circularity of the process by which theory has to be preconceived before it can be applied and tested; and while theory can find some confirmation from empirical reality, the usability of a theory and choice between theories seem to depend upon the greater degree of confirmation from empirical reality.

However, even insisting that praxis is primary and that theory has to be drawn from praxis does not dissolve the hermeneutic circle, given the observable fact that groups of people with the same practical experience may derive different theories from their praxis. The Christian also claims to derive his theory from praxis.

It is in this context that I would like to propose an alternate theory, (drawn from Praxis), which is Christian in foundations, but does justice to Marxist theory. Such a theory is not proposed for acceptance by Marxists, but in the interests of mutual understanding and possible collaboration in areas where there can be agreement about programme, despite ideological disagreement.

---

[11] Op. cit., p. 44.

[12] Engels, ibid. pp. 53—54.

6. SOME QUESTIONS FOR A MARXIST-CHRISTIAN DIALOGUE ON MEANING

I do not come from the western Christian tradition, but from what I regard as the classical Christian tradition as developed in Asia and Africa and conserved, with some major distortions, in the Eastern or Oriental Orthodox tradition. I shall relate the fundamental differences and agreements between Marxists and Christians on meaning issues under five heads:

a) God versus matter

b) *Theosis* versus *Menschwurdung* as understanding of the human nature and destiny.

c) Historical versus eschatological fulfilment.

d) Orientation for revolutionary action

e) The place of religion in human culture.

Due to limits of space, the main points have to be stated in telegraphic language.

a) *God and Matter.* The Marxist posits the self-existence, eternity and infinity of matter-energy.[13] The Christian denies the eternity, self-existence and infinity of matter, ascribing these attributes only to God — insisting that matter is not eternal, is existent only in a contingent (created) manner, and is finite at any given moment. Despite these fundamental differences, the Christian can concur largely to a "materialist conception of history" which, according to Lenin, was more important to Marx and Engels than materialism as such.[14]

The historical and dialectical aspects of reality can be readily accepted by a thinking Christian, and if materialism serves the purpose of keeping thought harnessed to social and material reality as we experience it, the Christian cannot have any objection. So long as materialism is not exalted to an ontological principle of monism, the Christian can agree with dialectical and historical materialism within the framework of the Christian category of creation.

b) *Theosis versus Humanisation.* The Christian thinks of God not only as the single principle from which all reality emerges and on which reality is contingent, he also thinks of the destiny of reality as the perfection in all good — i.e. Godlikeness. Humanity serves as the pioneer and captain of this process of movement towards final fulfilment, and is himself in a social or community process being shaped into the fullness of all creative good without the mixture of evil. We affirm the

---

[13] Lenin's definition of matter is generally acceptable to me as a Christian: "Matter is a philosophical category denoting the objective reality which is given to man by his sensations, and which is copied, photographed and reflected by our sensations, while existing independently of them" (*Collected Works*, Vol. 14, pp. 280—81).

[14] Ibid. (1972 edn.): "Marx and Engels ... naturally paid most attention to crowning the structure of philosophical materialism, that is, not to the materialist epistemology, but to the materialist conception of history. That is why Marx and Engels laid the emphasis in their works rather on *dialectical* (all italics Lenin's) materialism than on dialectical *materialism*, and insisted on *historical* materialism than on historical *materialism*".

principle of discontinuity and transcendence between God and world — not only in origins, process, but also posit basic continuity-contingence and immanence between God and World in the final fulfilment. It is humanity that becomes "immanent" in the Cosmos, and becomes the bearer of God's transcendence and immanence within it.

This means the Christian can see class struggle as an aspect of the struggle between good and evil, though Christians would be unwilling to identify one class with the good and the other with evil. This is a matter of apparent difference between Christians and Marxists, but a genuinely open dialogue may reduce the degree of difference in meaning perception.

c) *Historical versus Eschatological Fulfilment.* Another main point of difference between Christians and Marxists seems to lie in their differences in conception of the relationship of the final fulfilment to history. Especially for Eastern Christians who have no "doctrine of original sin" and who do not teach that man is capable only of sinning, there is no need to insist that "the poor will always be with you" or that the class structure of society cannot be abolished within historical time. In fact the Christian teaching commits the Christian to work for the abolition of classes; and therefore to collaborate with the class struggle of the proletariat to abolish capitalist society with its inevitable class antagonism; the Christian is moved by his faith to work for the classless society, which will emerge only when the historical and economic conditions for a classless society would have matured through dialectical development; he is also committed to removing the inequalities and imbalances of town and country, between mental and physical labour; between nation and nation or region and region; he too sees it as a process which is powered by forces within present societies, and captained by the victims of injustice themselves.

But the Christian has a vision of a final fulfilment which transcends history. We give various symbolic names to this fulfilment: Resurrection, *Apokatastasis,* heaven, kingdom and so on. The essence of our eschatological faith may be difficult for non-Christians to grasp — namely that while the final fulfilment of humanity, its unification and the removal of all contradiction and all evil from it, lies beyond history, it is this final fulfilment that determines the true character of humanity and therefore should serve as norm in all historical striving towards fulfilment. This is another of the points at which dialogue between Marxists and Christians can be illuminating.

d) *Orientation for Revolutionary Action.* On this point there is a lot of misunderstanding and confusion of thought, among Christians themselves. I do not think that the issue between Marxists and Christians is that of violent vs. non-violent revolution. There is no insistence within Marxist ideology that there cannot be a revolution without violence, nor is there anything in Christianity which is specifically about non-violence. The violence-non-violence issue is introduced only to cloud the real issue of justice-injustice. Violence is integral to capitalism and is espoused in its defence. Socialism has no necessary connection with violence.

The difficulty lies elsewhere. The Christian faith tells Christians that no group of people (including bishops and priests, but also the workers' party) can be entirely trusted to lead the revolution of the people.

At this point there seems to be some fundamental disagreement between Marxists and Christians, one that seems rather difficult to resolve easily.

Where they can agree, however, is that when conditions in society are ripe, there is no reason why Christians should not join with the forces of progress in overthrowing the forces of oppression and exploitation.

e) *The place of religion in culture and society.* There is no doubt in my mind that Marx, Engels and Lenin regarded religion as anti-scientific, reactionary and a mystifying of reality. Honest Marxists today hold the same view. Philosophically the debate has been exclusively between Thomism in its various forms and Marxism. No other Christian system has sought to deal with contemporary problems in an adequately philosophical manner. I generally agree with the stricture made by the Soviet Academy of Sciences against certain purportedly radical Christian positions as "clericalism in politics, demagogic criticism of monopolies and defence of petty-bourgeois property in the economic field".

But Marxists, I hope, do not understand all Christians as objective-idealist neo-Thomists or irrational-existentialist neo-Calvinists. We do have other Christian ways of thinking and dealing with socio-historical reality and these ways of thinking have not been adequately set forth in writing as yet.

Here again a dialogue between philosophically trained Marxists and philosophically trained Eastern Christians could possibly lead to some new clarifications.

An Eastern Christian like me, for example, can see the relation between substructure and superstructure somewhat differently. While agreeing with the Marxist that the sub-structure is largely made up of the dialectic between the forces of production and the relations of production, he sees with a shade of difference both the super-structure and its relation to the sub-structure. Two points can be very briefly laid down here:

a) The sub-structure does not entirely *determine* the super-structure, but *interacts* with it *dialectically*, i.e. just as the sub-structure influences the super-structure very powerfully, there is a contrary force of the *super-structure influencing the sub-structure.* Just to cite one example, the development of the forces of production in my country (India) is influenced to a considerably degre by factors or institutions in the super-structure, including religious and social factors. The marked differences between the pace and pattern of development of the forces of production in China and India can be partly explained by basic differences in the super-structure of institutions and religions in the two countries.

b) I can also see the super-structure of culture and institutions at two levels, with two different structural principles. There is one level at which each society is to arrive at some common value-choices, through a process of creative revolutionary discussion and decision in the light of revolutionary practice. This is the ideological level of common social values, arrived at on a secular basis, with the interests of the peasants and workers taking primacy, others accepting these interests as their own. Here the values are necessarily common, and derived on a secular basis, i.e. their justification, whether on religious or anti-religious or secular humanitarian grounds, does not depend for their validation on

any dogmatic principle, secular, religous, theist or atheist. But such common values must be subjected to continuous re-examination in the light of revolutionary and creative experience.

There is, however, another level, where the lack of consensus is not to be regarded as a drawback. The bases of values commonly arrived at need not themselves be common. A Hindu, a Muslim, a Jew, a Christian, a Marxist, and a liberal humanist, can agree on the same values, like justice, peace, the unity of all mankind and the dignity of all human beings, starting from different ideological positions. The state cannot impose any uniformity on these matrixes of human values without seriously endagering the human capacity to create and recreate genuine human values. At this point of the matrix of values, or world-view or reality approach, *no uniformity* should be imposed. All views should be exposed to radical and rigorous criticism, but no view, unless it is basically anti-social, should be suppressed. At this world-view level, creativity, innovation and *diversity* should be encouraged without endangering the ideological consensus about common values to be pursued by society as a whole.

These two levels of the super-structure — one with ideological *consensus* about social goals and the other with *diversity* of reality approaches in critical dialogue with each other, would admittedly be more difficult to regulate centrally, but the creativity and strength of a society and of the humanity shaped in it will be only enhanced by the maintenance of this dialectic, within the super-structure and between the sub-structure and the super-structure.

CONCLUSION

The meaning of life and the meaning of history are not handed to anyone — be he Christian or Marxist — on a platter. The Marxist probably has the best reasoned and critically worked out theory of the meaning of life and history, worked out in relation to reality observed scientifically. Non-Marxists like myself have learned deeply from this way of seeing meaning and are grateful for the illumination that it has brought.

If Marxists were to engage in dialogue with non-Marxists on this subject at some depth, the methodological problem of objective standards and criteria for deriving meaning will emerge as the first hurdle. Once we come to a common conclusion on the methodological problem, it should become possible, for some non-Marxists at least, to find a common ground and common goals for solidarity and collaboration in struggle, even while remaining non-Marxists.

Paulos Mar Gregorios

I The Meaning of Meaning:

Since the question whether life or history has any meaning at all has been hotly debated by many throughout the ages, from the ancient Skeptics to some contemporary existentialists, it becomes necessary to provide some precision to the definition of meaning for our context.

By meaning we understand

(a) some fundamental significance to us;

(b) the assumption of a certain purposiveness in individual human lives and in [illegible] as well as world history.

Then one looks at other languages for translation equivalents of the English word "meaning" we see that e.g. in German Sinn, Bedeutung and Meinung among other words could be used. In French, there are Sens, Signifiance and [illegible]. Obviously the German Sinn and the French Sens, corresponding more to English Sense and Sensibility rather than to meaning, have their etymological origin in the Latin Sensus, which probably has behind it the idea of a "significant message received by our senses". The English word "meaning", though equivalent to "it makes sense", is perhaps less sense-experience-oriented than thought-oriented.

In our context we are looking for something that "makes sense" of this phenomena of "life" and human history - both in terms of a coherent pattern which we can grasp and within which life and history "make sense" as well as in terms of an explanatory principle that accounts

they are, and helps us to "make sense" of a welter of contradictory phenomena by bringing them all under rules and principles of a universal nature. Meaning must therefore inhere in a structure, pattern or Gestalt that we can grasp, and the inner structure of this gestalt should be explicable by universal principles.

Our understanding of meaning is usually based on two fundamental principles — Causality and purposive action by conscious beings. So if we are to understand life and history and grasp their meaning, we probably need a causal explanation of how life and history came to happen, and integrate into that explanation any purposive action on the part of human or other beings.

One can say "History is bunk" (no pattern and so no explanation) or that history is like an orchestra where the players play without notes and the Conductor weaves whatever notes are played into some coherent and meaningful whole (R. G. Collingwood). Now whichever answer is given, the question is to fit as much concrete historical data into this pattern as to "make sense" of the pattern itself. It will not do, for example, to do what Arnold Toynbee has done, to provide a pattern of the rise and fall of civilizations, and then to give us an impressive number of illustrations that fit the pattern. One has to leave it open to critics to bring counter-examples that do not fit the pattern and therefore "refute" the

historical event of substantial significance could be fitted into the model without too much tailoring, or at least there should be sub-theories enough in the "cluster of theories" which constitutes the model, to account for all historical phenomena. And we have to find a model for life itself, which then fits in or "gives us" an model for history.[1]

Many models have been presented in the past, the most significant ones being the Hegelian and Diltheyan models. For Hegel the basic lineaments were provided by History, which incorporates all the activities of the Human Spirit in Time which ~~in turn~~ proceed in accordance with the laws of logic or Reason, as well as with those of Space or Geometry. History, thus incorporating the actions of the World Spirit through the human Spirit, is the working out of what ~~is~~ the ~~Spirit~~ Idea is in itself - i.e. Reason or Freedom in Nature and Time. The Spirit is the Synthesis of Idea (in-itself) and Nature (for-itself), and history is the working out of the dialectic between Idea and Nature, as well as between the Spirit which is eternal

---

[1] In the German tradition, R. Eucken, Der Sinn und Wert des Lebens (1908) still provides an interesting perspective, along with Wilhelm Dilthey's Einleitung in die Geisteswissenschaften (192[illegible]. Among other important German works one should mention R. Bechert, Eine Sinnphilosophie (1941), H. Reiner, Der Sinn Unseres Daseins (1964), H-G. Gadamer, [illegible] (1960) and finally Jürgen Habermas

nd the individual life which is mortal and passing
All actuality that is passing from the present with the
past is however gathered up by the Idea or by
Thought or Consciousness in memory, every
actuality thus enriching the Idea and leading to
its fulfillment and ~~self-consciousness~~ full
self awareness.

But not just everything that happens
There is a norm for history in Hegel. This norm is
nothing other than the Goal or purpose of the Spirit
which is freedom. So the Spirit favours those
historical movements that foster freedom. World
history is the progress of freedom.

True freedom is defined by Hegel
as the situation in which the subject-object alienation
is overcome in the act of self-reflection or self-
awareness in which the Spirit as Conscious awareness
makes itself into its own object and content of
knowledge.

The opposite of Spirit, for Hegel, is
of course matter, which is the essence of
unfreedom. It can never have its substance in
itself, being constituted ever as an object by others:
it is inert and has no dynamic in itself.
except that of negating freedom — e.g by causing
obstacles to the Spirit, like poverty, disease, famine etc
The Spirit progresses by overcoming these obstacles.

The State was the then (in
Hegel's time) the most advanced of the expressions
of the Spirit, for here liberty was organized
into a concrete objectivity, within which the
Individual can also exercise his or her freedom

a self-awareness, untainted by matter.

II Meaning of History and Meaning of Life

Hegel was very much concerned about the relation between the meaning of collect history and the meaning of personal life. The individual person is not simply lost in the historical process. ~~They~~ Persons have different roles in history, (a) as citizen, governed by the laws as the morality of the State; (b) as person, who transcends the State and exists as an end in himself or herself subject only to the morality of the Absolute Idea (c) as Hero, as maker of history, as the one who acts in History and thereby creates history; and (d) as Victim, or passive recipient of all the blows of history.

~~all Comp~~ For the early Hegel, "the realm of the Spirit is all-comprehensive; it includes everything that ever has interested or ever will interest man. Man is active in it; whatever he does, he is the creature within which the Spirit works"[3] Human nature is where Spirit and Nature unite, in his body/soul constitution, and this is the universal element in human nature. This personal human nature is a microcosm of the larger Cosmos where the Absolute Idea is working itself out in Nature, thus Reason actualizing itself in history. The Cosmos has a purpose in itself - namely, to work out its own Reason as self-aware Freedom. "It is an insight of Speculative philosophy that Freedom is the sole truth of Spirit"[4]

---

[3] G.W.F. Hegel (1770-1831) Reason in History, Eng. Tr. Robert S. Hartman, The Library of Liberal Arts, Bobbs-Merrill Indianapolis, 1837/1953, Fifteenth reprint, 1979, p. 20

"Spirit,.. is that which has its centre in itself", unlike its opposite, matter, which being essentially complex or unsimple or composite, seeks unity which is the opposite of its own character, and by finding which it would cease to be itself. Spirit has being in itself, by working out its own Idea, and becoming aware of itself, it can organise the world within itself, within its own self-consciousness.

But individual freedom, where only <u>one</u> is free, is the reach of Orientals, who want always a tyrant who is free to do what he likes. Orientals do not know freedom as the reach of the whole cosmos. So for them only the tyrant is free. The Greeks and the Romans had a higher consciousness of freedom, but they sought only the freedom of the <u>few</u> of <u>some</u>, not of man as such. So they had oligarchy and slavery. "Only the Germanic peoples ~~knew~~ came, through Christianity, to realise that man as man is free and that freedom of Spirit is the very essence of man's nature."

Now if history is the vast arena on which the Absolute Idea is working out itself through the establishment of freedom as the universal reality, human actions which constitute history, are the result of passions, personal talents private aims, and drives for satisfaction of selfish desires coming into dialectical conflict with the demands of reason, in seeking to be converted

---

5. <u>Op. cit.</u> p. 24.

from potentiality to actuality. The private interests of persons and individuals constitute the motive for their actions; but Reason as Absolute Idea governs the pattern in which these private actions blend with each other. World Reason provides the warp and human personal interests the woof "of the vast tapestry of world history"[6]. The national State is the concrete form in which this history is woven at the local level.

World history has been working long before the emergence of man - as Nature; but now in the organization of the State, there comes into being a new form of world history, where human beings become conscious of the forces that shape them. Through the actions of persons which they themselves unreflectively regard as the result of their private passions, drives, desires or decisions, the World Spirit shapes history and achieves its purpose — namely that of actualising its potentiality as freedom.

Man is thus the antithesis to the thesis of the natural world. But in nature and in history it is the Spirit that manifests itself as freedom. As the Spirit works in the world of human persons or history, there is a contradiction between people's personal interests and the interests of the World Spirit or of History as such. But the World Spirit so governs the over-all pattern that even these selfish and evil actions of individuals

---

6 ibid. p 29.

, be made to serve the purposes of the Absolute -
it works itself out as Reason. World History, without
such individuals being made aware that it is the Idea
it acts in and through them. The State with its
nature of law becames the form in which Reason manifests
itself, the condition for the manifestation of Freedom
which is the nature of the Spirit.

For Hegel, then the meaning of history
and the meaning of life are related to each other.
Life is one manifestation of Spirit; ~~actual~~ human
life is where the World Spirit works through people
to fulfill their own personal ends, but in the process
achieves the purpose of history itself, i.e the
Self-manifestation to itself of the Spirit by actualising
freedom — The Spirit fulfills itself as freedom
by first objectifying itself and then thinking it
of its own being. The contradiction between the
present of the Spirit and its own true being as
Freedom and Reason, lead to negations of the past
and actions to create a new future.

PERCEIVING REALITY AND ANTICIPATING THE FUTURE

Paulos Mar Gregorios *

This Seminar aims at 'anticipating the future' as part of the 'pursuit of Truth'. However, before we speak about Truth, let us have a brief look at how we perceive that Truth. It is not the 'pursuit' of Truth (as though we pursuers were somehow outside and independent of Truth) that we shall be concerned with in this paper, but the *perception of reality*, even in our 'anticipating the future'.

I Methodological Considerations

A. Optimism and Pessimism.

We have just come through 1984, a bad year to live through, even though our world is very little like what George Orwell's *1984*, or Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* had predicted in 1949 and 1932 respectively. Our nightmare society of today is so different from what those brilliant Englishmen had suggested they would be, citizens reduced to robots and controlled by an all-powerful super-state. The fact is that people are no more robots today than they were in 1932 or 1949, and the state seems to be so helpless in resolving simple problems like war, the arms race, poverty and injustice. Certainly the futurologists of the first half of the century were wide of the mark.

In the 60's of our era, we saw the collapse of the earlier optimism of the decades prior to that. For example, no one was talking too much about the *Hastings Report* on *The Year 2000*, which pointed such a rosy picture for the end of the century when everybody in the world would have a U.S. $ 20,300 income. Robert L Heilbroner's gloomy *An Inquiry into the Human Prospect* (New York, 1974) told

* Dr. Paulos Mar Gregorios is Metropolitan of Delhi and the North (Orthodox Syrian Church of the East), a Vice-President of the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches, and Honorary Professor at U.T.C., Bangalore.

Bangalore Theological Forum, Vol. XVII, No. 3, July-Sept. 1985.

us that the economy and the world can only get much worse and that the golden age was over. Even Daniel Bell, the prophet of the post-industrial society and ardent advocate of capitalism, published his *The Cultural Contradictions of Capitalism* (London, 1976), and began predicting a gloomy future based on computations of new scarcities. In Japan, the *Economic Research Centre* forecast that the 'advanced country disease' will persist in the foreseeable future, with its symptoms of high unemployment, high inflation, and the depression of the market.

On the other hand, the Marxists have consistently been optimists, at least in theory. They are sure that the inexorable laws of society will lead to the collapse of capitalism and the triumph of socialism. 'Historical Optimism' is an integral part of Marxist ideology.[1]

It seems that in the Two-third world, where most of humanity dwells, we have little independent thought, except to follow either market economy pessimism or socialist optimism or a blend of the two, without logical consistency. In India, the blend is always a strange combination of fatalism on the one hand, and a modest optimism of the 'chalega' variety. We think anything that breaks down can be repaired, and if spare parts are not available we will make our own.

This cautious optimism is now in full bloom with the advent of the Rajiv regime with its doctrine of clean politics, clean administration and hard work. Rajiv himself does not belong either to the market economy pessimism or to the scientific socialist optimism. In fact in all of us there are four factors inter-acting, namely :
(a) Optimism about history ; (b) Pessimism about history ;
(c) Optimism about the possibilities of human effort; (d) Pessimism about human effort. Rajiv Gandhi belongs to the category (c) where the main stress in on human effort, which is also in Marxist historical optimism; but in Rajiv's case, his effort-optimism does not seem to be based on any ideological grounds, except that such effort-optimism is not characteristically Indian. One might even attribute it to his Parsee background.

1. Cf. Boris Ponomarev (Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union), 'How Marxists see the Future of Mankind', in *Socialism, Theory and Practice*, (Moscow 1984).

The important thing in any anticipation of the future is what proportions of the two kinds of optimism or pessimism we incorporate in our prognostications, consciously or otherwise, quite often without any rational arguments for such optimism or pessimism whether about history or about the effectiveness of our efforts.

B. Perception of Reality—Some Ground Rules. It is clear now that absolute scientific objectivity is a myth. It is a popular myth that the computer is infallible and objective. Of course, the computer, being a machine, does not make mistakes; it can only fail, as machines often do—fail to function properly. But that rules out infallibility. What about objectivity? Objectivity, like causality, has been one of the casualties of recent developments in the philosophy of science. All knowledge, it is now seen, invariably involves an element of subjectivity. This subjectivity is clearly seen at two points. In particle physics, it is now clear that the measurement of mass or velocity of a particle inevitably involves the adding of a quantum of energy in the process of measurement which affects the measured particle, so that there is no way we can know the particle objectively. This inescapability of the subjectivity of the measuring process is one aspect. The other is the insight that all perception and all scientific knowledge is based on a hypothesis or theory, which is a creation of the human mind in its subjectivity. The object of study does not supply the hypothesis. It is a subjective creation in human language.

These modern insights have now led to the re-instatement of the subjective in all knowledge. There is a category-structure through which we perceive reality and which we create. Aristotle tried to say that the category-structure was *a priori*—independent of experience. They are objective, non-reducible, *sui-generis*. Even Kant's radical modification of these categories retained some comparability with the Aristotelian schema, though Kant saw these categories as subjective, applicable to the *phenomena* and not to the things in themselves, or noumena; they are formulated in the realm of 'pure reason'.

Today modern Hermeneutics has moved beyond any such fixed category scheme as applying only to pure reason, whereas other categories become operative for practical reason and for critique of judgement. Dilthey was one of the first to clarify the problem in Kant of taking the critique of pure reason (akin to scientific knowledge) as normative and the others as lesser or less pure forms of knowledge. By positing history rather than physical sciences as normative, German thought took a line different from Anglo-Saxon. But Dilthey failed to lay down any valid ground rules for objectivity in history. Husserl's attempt to overcome the epistemological problem of objectivity in the historical and scientific realms has also come to grief, even though the attempt was to ground objectivity in a transcendental subjectivity.

Heidegger put back the concept of *interest* and therefore of ***feeling*** and subjectivity in knowledge. He also succeeded in disclosing the fore-structure of understanding, i.e. that of projecting a tentative understanding which is then to be confirmed by experience. He helped us understand science itself as partaking of this hermeneutic circle, in which, in a sense, you can know only that which you already know. Thus, the hypothesis has to be in the mind before it can be applied to reality by projection, anticipating experimental confirmation.

It was Gadamer[2] who pointed out to us that our prejudice against prejudice, an inheritance from the Enlightenment, stood in the way of recognizing the inescapability of prejudice in all understanding. Our only choice is between prejudices, i.e. bad prejudices or better prejudices.

According to the Enlightenment, it is wrong to accept any authority of tradition and everything has to be brought before the judgment seat of reason. Underlying this are the twin concepts of

2. See especially Section II A of his *Truth and Method* (E.T. Sheed & Ward, London, 1975, pp 235) on "The Hermeneutic Circle and The Problem of Prejudices."

the sovereignty of human reason and the idea of progress. Humanity has made progress. We are constantly moving towards Paradise, which is in the future, not in the past. So those who lived in an earlier time are less informed and more stupid. We have superior knowledge and superior tools of finding out or 'pursuing' the truth. That was the claim of the Enlightenment.

Contrary to this reason-exalting and progress-dogmatic tendency of the Enlightenment, we have also in Europe the opposite tendency. Romanticism suggests that the old was gold and we should recover it. There is much of this in the modern 'greenie' or environmentalist movement. Rousseau was its prophet. Paradise was in the past, not in the future. We lived close to nature in the past, and industrial civilisation has now taken us away and put us in chains.

Few people recognize the fact that western civilisation embodies both these opposite tendencies. We ourselves are in the grips of these two tendencies of thought, which is the counter-part of the reality/effort-pessimism/optimism. But in this other dialectic of Paradise-in-the-past/ Paradise-in-the-future, or Romanticism/ Enlightenment, or Tradition/Futurism, the Enlightenment or Reason has taken the upper hand and Romanticism was tamed by it into 'historicism' and the 'historical method', where the past is important, but the past only as analysed and re-constructed by reason.

The Enlightenment had one goal, the subjection of all authority to reason. Europe, in both the French Revolution and in the Enlightenment, put reason on the throne of authority, and we Indians who have been trained or brain-washed in the system of western thought, are now alienated from our own more sophisticated approach in the 'pursuit' of truth or perception of reality.

We had our own naive exaltation of reason and propositional truth in the Nyaya system of categories. In contrast, we have also the Vedantic approach to knowledge-away from mere reason and language, reducing both to the world of *avidya* or nescience (thus modern science would be nonscience), and recommending the path of

Sabda or authority or *sruti* or *agama*, in order to escape from reason and its nescience into the true *jnana* or *paravidya* of super-sensible *anubhava* (beatific vision). The place of the *guru* or *acharya* is also crucial. Reason does not lead to truth, for it remains in the realm of subject-object dualism, the world of *avidya*.

Where the Enlightenment went wrong is probably in its assumption that traditionless perception is possible, even in knowing the world of *avidya*. Romanticism on the other hand sees tradition as the antithesis to reason, and sees it as part of the given, as part of nature itself.

Hans-Georg Gadamer has shown us a middle way, by proposing that understanding or perception of reality is 'the interplay of the movement of tradition and the movement of the interpreter'[3] . But he goes on to say that all understanding involves an anticipatory element, an expectation awaiting confirmation, a fore-conception of completion as he calls it. There is that element of a guessed or anticipated meaning in your listening to a sentence or reading it. At least halfway through hearing or reading the sentence, you half guess how it would end up; otherwise one cannot listen to that first half.

Another important principle of Gadamer's is that 'true historical thinking must take account of its own historicality'.[4] History is not just in the object of understanding, but also in the subject. The subject has a particular 'horizon' within which alone he can understand, though in the very process of understanding, this horizon changes or expands. And the understander's or interpreter's horizon is determined by his or her own historicality. One sees both past and present as well as future only in terms of one's own location in history, the experiences one has had as an individual, as a particular family member, as a member of a particular society, as a citizen of a particular nation at a particular time, as a member of the human species, as a product of the evolution of the whole cosmos.

3. *op cit.* p. 261.

4. P. 267

We will stop this methodological probing by simply stating that in elucidating our anticipation of our future, we must be conscious of the role that the elucidator's own historical locus (or *wirkungeschichte*) and horizon play in the content of that elucidation.

II The Future as Scenario

We can look at three or four scenarios of the future, from different perspectives, one a contemporary West European liberal and the other a contemporary East European Socialist as well as a Chinese horizon, and then try to find our own way from our own place of standing.

A. The World Market Economy Scenario. Any prognostication of the future on the part of western liberals has to take into account the four diseases of the economy which have been diagnosed:

1) **Stagnant Production** : The growth of the economy has slowed down. The growth rate of all western (developed) economies together in this decade shows the following trend :–

1980 : + 1.2 % ; 1981 : + 1.2 % ; 1982 : -- 0.5 % ; 1983 : + 0.5 %. There seems to be little prospect of the growth rate going up even to 1% per year. 2) **Growing Unemployment** : Again the figures are eloquent. Unemployed in 1980 : 21 million; 1981 : 25 million ; 1982 : 30 million ; 1983 : 34 million. 3) **Shrinking World Trade.** Here are the figures for the World Economy's annual percentage increase or decrease in trade and commerce:– 1980 : + 1%; 1981 : 0 % ; 1982 : — 1 to — 2 % ; 1983 : — 1 %. 4) **Growing Debt Burden of the Developing Countries :** at the beginning of 1980 : $ 406 billion ; 1981 : $ 465 billion ; 1982 :$ 530 billion ; 1983 : $ 626 billion ; 1985 : nearly $ 1000 billion.

These are the four diseases perceived by the economist which are sufficient to account for the pessimism that exists in the west. Add to it the factors of a deteriorating environment, a growing insecurity and fear of nuclear catastrophe, and an anticipation of collapse in the world economy. Add again the unhealthy monetary and

economic cut-throatism among the leading market economy countries in their panic about survival, e.g. Japan, U.S.A. and Western Europe at each other's throats.

Where is the ray of hope for these developed industrial countries? Only one, namely a world war which would change the alignment of forces and eliminate the danger of socialism as well as weaken some of the other leading market economy countries. If a war between USA and USSR can be fought outside Europe, Western Europe stands to gain, and if it also results in the defeat of socialism, Eastern Europe would join Western Europe and they can, as a United Europe, once again recover world domination. If the war can be fought in Europe and socialism can be defeated, the Soviet and European competition would be eliminated for the moment and U.S.A. can dominate the world market. If Japan can also be drawn into the war, so much the better for the U.S.A.

And in case there is no major war—all out nuclear war is clearly unriskable—there are two possibilities: (a) whoever captures the arms market will control the whole market. So all industrially developed countries are concentrating on arms manufacture and trade; (b) keep on spending on the armaments race, and occasionally foment little local wars without involving the major powers, then this arms production and trade will keep the economy going, and also stimulate technological development (e.g. electronics, communication, espionage) and the technology market will supplement the arms market. If possible capture also food technology and health technology because there are big market expansion possibilities here, as the population of the world grows. And by keeping up the pressure on the arms race, the Soviet Union will find it economically impossible to catch up: their standard of living will not improve or catch up with the affluent of the industrially advanced market economies. This will lead to consumer unrest in the socialist countries, which can be skilfully used for the undermining of socialism.

The whole thing is not particularly cheerful, but that is the best that Western Liberalism in a market economy framework can conceive or hope for. Within this framework, there are a number of naive minorities which have several utopias: the greenie utopia of a low consumption, steady-state or no-growth or even industrially devolutionary society being the most prominent.

The Socialistic Communist Scenario. In the socialistic world, there are two scenarios; one used mainly for preaching (as in the case of Christians also) and the other more realistic.

The preached scenario goes like this: The inexorable laws of historical materialism will see through the collapse of capitalism, the triumph of socialism, and the transition from developed socialism to communism. This is assured. That transition has the following goal, as stated even in 1961 by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union:

> Communism is a classless social system with one form of public ownership of the means of production and full social equality of all members of society: under it the all-round development of people will be accompanied by the growth of the productive forces through continuous progress in science and technology: all the springs of co-operative wealth will flow more abundantly, and the great principle 'from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs' will be implemented.

In communism, as distinct from socialism, according to this preaching, the individual will be different. His or her creative capacities would have flowered, and his or her labour be infinitely more productive and interesting and satisfying. The present pattern of division of labour will also change, and each person will contribute the best of his labour without constraint or regimentation. Also there will be a new motivation for labour, so that material incentives, such as are there in socialism, will no longer be necessary. High moral incentives will keep the society together without state coercion. Labour will be performed, not for wages, but gratis, as a free contribution to society.

The key to all this is of course: (a) the growth of the productive forces in socialist society through accelerated development of science and technology, and (b) defending the socialist states and economies from subversion or aggression engineered by their enemies.

The socialist countries, especially those in the CMEA, have less than 10% of the world's population, but do account for about 30% of the world production of electricity, oil, natural gas, coal and steel. The unemployment rate in the CMEA countries is very low—almost negligible. Their growth rate has been fairly consistently about 2.2% per annum, and the per capita income growth has been about 70% from 1971 to 1982 compared with the 30% of the EEC countries in the same period. The CMEA has much greater self-sufficiency also in energy and raw materials (90-95%).

So socialism is going forward and, unlike capitalism, is not in crisis. That is how it is presented or preached. And their projections of the future are all entirely optimistic.

In reality there are a number of problems. The first and the most important is not lack of personal freedom, but the high incidence of *boredom*, especially in the cities. Since there is basically no economic insecurity, the rat-race for making money and the tensions that result from it are not so prevalent as in the market economy countries. But there is a general feeling that the western countries have a higher standard of living, better consumer goods and more freedom to make money and enjoy life. This feeling creates a measure of restlessness especially among the elite. Work is not always easy to change or choose. From this comes a measure of boredom, despite large cultural possibilities. Alcoholism spreads in the wake of boredom, bringing production down.

The second most important problem is perhaps the *mis-use of power* by those in government and in the communist party, including a lot of petty bribery and corruption. From this comes about a growing disaffection for the government, the party and its ideology. This is a dangerous trend for the future of socialism.

The third problem, and perhaps even more important than the other two, is the growing pressure to *spend on armaments*, and also to compete for the world armaments market where reactionary elements are being armed by the market economy countries. If the pressure on arms expenditure keeps up, it will be difficult to increase standards of living and to develop the forces of production adequately in order to build the communist future. Disarmament is a desperate need for the socialist countries. There is genuine fear of war and desire for peace, for the future of socialism and communism require spending less on armaments and not going to war.

The absence of certain personal freedoms is a fact in the socialist countries. There are restrictions on work and residence choices, on making money, on night-clubs and gambling, on free travel, on holding meetings or public demonstrations, on political or religious propaganda, on literary activity, on dissent and protest, on criticising party and government and so on. These restrictions are justified as necessitated by social discipline in a situation of aggression, encirclement and infiltration by the forces of capitalism.

The basic scenario, despite these problems about the future, remains *optimistic*. At a less conscious level there is disquiet and uncertainty arising from a doubt about the full validity of the ideological preaching. The unpreached hope is that as the old guard of leadership changes, a younger crowd in their fifties will take over the leadership and move on to a more realistic blend of pragmatism and ideology. Perhaps not as radical and open as in the People's Republic of China.

C. **The China Future Scenario**. The mention of China leads us to a measure of speculation about the new wave of future anticipation in that great country of a billion people, who do not follow the CMEA line. For them today China and Chinese civilization are more important than socialism or communism. They have a particular ideology of history which believes that both USSR and USA as well as Japan and Europe (and also India) are all doomed. The future belongs to China, if the four modernisations can be carried through without political upheaval. The mood, however, is one of basic optimism, leading through a major world war, to Chinese domination of the world.

D. The Indian Horizon. We now come to our own situation and look at its possibilities and our vision of the future of our nation and of the world. I can do this only from a personal perspective, severely conditioned by my limited horizon and my own untypical *wirkungsgeschichte*.

Let us look at the political situation first. Rajiv Gandhi has surprised all of us. I confess I told his mother less than two years ago that Rajiv will not be able to hold the country together. The evidence so far shows I was mistaken. There is thus the full possibility that I may be completely mistaken in everything I say about India's future too. Rajiv himself is scared by the people's expectation (*India Today* Interview, Feb. 15, 1985). He has said so. But he is a good airline pilot, and quite consciously sees his present job in those terms. I cannot remember any time in my life when there was so much optimism, not even in the days of Nehru as Prime Minister. The important thing is that the optimism is broad-based, and not derived from any rhetoric, but from a basic intuition about the integrity, ability and political will of a politically inexperienced younger person. We cannot say yet that the incongruous and cumbersome aircraft which is India has taken off. Nor has the other aircraft piloted by Rajiv, the Non-Aligned Movement. But the engines are whirring. The motor is not dead. One does not know for sure whether the plane is air-worthy or has enough fuel and spare parts to make it go for a while.

Rajiv gives high priority to the abolition of poverty, but at the moment he, like Deng Hsiao Ping in China, is on a pragmatic line : clean up government, improve efficiency of production, take some hard decisions with a no-rhetoric soft sell, and solve problems where they can be solved. But the past is with us, limiting our possibilities of the future. For example :

a) Can the problems in the Punjab, Kashmir, and Assam be solved at all ? b) Can the undemocratic political process of election which costs Rs. 2 to 100 lakhs per candidate (with the implication that he who pays the piper calls the tune) be radically changed ? c) Can the 50% of our population who live below the poverty line find a means of living within our market economy

system ? I do not want to say no, because I may be mistaken. But at the moment my optimism is heavily tainted with scepticism, on all three points.

Nature has been good to India during the last three years. Bumper crops have saved our economy from total lameness. In 1983-84 we produced a record crop of 151.5 million ton foodgrains (well beyond the target of 142 million). 1984-85 may not be as good as that, but the weather has not been too destructive, and we may reach the target of 153.6 million if all goes well. Growth rate has been high because of the bumper crops. Rajiv's policies may lead to a spurt in industrial production and therefore a substantial increase in the over-all growth rate this year. But agricultural growth rates for the future cannot be extrapolated from the experience of the last two years. Sugar, cotton and jute production had already fallen during this same period. The same goes for steel production since 1981-82. Fertiliser production is also inadequate, and we still have to import 6 million tons at a cost of Rs. 1200 crore.

Rajiv may be able to bring about some modernisation of *Industrial* production equipment and also of the infrastructure. Cotton textiles may not do so well, but energy supply (coal, electricity and gas) may be better. *Inflation* is unabated. In 1983-84 the over-all rate was about 8½% and in the first half of 84-85 about 11% per annum. *Foreign Trade deficit* is also bad : Rs. 5, 951 crores in 1983-84, and Rs. 5, 868 crores in the year before that. Our imports are increasing, despite the rise in indigenous petroleum production. What offsets the picture somewhat is the continued flow of remittances by Indians abroad. The increase in rupee value of dollar works both ways. In 1985-86, repayment of the IMF loan (5 billion dollars) will begin to fall due. Debt servicing charges have already gone up from 8% to 14% of export earning.

Rajiv may be able to tone up some *public sector* undertakings. He will give more freedom and initiative to private industry. Savings rate, which is now a healthy 20%, has not been properly utilised in investments. Rajiv may improve things at this point. The black economy will need some hard decisions to curb it. It has not yet begun to recede.

But the main problems, those of chronic *unemployment*, unabate *poverty*, and the growing, gaping *gap between the rich and the poo* these have not yet been tackled. Our total unemployment in th labour force is probably greater than all the developed marke economy countries put together. Employment is a direct focal poin in the seventh plan, but it is not yet clear how it is going to b tackled, beyond the Integrated Rural Development Programme an the National Rural Development Programme for which unbelievabl tall claims have been made by the government.

E. What Kind Of a Future Can We Anticipate ? Given this kind o a world, and the kind of effective history that I have, what kind of future can I anticipate for the human race ? My anticipation is ver tentative, but based on the conviction that history always takes un expected turns. I see the hand of God in these unanticipated turns most recently in the accession of Rajiv Gandhi to power in India Quite often the evil has to become quite ripe before the axe of Go falls. It must fall, sooner or later, on the present oppressive—explo tative design of world power by which one-fourth of the world is aff luent and three-fourths indigent. I expect an unexpected turn. I d not know whence it will come or when it will come. But my faith tells me it will come, and I pray for it.

One possible hopeful scenario is for *disarmament negotiations* t gain momentum and proceed expeditiously. Once war production be comes minimal, capitalism will take a big beating and socialism wil take a giant leap forward as the standard of living in some Europea socialist countries goes up. Because my anticipation is such, work ing for peace and disarmament becomes a very high priority fo me–of course to save the world from war and nuclear catastrophe but also in order to promote greater social justice in the world

The negative side of the same scenario is that the *arms race* goe on unabated, but before there is a nuclear war somebody by acciden may cause a major piece of sabotage which results in something lik the Bhopal tragedy and opens the eyes of the world to the consequen ces of a nuclear war. This is entirely conceivable and may be on path for history to take.

The third and the most gruesome scenario is to have an *actual nuclear war* and the nuclear winter that would result from that. The consequences of this scenario are horrific according to a consensus of scientists from East and West at the Moscow Round Table in 1985 on the consequences of a nuclear war.

> Until recently war strategists and military advisors have operated on the assumption that a nuclear war is containable, winnable and survivable. But now, new research results both in the USSR and the USA confirmed by the research community world-wide, have completely changed our picture of what the disastrous effects of a nuclear war would be like. What we had overlooked was the enormous impact on world-wide climatic conditions which would result from the smoke, soot and dust from large city and forest fires set off by nuclear explosions.

We cannot afford this third horrific scenario. The human spirit, assisted by the Spirit of God, must eliminate the possibility of this scenario. There is no way except to ban all nuclear weapons and to keep space free from all weapons.

III Positioning Ourselves and Choosing Horizons

Our analysis of the world situation and prospects for the human race makes it clear that peace and social justice are inseparably related to economic structures. Yet, to perceive the truth of the economic structure of our world today is difficult for most people in our country, because our horizon of vision and understanding has been so conditioned by our western education and our media as to preclude such perception of truth. Once we have grasped the nature of the economic structure within the country as well as between nations, we cannot but be committed to a struggle to change these structures in favour of something less tilted, in favour of the already affluent.

But the economic structure of the world and of India is but one aspect of the whole of reality. There are other elements we need to consider, and elements which cannot be perceived without a further extension of our horizon of perception and understanding. Here I shall have to be brief. Since saying much cannot lead to greater understanding.

Our horizon at this point as Indians must get its orientation between two poles: one to the extreme left provided by modern secular thought, and the other to the extreme right as formulated by traditional Hindu thought. To begin with the second, Vedantic thought as interpreted by Sankara and his modern disciples denies the ultimate reality of this world ; it affirms that this world is a projection of the concealing power of ultimate reality (a *Vikshepa* of the *Avarana Sakti* of Brahman), and has no truth to it except at the level of a commonsense which is basically an expression of non-knowledge (*Avidya*). Truth is that which is permanent and unchanging, without desire or passion, without hate or love, totally impersonal, totally without qualities. Truth has to be discovered by a true knowledge in which all duality, multiplicity and quality disappears and everything is experienced as just one undifferentiated whole. where knower, known and knowledge become united as one.

At the other pole is the contribution of the French Revolution and the German Enlightenment, the first setting in motion the process of secularisation and the second affirming the main elements of a secularist view of reality. Reimarus, Herder and Wolff wanted Christians to stop worrying about salvation in 'another world'. In addition to demanding absolute sovereignty for human reason over against ecclesiastical authority and tradition, they wanted also to make sense of 'this world and no other'. The only description of the world that could make sense is one which proceeded without presuppositions, religious or other, even as if God were not : *etsi deus non daretur* (Bonhoeffer).

We have to stand between the Advaitic and the Secular and I must say there are many vantage points within that spectrum. In India we have the great Nagarjuna, who comes closest to my own view, or Ramanuja who regards the world as the body of God, or Madhva for whom the commonsense perception of reality is just as valid as what comes out of deeper reflection, so long as our own internal witness (*Sakshin*) is convinced that it is the truth.

The Advaitic position has much greater affinity to the classical western Christian position as outlined by Augustine based on Plato and Plotinus. Augustine speaks of the contrast between the city of God

and the city of the earth, the first a real city and the second merely passing and in the process of decay and dissolution. Martin Luther's 'two kingdoms' come from this vision. This perception today works in favour of the privileged classes, since it does not put any heavy emphasis on changing this world, as it is in any case passing away. It concentrates on 'treasure in heaven' the doing of good deeds and the cultivation of one's own soul. The rich endorse this heavenly treasure-hunt, so that while others are hunting for treasures in heaven, they can get a corner on as much as possible of this world's treasures.

The Advaitic and the Augustinian-Lutheran conceptions fit neatly into bourgeois market economy thinking. The cultivation of one's own soul, or the realisation of one's own identity with the All would in no wise conflict with the basic individualism and the search for personal fulfilment which are the characteristics of the bourgeoisie and of the secular version of their religion which is market economy capitalism.

In this sense the opposite pole, namely secularism, has great attraction for genuine humanists who wanted to break away from the dominance of bourgeois-capitalist values. Marx and Engels belonged to this group of genuine humanists who saw how the Augustinian religion, in league with feudalism and capitalism, played a reactionary role. Reimarus, Wolff and Herder, fathers of the German Enlightenment were also in the same league and influenced by the same reaction against feudalist-capitalist religion ; but they wanted to save religion ; and thus gave shape to a liberal-secular version of it.

Our educated national elite in India has inherited these two traditions of the west in variously mixed measure. Marxism and Liberal Secular Humanism, in same cases with a measure of Indian or Augustinian religion thrown in, constitute the intellectual horizon of most of our Indian thinkers. Gandhianism had also borrowed liberally from the west, from Rousseau and Romanticism, from Ruskin and Tolstoy, but it had a measure of personal authenticity to it, and it made its impression on India because it was not only preached, but actually practised effectively by Gandhi himself.

In perceiving the truth for us Indian-Christians today, the key is to locate ourselves in relation to our horizon. There is no guarantee that our horizon would be so much better than others, just because we have consciously chosen it. But we have to try. Two questions need to be asked and answered from a Christian perspective :

1) What does our faith teach about the reality or otherwise of this world ?

2) Does our faith give us any direction for our inevitable involvement in its processes and movements ?

As a Christian I do not expect to get direct answers to either of these questions from the scriptures. But for one steeped in the worship of the Church, and in the writings of the more philosophical of the Eastern Christian Fathers, the answers are not so difficult to formulate. It is more difficult, however, to communicate the vision adequately to others unfamiliar with the Tradition. Here we attempt only some notes by way of answers.

(1) The Status of the World: This is settled by four considerations: (a) its nature as created; (b) its state as fallen (c) its new status as redeemed in Christ; (d) its eschatological destiny to be reconciled or reconstituted in Christ,

(a) **Creation.** The world is created. What reality it has, comes from outside itself; it is not self-existent or self-sustaining. Here the Christian parts company with the secular humanist and the Marxist. The world has only a contingent status, at every moment dependent on the will of God. We cannot say *etsi deus non daretur* ('as if God did not exist'). If God were not, the creation would not have been, and if God is not, the creation would cease to exist, for its very basis is the creative will and wisdom of God. We should totally reject the Bonhoefferian formula *etsi deus non daretur* if we want to remain Christians. Of course no one can object to Bonhoefferians creating their own religion. But it should not claim to be Christianity, even the type qualified by the ridiculous adjective 'religionless'. There is no created order that is self-existent: there is no created order that is not every moment contingent upon the will of the Creator. At this point we should boldly part company with Marxism and secularism of any variety.

Neither are we prepared to accept the position of Sankara (or of Ramanuja or Madhva, though for different reasons) in which we can find some aspects of Christian truth. For example Sankarites insist that the *jagad* is *mithya*. We Christians also say that the world is vanity and emptiness (Ecclesiastes 1:2). 'By faith we understand that the world was created by the word of God, so that what appears was brought out of what does not appear' (Hebrews 11:12). It is our faith that it is the Word of God that projects the world and makes it come out of non-being into temporal being. We also believe that the world is *in* the Word of God, sustained by it in existence (John 1:13). But we are also convinced that the world as we know it has no permanent existence ('the world passes away' Jn 2:17). The same world has stored up the world for fire (2 Pet: 37 ff). In creation-theology language we say that the created order has both elements as its possibility, the creative word which brings into contingent life and the non-being from which the creation has come to be.

It is therefore that we tend to agree with Nagarjuna that it is not right to say either that the world is real or its opposite. The world is constituted by certain conditions created by the Word of God, i.e. the temporal being of the universe and the perception system of human beings in their mutual interdependence. Nagarjuna in the first century called it *pratitya-samutpada* or conditioned co-mergence; we call it creation.

b) **The Fall of Creation**. The Augustinian tradition is very strong about the deeply entrenched nature of sin in human persons. Reinhold Niebuhr has extended this conception of human sin beyond the personal, and in this he corrected what was in Calvin an overly individualistic understanding of sin. Niebuhr's contribution was in showing us the structures of 'immoral society', something which is characteristic of our century. We see now that sin is more than merely personal, and though there are still Christians like Billy Graham who believe that the way to make a society good is to make everybody a 'born-again Christian', even Billy Graham should not be unaware of the presence of sinamongsthis 'fully born-again' entourage. Niebuhr's precious contribution was to show us the social dimension of sin.

There are two points at which Niebuhr can be criticized. Th first is his tendency to oppose sin and morality to each other as if si were simply immorality of some kind. This is a peculiar temptatio of the western liberal tradition: to moralize sin, and to make it thu primarily a matter of external actions. The result is that when man reformed thinkers today conceive their ideal society, they see it pri marily in moralistic terms—just, participatory, sustainable, etc There is more than morality involved in the Kingdom of God, eve if such morality were more social than personal or individualistic Niebuhrians would moralize even the principalities and powers an almost equate them to the unjust structures of society.

What is there that is more than moral, you may be tempted t ask. Is it piety added to morality that you want? I would answe the question in short-hand, risking incomprehension. (a) Make th tree good, and the fruit will also be good; (b) Make the goo heroic, creative and sacrificial, not merely just and free from evil.

But there is another point at which Niebuhr and Niebuhrians being children of the Enlightenment, cannot grasp the reality of th fallenness of the created order. This world is outside Paradise, something set up temporarily to hold the human race cast out Eden. Everything that happens here has significance because of th saving activity of the Incarnate Lord who has come to this world an become part of it. But this world as it is now constituted and experienced by our senses is by no means an ultimate reality and our Christian hope were confined to this world, 'we Christians woul of all men be most miserable'.

That is the point at which Christians have something in commo with Sankara and the Sankarites, provided we are not Christian caught in the secular trap laid out by the Enlightenment. We di agree with the secularists that this world is the only world that exist We assert the contrary: that this world as experienced by huma beings is not as real as it looks at first. It is a passing world, ma even worse, it is not there objectively, at least not in the form which we perceive it. Modern physical theory has proved th hollowness of any scientific claim that this world open to our sens is the world as it is. In fact in present theory we cannot even pos

that something definite and formed is there. We can only conceive an enormous range of possibilities, not an objective reality fully actualized.

But as Christians we part company with Sankara and the Sankarites at that point. We go on to say that this passing world has genuine significance, because the Son of God has been incarnate in it, and has shared our experience of it. For us we cannot treat this world merely as fullen. It is a fallen *and* redeemed world.

(c) The World as redeemed. As we move on beyond Niebhur ot posit the redemption not only of the structures of society, but also of the structures of the non-human world, we come in direct conflict with Sankara and the Secularists. Against the secularists we assert that the world cannot be understood by rational analysis alone, and against the advaitins we affirm that history and matter are not totally unrelated to the ultimate truth. Here we are closer to the Marxists, though we reject many of their pre-suppositions like the self-existence, eternity and infinity of matter.

But we can state that history and the non-human creation constitute one reality moving towards a goal, a fulfilment that depends upon the fulfilment of the human race. That is where we have something in common with the Marxists. The redemption in Christ has to do with humanity in its non-human setting, and all creation is to participate in the fulfilment of the children of God (Romans 8:19 ff). Humanity or the soul of human beings is not to be saved in isolation from the body and the physical environment which shapes and sustains humanity.

But we disagree with the Marxists in finding the fulfilment of the human race and of the rest of creation at a given point in history. While we can affirm that history is both significantly meaningful and directed towards a certain fulfilment, we do not believe either that the process itself will take history to its fulfilment or that the fulfilment will be within temporal history. Our perception of reality and our vision of the future requires an end of history, a kind of death of historical-temporal existence itself as a prelude to its transformation and re-constitution into a form that is no longer subject to death and evil.

We also affirm, however, that the world-process has been redeemed. In this sense we can understand all the institutions of society and even the religions of the world as aspects of this redeemed order. But every aspect, every institution, every structure contains both elements–the redeemed and the perishing, the Kingdom of God and the rule of the principalities and powers, the wheat and the tares growing together. Everything awaits the full redemption of the Children of God, when evil shall be separated from the good (the harvest, the judgment) and death itself shall be wiped away.

This perspective is diametrically opposed to the Augustinian view which identified the city of God with the Church and the perishing city of the earth with the world. In our perception we are not prepared to view either the Church or the world in terms of black and white contrasts. The wheat-tares combination can be seen in the institutional and social structures of the Church as well as of the world. We do not however, with Augustine, reject pagan virtue as 'but splendid vice', nor do we become self-righteous about the institutional and social-cultural life of Christians in this world. We however oppose the Augustinian view that everything which has not been baptized is sinful and evil.

d) **The eschatological destiny of the created order.** Part of the special logic of the Christian Church is its capacity to go beyond geometrical (cyclical, linear) perceptions of the course of history. It is simply not true to say that the Church has a linear view of history whereas the other religions have a cyclical understanding of history. Our perception is neither cyclical nor linear, but eschatological. The word 'eschatological', so little understood by many, belongs to this special logic. It means that the process has to be understood and assessed in terms of its final fulfilment. To put it in a crude metaphor, the seedling is to be understood and assessed in terms of the full-grown tree that it has to be when fully grown ; the larva by the full-grown butterfly.

The world-process is like the larva of a butterfly. Its true shape is concealed. Any amount of rational analysis of a larva will not reveal its true nature, unless one has advance apperception of the beautiful butterfly that it is to be transformed into as the

Perception : Some Western trends,
New Research and New Questions
~~(Some Western Trends)~~

(Dr. Paul Gregorios)

There is in the west today, particularly among more perceptive scientists themselves, a fresh questioning of the general validity of the perceptions underlying scientific truth and of the scope of its method.

Scientism, i.e. the view that the modern scientific method is capable of leading us to all truth, was generally a phenomenon of the late 19th and early 20th centuries, though there are still many scientists who hold that view. Especially with the advent of modern nuclear physics and relativity theory, the absoluteness of scientific knowledge could no longer be held as a scientific position.

OPPENHEIMER

Albert Einstein and Robert Oppenheimer, two of the outstanding scientists of the previous generation, began developing a philosophy of the two ways of perceiving reality. Oppenheimer, in his book on Science and the Common Understanding[1] developed the thought that our way of thinking in

---

1. New York, Simon and Schuster, 1954

terms of time and history was one of two alternative efforts of man to perceive the world of reality. The other alternative, ~~was to~~ ~~be~~ he called "the way of eternity and timelessness" The one could not be reduced into the other. "They are, as we have learned to say in physics, complementary views, each supplementing the other, neither telling the whole story." 2

In other words, Oppenheimer held the view that, just as physicists have today to hold together the corpuscular and undulatory views of light ~~in order to~~ as complementary to each other, the scientific world view has to be held together with what some westerners call the mystical world-view, in order to perceive a full picture of reality as it is.

Einstein, though very much a mystic, preferred to speak about the "speculative" grasp of reality which should complement scientific perception, which according to him gives only indirect knowledge of reality.[3]

This view that modern science opens up only a partial perception of reality is leading western scientists to a new openness towards Eastern philosophy, especially Hinduism and Buddhism.

---

2 op. cit. p. 69

3. See P.A. Schilpp, Ed. Albert Einstein: Philosopher-Scientist, N.Y. Harper & Bros. 1959. p. 248.

The literature on Perception in the west is mushrooming.

Quantum mechanics, particle physics, relativity theories — these were only part of the challenge to the monarchical authority of the scientific method. The other challenge came from the "drug experience" Huxley started the ball rolling with his Doors of Perception and Heaven and Hell. As the novelty of Mexican Peyote (PEYOTE) gave way to the laboratory production of LSD, experiments became widespread. Robert Masters, (greater authority than Timothy O'Leary) came out with his Varieties of Psychedelic Experience[4], which has become a classic on the subject today.

It was soon discovered that the experience which was induced by drugs could be induced by pure suggestion, with or without hypnosis. The work of Robert Masters and his wife Dr. Jean Houston has led to some astonishing discoveries about perception. A report on their work appeared in Harper's Magazine in January 1974. I had a long interview with Dr. Jean Houston, who has very high respect for India. Their technique is

---

4. Masters, R and Houston, J. Varieties of Psychedelic Experience, New York, 1969

to alter our ordinary perception through suggestion. Robert Masters has created a "cradle", following clues from witchcraft, shamanism and possession states. It is a triangular piece of metal on which the subject stands. His back is supported by a ~~stretched~~ canvas back-rest stretched between two posts, and he is strapped to the cradle by wide bands like seat belts. The whole thing is suspended from the apex of a four-pole pyramid. The platform swings about six inches above the ground. The slightest movement of your body sets the platform twirling and swinging. The subject is blinded by goggles which prevent him from seeing where he is going. In about a quarter of an hour, the subject is in trance - in what ~~Masters~~ and Houston call ASC or Altered State of Consciousness. The suggestions have been administered before getting into the cradle by Masters or Houston.

The experience defies description. ~~Those~~ Professor who have experienced it described it to me. The mind changes. A new world opens up. One can leave one's body behind and travel to distant lands, experience unusual ~~things~~ events, see colours, hear languages, learn things, go back to childhood experiences and so on. Later Masters and Houston abandoned the cradle and [illegible] used to induce

The subjects are usually highly educated people - professors, artists, psychiatrists and so on. They all experience images of various kinds, new learning situations, new heightening of inner perception, new ways in which non linear and non-rational thinking can take place with great profit to understanding.

They have published a do-it yourself volume on Altered States of consciousness techniques called Mind Games[5] Perception can be altered by group work under a knowledgeable leader

The same kind of conclusion results from the work of the Anthropologist Carlos Castaneda. Castaneda is well-known to the younger generation in the west The New York Times ~~book~~ review on Castaneda's first book: The Teachings of Don Juan: a Yaqui way of Knowledge[6], characterised the book itself as an " an extraordinary Spiritual and psychological document ... destined for fame". In this first book, the Social Scientists' scientific Certainty is undermined by exposure to the perception

5 Masters and Houston, Mind Games, New York, Delta, 1972.

6. New York, Ballantine Books, 1969. By 1973 the book had reached its 17th printing.

of a "non-ordinary reality" and also exposure to extreme terror. The whole work of Castaneda can be characterized as field notes of a modern social scientist's wandering back and forth between two realms — ordinary reality and non-ordinary reality. In his second book (A Separate Reality)[7] Castaneda gave further field notes from his apprenticeship to Yaqui ~~the~~ Sorcerer Don Juan, and his further exposures to non-ordinary reality, the encounter with strange beings and giant, moth-shaped 'allies". The third book, Journey to Ixtlan and the fourth one, Tales of Power have completed the series, which constitute the best scientific documentation of a ~~wizard's~~ wizard's world of non-ordinary reality.

Castaneda's work and its implications have been widely discussed in scientific journals and periodicals. An article in the Philosophy of Science Magazine by Prof. Lawrence Foss is entitled: "Does Don Juan really fly?"[8] Prof Foss calls attention to the problematic nature of what we call factual truth, and our ordinary perception, particularly the perception of the intellectual tradition in which western science flourishes.

---

7 New York, Pocket Books, 1972

Joseph Chilton Pearce in his work entitled The Crack in the Cosmic Egg [9], based on the work of Castaneda, argues that our scientific Cosmos is only one possible construct, and that other constructs of the Cosmos (such as that of Don Juan) may exist which are just as valid in ~~and of~~ terms of experience. We bring a social consensus to our perception and, strange enough, reality confirms our consensus. As Sir Arthur Eddington once said

> "The mind has by its selective power fitted the process of Nature into a frame of law of a pattern largely of its own choosing; and in the discovery of this system of law the mind may be regarded as regaining from Nature that which the mind has put into Nature". [10]

This mutually reinforcing set-up between social consensus and perception has thrown the certainty of scientific judgments into serious doubt. Science is today regarded by many as only one among many ways of perceiving reality, and science cannot make sense of all the data

---

9. New York, Julian Press, 1971.

10. The Nature of the Physical World, New York, Macmillan 1931. p. 467.

that it encounters.

Our present science is a 17th Century European Construct which has been gaining social consensus all over the world. It is efficient in dealing only with a small segment of the Spectrum of Reality. Robert E. Ornstein of the Institute for the Study of Human Consciousness, the Langley Porter Neuropsychiatric Institute, has done Considerable work on The Psychology of Consciousness[11], where he develops the old Huxleyan idea that the Senses actually reduce and select data for perception. The electromagnetic spectrum is enormous — from Cosmic rays to radio waves. What is visible to our naked eyes is but a small slit We can see only waves of between 400 and 700 billionth of a meter in length, whereas the total range is from less than one-billionth of a meter to more than a thousand metres.

Hence Ornstein's Conclusion:

---

11. The Viking Press, New York, 1972

"Science is one of the most restricted and rare forms of knowledge available to man. Our senses limit, our central nervous system limits; our personal and cultural Categories limit; language limits; and beyond all these selections, the rules of science cause us to further select information which we Consider to be true. By a slow conservative process of Construction Science gradually builds a stable core of knowledge ..... Most cultures are fundamentally based on this active, linear mode -- the way of language, science and history. Ours is so thoroughly based on it that many have almost forgotten that other Constructions of individual Consciousness, other cultural styles, are even possible." [12]

Till a few years ago, the data of parapsychology could be ignored by scientists as irrelevant or uncertain. Today this is no longer possible. The UNESCO has recently devoted one issue of its prestigious periodical 'The Impact of Science on Society' (Oct-Dec 1974

---

12. op. cit. p 41.

To a study of the 'Para sciences', another journal published by Stanley Krippner is entitled Psycho-energetic Systems[13], and deals with acupuncture, brain research, bio-electric fields, Kirlian photography, etc., including material from China, Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union. A new discipline is coming to birth called 'Psychotronics', which is "the inter-disciplinary scientific investigation of the relationships among consciousness, energy and matter". The International Association for Psychotronic Research[14], has already held two international Conferences (first in Prague, second in Monte Carlo, June-July 1975).

This new willingness to take the hitherto neglected data of parapsychology has given rise to a whole crop of new books, not all of them of the same scientific reliability, but most of them highly suggestive in the way they handle the evidence.[15]

---

13. available from Gordon and Breach Science Publications, one Park Avenue, New York, NY 10016. 4 issues a year. annual subs. $ 19.50.

14. Address: Box 107, Cotati, Calif 94928, U.S.A

15. For example: John Taylor Superminds: An Enquiry into the Paranormal, New York, The Viking Press
John Beloff, Ed. New Directions in Elek Science, 1974
In Science

Another source of ...

interesting research on meditation techniques that is daily gaining ground in the West. William Johnston's Silent Music, The Science of Meditation[16] and Lawrence Leshan's How to Meditate[17] are good examples. ~~Mary~~ Marilyn Ferguson's The Brain Revolution[18] gives an admirable summary of the new research. Fascinating new data has been unearthed about the hemispheric asymmetry in brain function. It appears that linear, logical, time-sequence thinking is the ~~function~~ of only one hemisphere in the ~~human brain~~ cerebral cortex (left), while the right hemisphere (which controls the left side of our body) operates in a more holistic and non-linear way.[19] Human perception is both rational and trans-rational, and the two ways of dealing with reality, the scientific-technological (left hemisphere) and the poetic-holistic (right hemisphere) are coordinated by the inter-connecting Corpus Callosum.

Experiments show that if Sodium Amytal is injected into the left hemisphere, no analytical conceptualization of the environment is possible, and if injected into the carotid artery

16. See also Claudio Naranjo and Robert E. Ornstein, On The Psychology of Meditation, New York, The Viking Press, 1971.

17. New York, Little Brown, 1975

18 New York, Taplinger, 1974

19. See J-E. Bogen and G.M. Bogen, The Other Side of the Brain III, The Corpus Callosum and Creativity, Bulletin of Neurological Societies 34(1969) pp 191-220

The analytic side is released from EUPHORIA
influences and the subject experiences euphoria.
Perception is thus clearly seen as linked to
various centres in the brain; reality changing
as the perceiving apparatus changes. And only
a part of perception is sensory or rational.

Yet another source from which
new material is coming is the renewed interest
in the late Dr. Jung's psychological theories.
Ira Progoff's work on Depth Psychology and
Modern Man[20], Edward Edinger's Ego and
Archetype,[21] and the post-humous publication
of Jung's l'homme et ses Symboles[22], have
all revealed a fresh view of the individual ego
in relation to the collective, and of time in
relation to eternity (the Concept of 'SYNCHRONICITY'),
which have again put new questions about
the validity of our perception of ordinary reality.

There are many other impacts
which show how limited is the range and
scope of scientific perception ~~is~~. One need only

20.

21. Penguin Books, Baltimore, Maryland, 1973.
~~21~~. Edinger is Chairman of the New York Institute
of the C.G. Jung Foundation

22. Robert Laffont, Paris, 1964. English Title: Man
and His Symbols, Aldus Books Ltd. London, 1964.

the interesting research by the Kirlians in the Soviet Union on 'aura photography', a lens-less process of photographing the electro-magnetic waves around the human body and other bodies,[23] The evidence slowly accumulates to reveal the amazing wealth of forces and fields that constitute the universe and how man himself functions in relation to these.

We are now ready for a new perception and a new philosophy, perhaps? After all the job of philosophy is to perceive reality and to interpret it. And all our philosophies are social constructs, in dialectical relation to our consensus about perception. Can we now proceed to a new corporate effort which takes into account the perceptual experiences of both East and West?

---

23 Kirlian photography, sometimes called aura photography, is a lens-less process in which the object is placed ~~on~~ directly on film in a high frequency electrical field. Living organisms (plants and people) produce a glittering multi-coloured field of light in the film-image, something parallel to the 'aura' around the heads of saints in traditional painting. [illegible] believe that this field