

Committee IV
East-West Perspectives
on Spirit and Science

DRAFT - 8/15/88
For Conference Distribution Only

**CONTRIBUTION OF EAST AND WEST
TO SPIRIT-SCIENCE UNIFICATION**

by

Jean E. Charon
Director, Research Center
on Complex Relativity
University of Paris
Paris, FRANCE

The Seventeenth International Conference on the Unity of the Sciences
Los Angeles, California November 24-27, 1988

© 1988, International Conference on the Unity of the Sciences

I am a theoretical physicist and my research principally is on what is called, in Physics, "unification theories". Physical phenomena are classified in Physics according to four types (four "interactions" say the physicists), which are named the electromagnetic interaction (light, radio...), the gravitational interaction (which makes that stars and planets attract each other), and two interactions relative to the nuclear domain called the strong interaction (constituting the atomic nuclei) and the weak interaction (which is responsible for radio-activity). Since the time of Einstein physicists have suspected that Universe has got a fundamental unity, and that some day we should discover how these 4 interactions are linked together and would reduce at the end to only ONE great law of Nature. This law should be general enough to contain itself the four interactions. To demonstrate this unity in obtaining this unique law is what is called to build up a "unification" theory. In 1980 three of the four interactions were unified, only the gravitational interaction still remained out of the unified global formalism. At last, early in 1987, I was lucky enough to succeed in obtaining the total unification of the four interactions. The unification formalism that I personally proposed is referred to as the

"Complex Relativity" theory - an extension of Einstein's General Relativity.

The particle of Matter has got a "memory"

However, this is not the main subject of this paper. To speak explicitly of a unification theory, we need a very elaborate mathematical formalism, and it is of course not our purpose to present such a formalism here. But our work about unification had a "fall out" which was first very surprising: to obtain unification we had to suggest a new "model" of the particle of Matter, and according to this model each particle of Matter possesses a very important property, a "hidden" property which was first not detected by Physics: the particle of Matter has got its own memory; the "model" says that the particle of Matter can keep within its structures the "souvenir" of situations that it has experienced in the past. Of course, the particle's memory is not the same for ANY particle, some particles have a so small memory that we can (at least as a first approximation) consider that this memory even does not exist (what physicists believed so far was true for all Matter): but a more attentive study has lead to a "model" of Matter where, SOMETIMES, the memory is so

large that it cannot be neglected, even as a first approximation. This is usually the case of particles composing living Matter, from the vegetal to the human.

We can suspect that the entrance in Physics of the memorizing properties of Matter, inevitably accompanying the formalism of the "unification" theory, is going to have in the years to come a deep impact, not only in Physics, but also in Biology, or more generally in Philosophy. Indeed, we knew for more than a century that Science was getting a better and better knowledge of the brain, and we felt that maybe we were not so far to get information on the functioning of the Mind. But we were not ready to accept that the Mind could exist since the elementary level of the individual particle of Matter. Leibniz, and later the french Jesuit Teilhard de Chardin, have both suggested this "hypothesis" that each particle of Matter had a personal "Psyche"; and, indeed, this idea that Matter itself has got a Mind has thousands of years of age. But, in the past, this hypothesis looked only as an interesting speculation. Now we were considering this "memory" as part of a true scientific model. Obviously, we should however be very careful, and should certainly not let our imagination go too fast: but, without any doubt, Physics had discover that elementary Matter has got a memory of its own, and this is a large step concerning the knowledge of Spirit. Physics should be considered now, not as the Science of Matter only, but the Science of Matter AND Spirit (I sometimes call it the Science

of Psychomatter).

The One is at the same time the Whole

In this paper I would like to draw attention on a special point derived from the "model" of the particle of Matter (Psychomatter) that we got from the unification theory. It concerns the way any object (the One) is linked not only with himself (that is IS himself) but with the totality of the Universe (the Whole). In other words, we cannot separate any object from itself (which is evident) but also from the rest of the Universe (which was not "evident" before the unification theory); any object is at the same time the One and the Whole.

This means also that any object (including an elementary particle of Matter) has got a double connection with the Universe: since it has got a "memory", the particle of Matter has first got a "personnal" aspect (which takes into account its personnal memory); and also this object (the particle) is "the Whole" (which take into account the fact that it is not separable of the totality of the Universe). We have to get used to this paradoxical situation: we are the "One" and the "Whole", and this is true for any object of the Universe, as well for an elementary particle as for a complete "Organism" (we, the human beings, should of course

be considered as such "Organisms").

This situation corresponds in fact to the thousand-years old idea that, to define any object of the Universe, we should say that this object has not only an "existence", but also an "essence". What the unification theory has taught to us is that this "essence" of the One is the totality of the Universe, that is the Whole. We are the One and the Whole.

Intuition and Reason

Why are we insisting on such an idea, according to which we are at the same time the One and the Whole ? Because we wish to stress forth that we have two ways (and not one only) to "access" to the Universe:

. through the One and its own "memory": but the "unification" theory shows us that we are in this way conscious of an artificial universe, a "symbolic" universe which is always "relative" (never "absolute"), and "relative" to the symbols that our memory suggests to us to represent this Universe. A deeper analysis indicates that this artificial universe is the one created by Reason (taking however this word "Reason" with a

very large meaning: Reason is what allows to connect symbols to a "language" through a "logic", whatever be the logic and the language).

. through the Whole (that is through our "fusion" with the totality of the Universe). Again a deeper analysis indicates to us that we obtain in this way a "transcendant" vision of the Universe, that is a vision which cannot be communicated to others through any language. It is what we sometimes call a "primordial sensation", but not a true "perception". We call also Intuition this primordial sensation not communicable to others. Intuition is always "silent". This unique vision of the Universe escapes any translation through any language, since the "primordial sensation" that procures Intuition is not a language (no symbols available).

Two paths for thought: Reason and Intuition

Why are we so much underlining the important role of Reason and Intuition ? Because we think that Reason and Intuition are the two "motors" of the behavior of living Organisms, and still more generally of Matter (Psychomatter). This is true of human behavior - where these qualities of thought, called Intuition and Reason, are indeed justifying a large part of our behavior; but it is also

true, upon second thought, of simpler Organisms, like an animal or even a vegetal. These qualities of Reason and Intuition are certainly less apparent in animal and vegetal - the "memory" is smaller - but, nevertheless, the same properties of Reason and Intuition "exist" also, and this again is confirmed by Physics and the general "model" of Psychomatter.

However, when we consider human behavior, which is of course of a special interest to us, it seems that our planet, the Earth, shares in different ways the use of Reason and Intuition: what we generally call "The West" seems to mostly trust Reason; on the contrary, "The East" seems to believe in priority to Intuition. Of course, this should not be taken too "literally", we have reasoning and intuitive thought everywhere on the Earth: but we certainly note this preponderance of Intuition over Reason (or the reverse) when we analyze carefully East and West.

It is interesting to examine if we do not lose too much of what could be called "the power of thought" by using only one of the means that Nature has put at our disposal - either Reason or Intuition - to become conscious of our Universe. Certainly we behave better when thinking both with Reason and Intuition, in the same manner as we walk better with the help of our two legs than with one leg only. And we have first to ask a question: is that so sure that Reason is so "superior" to Intuition? Is that so sure that, practically, humanity could progress without the help

of Intuition ? We heard such an affirmation answered to this question quite a number of times, especially coming from the West ! But a better informed analysis shows us that both Reason and Intuition have got "limitations" as soon as we want to use one without the other. Let us look carefully to this aspect of "limitations".

The limitations of Reason and of Intuition

We already mentioned what could appear as the greatest limitation of Intuition: Intuition is transcendant, not communicable to others, in any language. The only "vision" of the Universe that we can experience with Intuition is a "primordial sensation". Intuition is a true "fusion" with the Universe, "we are" the Universe, we are the Whole; Intuition is absolute, but this absolute is always silent. Silentness appears as the principal limitation of Intuition.

On the contrary, the main limitation of Reason is that Reason is never absolute, but always relative, and relative to the presuppositions that we accepted to be able to use Reason. In this sense, we never get with Reason an "authentic" vision of the

Universe, it is always an "artificial" vision, it is only a "representation" based on symbols accumulated in our memory.

If we change our personal memory, we necessarily change the representation of the Universe. A large part of the presuppositions associated to Reason is made of the organs of senses themselves, with which we become conscious of the Universe: this is why a fish, a bacteria or a flower do not see the same Universe, and certainly not the same Universe as we see. Humans themselves, when we consider them with attention, use different presuppositions when looking at the Universe: this is why we generally see, with the help of our Reason, a different Universe than our neighbor: the "images" of the Universe may be close to one another, but they are however not exactly the same when we examine them in detail.

Another point (which is however more "technical") limits Reason: suppose that we are developing a language based on Reason, and are getting in this way more and more "logical" statements. In the course of this operation we introduce in our language more and more presuppositions. But, of course, we pay very much attention not to introduce new presuppositions which would be "contradictory" to the set of presuppositions already accepted. We build in this way what we think is a "coherent" language to communicate with others and with ourselves. However, and in spite of all the precautions that we have taken, there will always be a moment when this "coherent" language will become itself contradictory: this language will say, at a certain moment of

its development, that the same thing is, at the same time, "white" and "black"; or that the same act is "good" and, at the same time, is "evil". We were expecting Reason to always propose to us coherent, and even "harmonious", statements: this is not true since, as we have just seen, Reason can lead to "contradictory" statements.

When such a contradiction happens, there is only one way out: declare that the prevailing language of Reason is to be changed, and build up another language with different presuppositions, a new language of Reason in which the previous contradiction disappears. One example is the wave-corpuscule contradiction of the language used by Physics before 1925: Matter was declared by the prevailing language of Physics to be at the same time corpuscular-like (discontinuous) and wave-like (continuous). This contradiction was not acceptable by Reason (and consequently not by Physics, resting on Reason). Physics was obliged to invent the new language of probabilism to "enlarge" its representation of the Universe: we should now say that Matter has only such and such "probability" to be here at such instant. The language of "determinism", which was the language of Physics for thousand of years, was definitively over and replaced by probabilism. The same "adventure" happened more recently (1980) in Physics: Matter was found to be at the same time point-like and having also properties (like mass for instance) that could not be located on a "point". A new language to represent Universe (language of Imaginary) was the consequence of such a contradiction: Matter is point-like in the Real space (the

observable space), but "extended" in the Imaginary space (our "personnal space").

Mathematicians (Gödel and others, 1950) have analyzed this grave "limitation" of Reason: they have concluded that:

a) any language obtained out of Reason meets this "limitation" at a certain moment. The only way out is to change of language: in the new language the contadiction disappears. But this obliges us to conclude that Reason by itself can never give a final representation of the Universe, this representation should be changed periodically.

b) The new language (that we generally call the language of "Generalization") is not only "not contradictory" (coherent), but it allows a more precise and complete representation of the Universe than the previous language. This means that our "consciousness" of the Universe gets, with time, always higher and higher.

c) How can we build up (or create) the new language of Generalization ? We should make use of what we call "the paradoxical thought", which directly calls for Intuition. We

shall now examine this aspect with great attention, because paradoxical thought is, in fact, the path to more consciousness, that is the path we should choose for evolution.

The paradoxical thought

This kind of thought has been suggested to solve the problems associated with the limitations both of Intuition and Reason, that we just explained.

The paradoxical thought, having recognized these limitations of Intuition and Reason, proposes TO CHANGE THE DEFINITION OF THE "EXISTENCE" OF ANY OBJECT: an object A is now declared "existing" when it is at the same time what it is and the complement of A to the whole Universe, and in particular the contrary of A. This is well illustrated by Toshihiko Izutsu, who teaches Philosophy at the University of Tokyo, in Japan: "A flower is a flower and also anything but a flower, and particularly the contrary of a flower; consequently a flower is nothing; but however it is a flower".

We see that, in such a definition of "existence" (which is more

familiar to the East), any object is identified with the Whole (essence) ...and has however an individual existence (this object is a "Person", it is a "One").

We note that, with the paradoxical thought, we are not directly using Intuition or Reason; or, should we say, the paradoxical thought should be considered as the highest step out of Reason, or the step of introduction to (or before) Intuition. The paradoxical thought is no more Reason, since Reason does not accept "contradictory" definition of any part of the Universe ("A is itself and its contrary" is not accepted by Reason); and the paradoxical thought is not yet Intuition, since in true Intuition we are not able "to speak" of any object A: A is transcendant, and silent.

Why this new definition of "existence" ? There are at least two important reasons:

1- It is a dynamic (not a "static") definition of an object A. The ancient definition (dating from Aristotle) was concentrating on the structure of A itself (A is A different from all the rest of the Universe, an affirmation which seems quite

"natural" to the West), while the new definition considers that A is not separable from the Whole, that is to say from the rest of the Universe. If the rest of the Universe evolves, then A evolves accordingly. The new definition of an object A depends not so much of the local structure of A than from the way that A is linked to the rest of the Universe, as far as can be this "rest".

2- It is also a definition of "existence" which allows to easily "transfer" from the paradoxical thought to Intuition or Reason, and in this transfer get to a higher conscience of the Universe:

a) There is nothing like a "paradoxical" definition of any region of the Universe to lead to a true Intuition of the Universe, that is a "fusion" with the Whole. Because we are meditating around contradictory premises, it is not possible to directly use Reason. But we are here, with the paradoxical thought, very near of that "primordial sensation" of the Universe (Intuition), that cannot be translated in any language, but from which we shall emerge however with a higher "consciousness" of the Universe.

b) We shall use, in turn, that higher consciousness of the Universe "to create" later the new language of Reason that we are looking for, this language where the "contradiction" of the old language disappears (what we called the new language of "Generalization").

Intuition and Reason: two complementary approaches to the Universe

We should now conclude the preceding remarks about Intuition and Reason, derived from the unification model suggested by Physics:

1- Intuition and Reason are complementary looks that all living Organisms have of the Universe. Intuition is a true "fusion" with the Universe, we "are" the Universe, we are "sensible" to the whole Universe. On the other hand, Reason gives us a symbolic approach to the Universe, we "build up" our own Universe with the symbols that we have accumulated in our own ~~me~~ memory. In both cases, Intuition and Reason, the "source" of our consciousness of the Universe is unique, it is the "concrete" Universe itself; but, with Intuition, we have an authentic sensation of the whole universe; while, with Reason, we obtain a symbolic representation of the Universe thanks to what life has accumulated in our own memory. Intuition is an "absolute" sensation of the Universe, but uncommunicable to others; Reason is only a "relative" representation of the Universe (relative to the symbols that we use), but allows to share with others the

representation of "what is".

2- Intuition and Reason are also complementary in another way: if we approach the Universe with Reason only we get, sooner or later, to a contradiction, where the same part of the Universe appears, in this language of the prevailing Reason, at the same time as "white" and "black" (or good and evil). To get over that "paradox" we have to call for Intuition, and through "Generalization" change the previous language of Reason. On the way, we find out that Intuition has allowed us to become more "conscious" of the Universe (better knowledge of the Universe). So, alternatively, we call for Reason and Intuition, each time getting to a higher level of consciousness.

3- An error that we have to avoid is to believe that Reason alone would be sufficient to obtain a progressively higher knowledge of the Universe. In such an error, the inevitable contradiction to which leads finally Reason is solved by a "hierarchisation of values": since we cannot tolerate that the Universe can be at the same time "white" and "black" (or good and evil) we call for the prevailing values of moral or ethic (or, more simply, to the values adopted by our own Culture) to say that only "good" is right. This is "Reductionism" and not "Generalization", and this solution accepts Evil as being part of

this Universe created by God: it seems clear, at least to me, that God cannot be the "creator" of a Universe which, even locally, would be accepted as being "Evil", it looks to me impossible "by definition". The right way, as we said, when Reason meets such a contradiction, is to call for Intuition and create a new and enlarged language of Reason in which we go over the paradox that Reason has detected: in this new language we get to a higher level of consciousness, where there is no more "good" and "evil". I do not say: "where everything is good", but I say: "where there is no more good and evil", which is very different. However Generalization is never a final step: after we increase our knowledge for a while with the help of Reason, we inevitably come to the time when a new contradictory representation of our Universe arrives...and we have again to change our language and proceed to Generalization. And so on. The tree of the knowledge of "Good" and "Evil" is always there; but this tree, although it has been much "criticized", is however, as we have seen, the "motor" of evolution towards a higher consciousness.

It is my own conviction that the best way to get to a TRUE TOLERANCE, and also to a TRUE PEACE of the whole Earth, would be TO KNOW BETTER OURSELVES AND THIS UNIVERSE where we all live. This is why we believe it is important to analyze, as we

tried to do in this Note, the way we think and prepare our behavior. What makes us behave in such a way, and not in another ? Only when we have a coherent and acceptable answer to such a question shall we be at last a unified (and however diversified) family, including of course East and West, North and South.

The Eons and the Fredaumières

1st. of July 1988

J.E.C