

**COMMITTEE III**  
Towards Ecumenism in  
World Philosophy

DRAFT - 11/15/87  
For Conference Distribution Only

**UNIVERSALISM AS A METAPHILOSOPHY OF MANKIND**

by

**Janusz Kuczynski**  
Professor of History of Philosophy  
Warsaw University  
Warsaw, POLAND

The Sixteenth International Conference on the Unity of the Sciences  
Atlanta, Georgia      November 26-29, 1987

© 1987, International Conference on the Unity of the Sciences



Janusz Kuczynski

A METAPHILOSOPHYUNIVERSALISM AS ~~THE~~ OF MANKIND

All the heretofore philosophies expressed and express only a certain single position, a single viewpoint which they absolutize. This corresponds to what could be described as the horizon of the expression of the intellect (Bergson), an inevitable one-sidedness, generated by the interest of a given group, era or civilization. Such a mechanism of a sui generis particularization, including the endowing with a class or historical nature, inevitably undermines the claims to universality, made by every philosophy worthy of its name. By wishing to dominate universally and eternally, even if only "intellectually", philosophies, despite their declarations, are additional factors of desintegration. They operate with the old style of thinking which reflects a division of mankind that still remains only a collection of desintegrated group subjects i.e. a mankind in itself. This old mode of thinking is characterized, among others, ~~by~~ by polarity, the building of attitudes upon the basis of extreme oppositionality and alter-nativeness i.e. the domination of the "either-or" principle. This is the reason why even a dialogue is limited exclusively to recognition, without constructing a permanent foundation of a meta-community.

This is also the reason why none of the heretofore philosophies has been capable of solving the problem of mankind's "to be or not to be", and none can become its common meta-philosophy. An answer, as concrete as possible, to the appeal made by Einstein and Russell for new thought, is indispensable. Such a reply is becoming possible as a result of the increasingly profound essential process of our times - the transition to a mankind for itself, a community of the people. Regardless of the still existing and, at times, even intensifying phenomena of desintegration ( e.g. local wars, fluctuations of the East-West tension), unification tendencies,

Janusz Kuczyński

## UNIVERSALISM AS A METAPHILOSOPHY OF MANKIND

The international situation, full of tensions, puts on the agenda ever more strongly the problem of preservation - or, more precisely, of creation - of peace. This is by no means the problem limited to the heads of states - all of us, men in the street, can have and should have our share in its solution. For that purpose it is necessary to understand properly peace itself in the first place - the peace with its deepest existential and social foundations. It is, consequently, necessary to explain the role of every human in actions for the peace.

This is the matter of our existence, as well as of our responsibility, and of our fundamental social ethics.

I would like to present here some of the conclusions of my own research, as well as of the Congress of Intellectuals for a Peaceful Future of the World.

Prior to the Congress there was held an international conference on "Philosophy of Peace" (1), devoted to the scholarly preparation of one of the principal motifs of the Congress, organized by "Dialectics and Humanism" (a Polish philosophical quarterly published in English) The conference focused on giving answer to the 30-year-old classical question of Einstein and Russell "Will we ever learn to think in a new way?"

I will present one of the attempts at providing the answer to the question - the answer that was also reported at the Congress.

Janusz Kuczynski

including international institutions such as the UN or the UNU are appearing on an ever wider scale. At the same time, NEW TENDENCIES in the transition from formations are emerging: the so-called peripheries are becoming more significant as leading or at least inspiring centres of such a transition (the Siemionov-Gellner theory). To this modification one should add one's own: it is difficult to speak about the disappearance of capitalism in the foreseeable perspective of, for example, two hundred years. Capitalism is becoming reformable and due to this fact there grows more distinct a third type of relation, apart from antagonism and convergence between formations (and blocs), namely, the complimentariness of capitalism and socialism. According to this conception, what is at stake here is the complimentariness of three types of organizations of production and social life - market, self-govermment and central plan.

It is mainly this complimentariness which leads towards the emergence of a universalistic meta-formation that includes the most valuable and de-absolutized types of organization. This objective universalism becomes the mediatization and meta-level of capitalism and socialism. Its subjective reflection and projection is meta-philosophy as universalism, as a meta-philosophy of mankind as a community. Objective universalism is characterized i.a. by "multi-polar", conjunctive, integrational, holistic, personalist and pluralistic thinking. At the same time, it ensures opportunities for the multi-level nature of identification and, therefore, a continuum.

THEORETICAL PREMISES: ORDER - TRUTH - CREATION OF MEANING

The tragicalness of the present situation, the tragicalness understood in the classical mode as the unsolvable conflict of values, forces us to seek for new thinking with ever greater intensity. It becomes ever more obvious that all traditional ways of seeing the reality - the old ways of thinking - will not manage to save the world, or even to conduce to its proper and full understanding.

Traditional thinking: particularization - absolutization - domination. All the hitherto existing philosophies grew out of some separate experience, be it social, natural, or cultural. Thus these were and are the philosophies which express one specific, particular wisdom of a given individual and social group. Yet every group, inclusive of social class, or even sometimes of a nation, and always an epoch, attempts to give to that visions of the world of its the validity of universality. One may say that philosophy is more rapacious than politics, since philosophy wants to rule also outside the pale and the time of direct political power of its group. Every philosophy deserving of its name wants to be universally and permanently valid.

In the light of the situation of the modern world one may perceive with even greater acuity that the philosophy as a rule did absolutize especially this particular vision of its. Hence it had to clash with other philosophies, which always led to the intellectual struggle, itself a reflection of social and political strife. Aspiring for the universal and eternal rule, they strove for the dominance over intellects for ever, and over everybody. It is obvious today that none of such philosophies can save the world. On the contrary, they deepen the contradictions and

the tragic confrontation of ideas and aspirations. The clash of various trends of thought leads to the "either-or" type of alternative thinking.

The traditional thinking, still dominating, is, however, not only particular, absolutizing, striving for domination, and consequently alternative. It is also, in fact, mainly descriptive; it says primarily what the world is like. Its principal function is to answer the question about the nature of the being. Only sporadically and secondarily there rises the question about how this being - the world - could be changed. Hence the traditional thinking was and is rather interpretative. Whereas, to tell the truth, the central tenet becomes the alteration of the world and the co-creation of a new one. The traditional specific intellectual conservatism is much more widespread in practice, and tenaciously durable, than we may suppose: its symptoms are to be observed in every walk of life.

New Thought: Totality - cocreation - Meaning of life and history

The new way of thinking must correspond to the conditions of the modern world, totally different from the old one. First it must decisively break with the particularism, becoming instead truly holistic. Not through domination, through imposition of one's own philosophy, but through the understanding that it is the irreducible variety, the multiplicity of attitudes and values, that becomes the point of departure; yet we have to aspire for the whole to understand and validate also the individual elements. That is the starting truth of modernity. It was already Hegel, Marx's great predecessor, who said that truth is the whole. For some assertion to be true, it must embrace all the essential

elements of the described phenomenon, fact, or process. Whereas Lukacs added that not so much economic determinism as the whole constitutes Marx's principle and method.

Still that does not suffice: such holistic truth may as well be permeated with conservatism, if it leads only to the mere meek approval of this variety of which many elements cannot be approved of from the rational point of view. Thus the new way of thinking has to be based also on the principle of co-creation of the new world. It is not only the social world that is concerned, but also the nature itself: natural sciences with the help of sciences must radically extend man's capacities in this respect, as well, if we are to avoid an ecological, and not only nuclear, annihilation.

None, repeat none, social force in isolation can achieve this. Hence I speak here of co-creation: what is needed is not absolutization of selected elements opposed to others, serving the purpose of domination of specific groups, hence not an alternative, "either-or", thinking, but a synthesizing, conjunctive thinking - "and-and" which unites all valuable experiences, which becomes the order of the day.

The approval of manifold values is thus not a tactical postulate but a philosophical one. The necessity to embrace all the whole is, moreover, not only the condition of truth, but also of the sense, and thus of the full rationality of co-created world.

The meaning of life of every individual and the meaning of history of his home country becomes here directly experienced and crucial. Every meaning like that may have its firm foundations in the broadest and most durable possible whole. We experience our own lives as meaningful primarily when (a) we have



a control of its shaping, that is when we are free: (b) when it is not isolated, that is when we live in a community which assesses our efforts; (c) when our achievements do not pass along with ourselves, but remain in the historic achievement of this community, and indirectly of mankind which in its human dimension is an absolute whole.

Likewise, the meaning of history becomes possible when there is freedom, community and continuation, permanence. On the level of history this becomes possible when there is a definite order of the world - despite all too many absurdities contrary to the laws of development - a certain form of (latent, at the least) rationality of being.

Hence one of the principal bases of the new thinking has to be the conviction of the existence of possible partial order within this broadest community, that is mankind. Order is the foundation of the meaningfulness of being. This is held by so varying, indeed even ontologically contrary, philosophies such as Christianity and Marxism: for the former this order is given, and to a certain degree guaranteed, by God; for the latter the order is linked with the regular, harmonious structure of the matter, of nature, of society.

To start with the truth which, while covering the whole yet reveals in it manifold values which produce foundations for their harmonious unification in the order which, however, we have to create ourselves in order to give full sense to the world - this is the introductory formula of this new thinking.

The order of nature and society as the basis of the meaning and Possibility of peace

The broadest, ontological definition of order may be drawn in the following way: order is an objective configuration whose

components are connected with the harmonious relationships which ensure to those components an optimum development, in accordance with their essence. If the essence of every being constitutes its internal structure, making the development possible, hence if it constitutes the set of potentialities of a given being, then the order is a specific essence of set of various beings, things, processes - a harmony of external relations of these beings within this set.

In other words: if the essence ensures the existential order of beings, then the order is the order of much higher category: of the internally differentiated set of various beings. This is not a simple ordering, e.g. an arithmetic one, but a harmonious configuration which serves the mutual development of the components - sometimes mutually contradictory, always different. For instance, complementariness of parts is an especially interesting example of social order.

The particularizations of this most general ontic order are: the order of nature, the order of society, the order of culture. The order of culture - and the order of the matter in particular - is an elementary and primary foundation of all the others. This is the order of mutual harmonious relationships, of elementary particles of the matter, the intratomic order, of molecules, of chemical elements, of regularities of development. This order in our corner of the Universe prevails over chaos, disintegration, the absurdities of mutual destruction by the higher forms of the organization of the matter. Were it not for that prevalence of order over chaos, there would simply be no life, there would be no us. Concretizing the famous classical question, repeated more recently by Heidegger: why is it that there is something rather than nothing - one should first ask: why is it that order rather

than chaos prevails?

Thus that is, obviously, the foremost foundation of the possibility of peace.

In everyday life we experience thousands of examples of the order of animate nature held together by one great current of the order of evolution. Nature is full of internal order, even though often "paid dearly" by, at times, the death of the whole species, and always with the death of individuals. The order of nature, therefore is not an idyl but a result of merciless laws of natural selection, of ruthlessly acting dialectical laws of animate matter - inclusive of (crucial for our subsequent considerations) manifold phenomena of complementariness, of mutual completion of species, individuals, of the whole ecological configurations.

Of greatest interest for us is the social order. Its elementary manifestations may be seen in: love of man and wife, of parents and children - which manifests itself in the superb harmony serving the purpose of their mutual development. On the other hand, it is difficult to determine unequivocally the order among various social groups and forces; all the same, I intend to carry out such an analysis and projection on the concrete example of Polish situation. In the broadest manner, however, one can say that it consists in the mutual complementariness of various professions, groups, aspirations, which co-create various aspects and functions of the totality of social life. When such complementariness and cooperation prevail over ruthless rivalry and struggle, over antagonisms, absurdities, evil - it is precisely then that the elements of social order prevail over the economic and political chaos, over evil and absurdity.

Cultural order, inclusive of the scholarly, artistic, educational, etc., orders, is the mere consequence of the aforementioned

ned. Yet the introduction of cultural order ever more frequently paves the way for the joint shaping of social order. The one who - be it in science, art, or education - creates and implements the appropriate patterns, becomes an authentic creator, in a much deeper sense than usually perceived. It is so since he himself creates the totality and the configurations of higher categories than the individual beings. When creating a new order the configurations of social and cultural complementary and harmonious relationships among beings - he creates a much higher level of ontic, existential order than the one which exists "naturally", thanks to the elemental forces.

Creation of universal order as the basis for true peace

It is now only that we can make a successive step towards the question crucial for our subject. It may be easily seen that the very existence of the order is a necessary - yet not sufficient - condition for peace, especially for the true peace. After all, there may be a specific negative complementariness between opponents, for instance in the conditions of cold war. Thus we proceed to the analyses which should enable us to determine more precisely peace itself, inclusive of true peace and of the borders between it and various forms of conflict which easily conduce to war, and which for sure undermine the fragile foundations of peaceful coexistence, for instance of the states with opposing social systems.

The universal order, on the other hand, should ensure the true and lasting peace. It consists in double - vertical and horizontal safeguarding of the bases of peace. Vertical in the form of overlapping and mutually enhancing orders: natural, social (inclusive of economic, technological, and political

orders), and cultural (inclusive of informational, scholarly, and philosophical orders - the concepts that will be explained by me subsequently). The attempts at building of various, selected orders have been repeatedly undertaken - in the recent period the most outspoken were the concepts of international economic order (cf. Polish publication on the subject of 1979) and of informational order, on the introduction of which most of the member states of UNESCO insisted. It soon became plain, however, that neither of them can exist on its own since it quickly is disintegrated by other spheres of life. Thus for instance, the international economic order fall apart, among others because it was undermined by political events, which was further aggravated by increasing ecological disintegration brought about by the growing crisis in natural resources.

It was also disintegrated by the augmenting horizontal chaos - simply speaking by the growing tensions among various countries. Thus another name for horizontal order may be provided by true international solidarity, or at least by the rational cooperation. And it is only the solidarity of all countries that can permanently prevent the occurrence of crises such as energy crisis, demographic crisis, and especially of ecological crisis, and of continuous political crises.

However, the question is not only that the universal order, that is the international solidarity and harmonious relationships within every country, as well as living in accordance with nature with cultural mission of man, with interhuman morality, can prevent the dangers that threaten us and that increase. The universal order will lead to - inconceivable today - flourishing of all mankind. It will lead to the multiplying of forces of production, inclusive of working out of really symbiotic relations with

nature, which was the subject of vision and of philosophical projection of Belgian van Lier in his concept of dialectical machine. It will lead to the utilization of all human capacities which at present so often neutralize themselves.

This is the real road, the possibility of ensuring of true peace. True, that is consisting not merely in absence of war which lurks behind each dangerous crisis, not only political, but even energy crisis (oil), economic (debts), nutritional, demographic, etc. The true peace entails such practice of mutual relations among various nations and countries, and also social forces, in which they mutually recognize their rights to living and development, and and consequently, they in unison face up to the menaces and undertake cooperation which is increasingly mutually beneficial. More than that - it is indispensable.

The true peace has thus its theoretically justified foundations in universal order. This seems logically unshakeable. However, we have to handle now the more difficult - but at the same time more interesting matters, that is the practical considerations.

#### POLAND'S EXAMPLE: FROM CHAOS TO THE ORDER OF HEART AND REASON

The indication and co-creation of the foundations of peace, true peace, must begin with the internal structure of countries which are subjects or even objects of international life. Both the documents of the United Nations Organization, as well as the pronouncements of, e.g. John Paul II, repeatedly proclaimed that wars begin in people's minds. But people's minds are shaped by the conditions of their existence, hence also by the structures of their countries.

The way of thinking and the way of behaving of a given group depend ultimately on its situation in the mode of pro-

duction: the classical definition of social class is connected with its relation to means of production, to their possession. One could add - with managing them, with codeciding about them on the participatory principles, etc. In terms of order and sense (introduced above as the premises of understanding and of building of peace) that means the perception of social order and of rationality of actions through the prism of possible impact on the world - precisely through the means of production. But also the perception of this world from the determined standpoint - precisely from the point of view of one's location within the social structure. These are the prevalent - even though as a rule unperceived in everyday practice - pressures, of conditions and habits.

Therefore there cannot be a durable - and in my words true - peace without justice, i.e. also without the appropriate social structure. Ye the concept of justice has here a dimension deeper than mere legalistic or moralistic: what is meant is the just organization of the very foundations of life. This entails also the justice of social existence, thus among others, the proper utilization of all possibilities comprised in its historical essence.

Central planning as the design for holistic meaningfulness - when absolutized leads to the power of bureaucracy

The leading idea of socialism is construction of society in accordance with the requirements of science, i.e. of optimum meaningfulness and rationality. This is concretized in the principle of central planning: in its assumption it should be based on the scientific examination of collective life and on the thence resulting designs for the future, primarily of the organi-

zation of society, mainly of material production. However, the practice teaches that this idea is very difficult in implementation - the least error centrally "charted" or "planned" is duplicated thousand - and million-fold, frequently causing losses greater than those resulting from the spontaneity of free market economy. Yet the properly implemented central plan can give incomparably more than any other organization of production.

Still, the absolutization of that principle, i.e. treating it as the only one, did lead in Poland to acute crises, to the alienation of groups of people managing the central apparatus, and to anti-democratic deformations. That which constitutes the great potentiality for the scientific organization of society, has become the source of many disasters and of hindrance, or at least of the serious deformation of development. The idea of rationalism, when absolutized, became its own contradiction, the nightmare of omnipotent bureaucracy which hung as economic, political, and moral liability over the society. The abuses and corruption were then, on social scale, but a mere consequence of the alienation and rule of bureaucracy. In extreme cases - which, however, happened in Poland only in the Stalinist period - this could turn even into totalitarianism, or at least into its milder, "theoretical" form, namely totalism.

Free market: maximum intensity of work and productivity at the price of waste

The principle of planned economy was born also as an opposition towards the spontaneity of capitalism which brought about, and is still stimulating, an intense development of forces of production yet at the price of immense waste of energy, resources,



human resources, and of specific particularization of individuals, of increasing isolation, selfishness, loneliness. The richest country - United States - which only 5 per cent of the world's population - consumes over 25 per cent of the energy of the globe! Despite working of many softening mechanism (even there "pure" capitalism is not the case), despite many traditional virtues of American nation with its tendency to various forms of organization of social life - there are widespread complaints of outstanding sociologists who point to the phenomena of "lonely crowd" (Riesman), "sick society" (From), "one-dimensional man" (Marcuse).

Still, the motivation released there by the profit principle is an extraordinarily potent lever of development of economy, technology, science, which flourish in the U.S.A. which give splendid results - even though against the backdrop of extensive areas of poverty, even starvation (!), and certainly of especially widespread disasters of drug addiction, delinquency, and all other forms of demoralization.

Unfortunately, socialism frequently seems to perceive only the unfavourable aspects of market economy. To put the things briefly: that was the reason why even its smallest symptoms - such as private enterprise - have been eliminated, and the family farms have been limited. They still function - despite the appropriate constitutional amendment - as something subordinate, in the same way as handicrafts and services. This is the fault of theoretical character, as well, since small producers who do not exploit can and should be the legitimate component of socialist economy. When situated in well-functioning, central organization of production, as its legitimate sector, as its completion, enclave, stimulation - they can perform an important function,

considerably enhancing the functioning of the economy, and also making possible the proper and leading functioning of central plan.

Self-government as the intermediate level and as the collective concrete subject

Given the above opposition (antagonistic, systemic, or complementary, functional) of two principles: of free market and of central planning - the idea of self-government assumes a particular importance. Deeply rooted in the socialist tradition, especially cherished by its utopian forerunners - it became in Poland for a number of times a source of hope and renewal. Self-government in its manifold forms (factory, local, cooperative, council) constitutes a priceless form of socialization of man-producer. The very motivation and work are here assessed socially; man becomes a part of collective subject, without relinquishing in any degree of his own subjectivity. On the contrary - this subjectivity is multiplied through the strength of community unified by the same goals. As Gramsci used to say: when man unites with others, he can obtain results well above those that seemed possible at the start. Thus self-government constitutes a concrete form of enhancement of man's powers.

In the configuration of the whole society it is a particularly important collective intermediary between the most general and abstract principle of socialization comprised in central planning and in all-social ownership of the means of production, on the one hand, and the principle of individual private motivation in economic free market play, on the other. Both the individual and the most general motivations may be united within self-government, thus leading to harmonious aggregation of various types of inspiration.

Faulty tendencies in the Party; the gravest fault of "Solidarity"

Yet the immense advantages of self-government can really function only when they constitute a specific mediation of various forms of life. When absolutized as the exclusive principle, and even only as the "leading" one, they must inevitably lead to the disintegration of the modern social and state organism.

Hence the concept of "self-governing Republic", understood as the federation of various enterprises, factories, etc., actually led to disintegration, to chaos, worse still - to the loss of many valuable individual ideas and of immense amount of social energy of so great multitudes, of millions of people full of best of intentions, of enthusiasm. This was not only lost to a considerable extent, but even became the source of processes which undermined the whole of the social organism. Absolutization of self-government indeed has to lead to anarchy.

Yet another great mistake was the limitation of self-government only for the reason that it was becoming a basis of independent, differentiated initiatives. I think that one of the sources of the successive crises is precisely the limitation of the self-government and pushing it to the margin of life. If after 1957, in the wake of October, the self-government had not practically been paralyzed, neither the crisis of 1970, nor the subsequent crises would have taken place.

The logic of social "game" was fairly lucid: the successive absolutization of the central apparatus of planning (and of self-government as the "competitive" collective subject), as well as the cyclic and indecisive acting in the small-producers' economy (especially in agriculture). In sum, this led to immense waste of social forces which mutually eliminated (or at least weakened) themselves. In moments of particular tension, as was

the case in 1981 - there even increased the threat of total disintegration of state.

There is no need to dwell on this analysis - suffice the above underlining of the main lines to make obvious that absolutization of any single principle - valid on its own - has to lead logically to the destruction of the others.

Universal organization of the society - lasting order and advance of Poland

The conclusions seem, for the purposes of our subject, unshakable and crucial:

1. The development of modern societies and of humanities (inclusive of economics, sociology, psychology, and philosophy) is led to evince the multiplicity of mechanisms of organization of production and of cooperation of human. Every of those mechanisms, every motivation and principle, have some pertinent values, do respond to some mental or moral needs. Nothing of this wealth of history of production and of societies should or can be wasted; as Lenin used to say, communism should be the sum total of the output of the whole mankind.

2. The mistakes and deformations of capitalisms, the mistake of the socialism so far, consist thus not in the mere utilization of these mechanism (that is of the market and of central planning respectively) but in their absolutization. It had been shown in Philosophical Manuscripts that it is absolutization itself that should be rejected, and not the values or aspects absolutized.

3. In that perspective, socialism - especially the socialism reconsidered - brings new, great potentialities: it has to guide itself with the principle of central planning and with the thence resulting leading role of the working class and of its party.

yet it can be properly implemented only when it is supported on the comprehensive and fullest utilization of all social resources. In its crucial aspect plan is but a theory, hence it must be all the more implemented by practice of self-government and the realities of the market.

4. Therefore self-government is obviously - in its most variegated possibly richest forms - the indispensable component of socialist organization of production and of social practice. Self-government is best at ensuring subjectivity - a concrete, real subjectivity to the labor force and to all employees. But this can be implemented properly only within the central planning and control: these requirements increase in a modern state, in the conditions of aggravating international crisis, as well as of the fantastically sprouting achievements of science and technology (e.g. the computerizing of informational aspects of management, of modelling the variants of decision, of planning and forecasting). Therefore one can attach great hopes to the repeated underlining of self-government in the program of the 10th Congress of the Polish United Workers' Party; self-government linked concretely with the independence of enterprises and their financial responsibility - specifically in the context harmonized with the planning of self-government.

5. It is likewise necessary to introduce - as efficiently as possible - of the principles of free market as the completion, inspiration, or corrections of some sort of the functioning of those principles which can be best fulfilled by such form of production. Thus one should assume - and forecast - the development of small-producers' economy, especially of the family farms. At the least, they should have full chances of unfolding of their potentialities: they should be given conditions of fair rivalry

with the state farms, so that in such stimulating competition all the mechanisms of production are taken full advantage of.

6. The discussion on whether socialism is referable turns out to be - under the light of the present perspective - meaningless: the issue is that socialism be implemented in accordance with its deepest ideological and theoretical principles. It is not the case of changing the system, but rather, of changing the management methods: concretely, of elimination of absolutization of planning and of power, to the neglect of other mechanisms. It is the case of implementation of fundamental versatility, universality of socialism. And there is still very much to do in the evolution of the system which has immense reserves; hence the present perspective turns out to be realistically optimistic to the maximum.

7. This is also the basis for conviction of Poland's great chance, despite all so great difficulties. There should be a place for every mechanism of production within the universalist socialist society - a proper place. Every human can likewise give very much of himself for common good - either working in the apparatus of central planning, or in a well-functioning factory, in self-government, tilling his own soil, in his workshop, or in his commercial business. If this is a good and meaningful work, then it can and must give both the good pay and the deepest possible moral satisfaction.

8. Such organization of production and of social life can likewise ensure the order of social cooperation, the mutual complementarity of various social groups, as well as of the separate organs of the same body: of managing groups, of experts who serve society with their expertise, of workers constituting a fundamental political force and presenting the best chance of

socialization thanks to their participation in self-governing co-management of production and of the whole country, finally of farmers who confirm the classical patterns of husbandry, responsibility, and union with nature.

9. Such harmonious arrangement of social relations and of possibly most effective work for the common good, are found properly speak within the reach of hand. It depends only on our collective will, on each of us individually. It seems that Poland will be long coming out of its economic difficulties, yet this may occur much earlier than we expect today if the above presented principles are implemented. What, however, seems to be most important is the almost immediately, certainly within the limits accessible to our actions, we can radically alter the present mental, moral, and political situation by entering not only the stage of national reconciliation and regeneration, but also of the great and, in fact fascinating cooperation of the whole society. That could be the model of the whole society. That could be the model of proper social organization, for the whole world almost, all the more valuable that worked out in a particularly difficult conditions, in the climate of present hopelessness almost which still permeates many circles.

10. The best aspirations contained in the thoughts of millions of members of "Solidarity", who desire the radical rebirth of their country, have been frequently dealt with as romantic. Let us call them aspirations for the construction of the order of the heart, of emotions, of great and - with the crushing majority - purest dreams. It was wrong, I think, that this romanticism was opposed by those attacking it from the standpoint of new positivism of the sort, i.e. of going back to basics in work, without elan or dreams. The latter wanted to build what

we might call the order of the reason.

After all, the universal order should comprise both the order of the heart as well as the order of the mind. Therein rests an immense power, the unlimited resources of universalist organization of socialist modern society which in this way is true to the great Polish, and to all great, traditions.

Such example of the true internal peace - of peace which is most certainly durable - can be not only the basis of legitimate and convincing actions of our country on the international arena, but also a concrete example to follow for the universal peace. This shall be shown in the next part of the present analysis.

#### PERSPECTIVES FOR UNIVERSAL PEACE

The broadest, as well as the deepest, foundation for the new thinking which is to explain and co-create the modern perspective for the world, can be found primarily in such philosophy of history which with too various scholarly tests, and which is most widely acknowledged. Barraclough of Oxford wrote a few years ago, citing Isaiah Berlin, that it is precisely the Marxist philosophy of history which is the most daring and most intelligent theory of history (Main Trends in History, 1979, p.164). It is especially its theory of socio-economic formations that is at issue.

In order to comprehend the global situation today in the most effective and objective way, one has not only to make recourse to the classical exposition of this theory, but also to develop it in accordance with the newest tendencies and facts of scholarship. It seems that as far as the known assumptions of the theory of successive formations is concerned, two crucial complements are necessary:



1. The indication that the ever increasing role in the mechanism of transition between two formations is played - appearances to the contrary - not by the centres but by the so called peripheries of main political, cultural, and civilizational circles. This modification has been presented in detail in an already famous interpretation by a Russian Semenov and Briton Gallner, and comprised in their work edited in 1980 in London, Soviet and Western Anthropology. I will limit myself to stressing that this interpretation converges with the aspirations manifesting themselves ever more often in various cultural areas to the presentation of subjective role of new - as a rule unsubjectified so far - societies; it also converges with such new sciences as "globology" (cf. International Social Science Journal, 91/1982).

2. Acceptance not only of the succession of capitalist and socialist formations, but also of their concurrent existence, and of the grave consequences resulting therefrom.

#### The foreseeable versions of the future

On the basis of the analysis of developmental tendencies of the present situation we can say that the fate of the whole civilization Earth and, consequently, the fate of individual societies, depend on the relations between two great formations: capitalist and socialist. It is not only that the relations between superpowers - that is mainly the political plane - that are concerned, but a much broader and all-pervading relationship between the two modes of production and of their consequences for the organization of social life, for culture, philosophy, etc.

In the foreseeable real perspective of at least a hundred

years (and the forecasts based on the computer calculus reach out two hundred years, calculating the pace of exhaustion of resources, of the growth of production, etc. e.g. in the famous book by Herman Kahn The Next 200 Years) one has to reckon with the concurrent existence of both formations, and not with the rapid replacement by one of the other. One of the reasons for this state of affairs is not only general changes, but also the reformability of capital which takes over ever more elements of classic socialist social doctrine, such as planning or self-government, even though in various modified forms. And this fact of concurrent existence of formation will be shaping our fate, as well as our tasks and responsibilities.

One can foretell at least the following forms of this concurrent existence:

/a/ the present antagonism, softened or aggravated by policies and everyday actions, inclusive of the accidental economic, cultural, etc., events.

It is ever more obvious that despite the softening political actions, such as the summit Reagan-Gorbachev, the present antagonism when left in its present essence which could be best expressed in terms of Hegelian dialectics of domination and coercion, or simply as "either-or", is bound sooner or later to lead to the mutual destruction of the opponents, with the rest of the Earth thrown into the bargain. It was already many times that the squadrons armed with atomic weapons took off on the false radar alarms. The transfer of nuclear and high-particle weapons into space, the inevitable reliance on the computer data, will further shorten the time for the "final decision" from the present few minutes to about 100 seconds, and then the present computer malfunctions could no longer be corrected.

Our fate will be decided by ever so often mistaken computers!

Hence for some time one attempts, mainly in the West, to replace the present relationships with:

(b) convergence, understood as the objective processes of closing the gap between the features of the two formations. The theory of convergence was introduced to European literature by Aron, it seems, and to American one mostly by Tinbergen and Kerr around the year 1960 (cf. C Kerr, *The Future of Industrial Societies*, Harvard University Press, 1983). And it was mostly American press, it seems, that was promoting the descriptions and photos of similar scenes, of behaviours of citizens of the U.S. and of U.S.S.R., perceiving in that the hope for political rapprochement.

Yet both history, as well as psychology, teach a lesson that becoming alike frequently leads not to friendship, but rather to hostility, or at least to the increase in rivalry;

(c) global interdependence, and within it the interdependence of the two formations. Since at least the reports of the Club of Rome it has become clear that the particular countries, continents, and, consequently, also political systems become mutually dependent, at least in the sphere of trade exchange and technology resources, environmental protection, demographic and health situation, etc. That is an objective - and one of the most crucial - tendency of the present civilization, and the one that is most commonly acknowledged.

The reader is asked to take notice of the fact that the interdependence as it were stresses the negative aspect of the relationship, i.e. the dependence and not, for example, the mutually enhancing chances for cooperation. Therefore I perceive the higher stage in:

(d) complementariness, in the mutual completion of various modes of production, and of forms of organization of social life. It ensures from the preceding analysis of potential complementariness of the laws of the market, of self-government, and of central planning under the conditions of new reform in Poland that these laws - and thence resulting forms of social life - do not have to be mutually exclusive and destructive. That happens only when they are absolutized. When, however, set in a harmonious whole, in a well directed socialist society, these laws may as if mutually complement themselves, and thus even augment the positive effects of their actions.

The relationship of complementariness accentuates the positive side of interdependence: it turns out that the variegated experiences, various types and modes of production, may be indispensable to one another, especially in the face of the external threats such as environmental or space dangers. They can mutually reinforce one another's advantageous aspects, while weakening - or even eliminating - the negative consequences of the hitherto absolutization of individual laws: of the market in free enterprise capitalism, of self-government in anarchism, and of central plan in the bureaucratic deformations of socialism.

It can be easily seen that the relationship of complementariness will increase the internal evolution of both formations. Likewise easily one can perceive that it in opposition to the present pernicious antagonism: hence it constitutes - alongside with the relationship of interdependence - the strongest source of hope for the future unification of mankind. After all, interdependence and complementariness are the most general tendencies within the fundamental, the most essential problem of our epoch, namely of mankind transforming itself from mankind-in-itself to

a totally new quality: mankind-for-itself. The former has been but a collection of peoples, nations, that we know all too well in our tragic history. The latter will be an authentic community whose all components need one another, complement one another, and enrich one another in the process of exchange, of the mutual influencing by experiences and achievements.

The "selection" of one of the four variants of the future depends on the sum total of mutual actions of the collective subjects: of nations and states. But every one of us is a part of such subjects, hence every one of our serious achievements can have its impact on the action of our collective subject: on mankind's destiny, on the pace and form of its transformation into the global community.

#### Universalist mode of production and the communal meta-formation

Thus the future is to a considerable degree dependent on our individual and collective choices, inclusive of the conviction of the possibility of its joint creation. Therefore, we can see most vividly the insufficiency of truth as a mere description of the situation in existence: then we would be certainly condemned to the present antagonism of formations and to the coming self-annihilation. Today more than at any point in the past we need creativity - the co-creation of the qualitatively new organization of society on the basis of objectively increasing interdependence and complementariness, on the basis of the potentialities of revolution in computers, information, technology, biology, finally in culture and philosophy.

Yes - the philosophical revolution which will be marked by the new thinking. Its key, all-embracing concept will be sense - treated not as a mere instrumental rationality, but as a summary

correspondent of the harmonious whole consisting of the mutually complementary and augmenting various parts.

It ensues from all that was said above that both the most important, most promising objective tendencies, as well as the new forms of thinking must have the shape of specific synthesizing. In contradistinction to the traditional, particularistic and selfish thinking, characterized by the perpetual and mutually destructive alternatives and antagonisms, this new thinking will have <sup>c</sup> - may we underline this once again - actually the form of conjunction: not "either - or" but "and - and".

The conjunctive thinking is at the same time the reflection of the tendencies at complementariness of the modes of production, as well as the co-creation of the new levels of this complementarity. It also constitutes, as it were, "the collection" of the best values created in various configurations, as well as the situation of those values in the common heard, at a meta-level of some sort. We can speak here consistently about meta-formation as of some new form or zone of cooperation of societies of various types, even given the present antagonisms and conflicts.

The communal metaformation is in the present analysis primarily a point of reference. Yet I think that it is likewise a reflection of the germs which already exist, of the germs of mankind-for-itself of the authentic consciousness and of elements of communal practice, e.g. in the form of UNO, UNU, UNESCO, FAO, and of many other informal areas of common values, interests, and aspirations.

The international economic order, stipulated already years ago, and then the international order of information - all constitute the expression of shaping of such meta-formation,

and of the forms of action which strive towards this meta-formation.

Universalism: an integration of class, national, and all-human solidarity.

The above considerations comprise at the same time the premise for the solution of one of more difficult problems of the new way of thinking. We agreed that it cannot be particularistic, alternative, antagonizing. Neither can it be exclusively reflecting, that is descriptive and analytical. It does not suffice to say that it should be global and conjunctive, and creative as well as meaningful in the ontologically-anthropological sense, that is aspiring for the discovering, grasping, and co-creating of meaning.

At least one other feature becomes indispensable: the new thinking has to have the property of harmonious inclusion of the regional, class, and national values into the universal area.

Of greatest difficulty seems to be the integration of class values into the universal, all-human horizon. And yet it is possible in reference to the best products of the particular classes, thanks to which they rose above their own limitations to the level of the common human good. This is the case, for instance, with the ethos of chivalry (cf. the famous work by Maria Ossowska), with the virtues of middle-class morality) a book by the same Ossowska), and perhaps even most vividly with proletarian solidarity which is ever more markedly becoming an all-human solidarity.

The integration of regional and national values is more clearly marked, but then mostly in the sphere of culture, even though sometimes it is possible also in politics. This illustra-

tes the model of "multi-tiered" identification with successive circles of community: family, profession, class, nation, and finally mankind. As a rule, these identifications do not collide with one another, but are mutually reinforcing.

On the basis of these premises, let us solve the problem of linking the global thinking with the "thinking" of particular collective subjects which seem to be constrained to their own horizon by their interests. In the case of conflict, hitherto the forms of thinking "in broader terms" and with stronger interests as a rule subordinated and assimilated, or even crushed the forms of regional thinking - or else there followed the disintegration of the previously existing whole. In other words, first the incorporation or disintegration by the stronger group, or disintegration of the broader group into a series of separate social organisms (we see clearly that the very concept of "thinking" is employed here in the particular sense which is closest to the way philosophy is generally understood).

Yet now such processes of absorption and disintegration are especially dangerous, sometimes excluded at all. National sovereignty became a universal slogan, but equally universal became the necessity of coexistence of nation even of their cooperation. Such assignments may be faced only by the philosophy which will link global thinking with the philosophies of particular collective subjects: only by universalism. When linking values it avoids the void or totalism of purely global thinking, whereas by transgressing the regionalist divisions it incorporates the values - at the same time preserving them, and even strengthening - into the hoard of common human good.



From dialogue to synergy: the practice of co-creation of true  
universal peace

The conclusions which ensue from the above presented analysis are at the same time dramatic and optimistic. This is not the optimism resulting from politics, from the main developmental tendencies of the world. They are dramatic since there occur here the various, sometimes divergent actions of individual and collective subjects situated in the whole plethora of complexity of life, of the coincidence of necessity and accident of wisdom and absurdities, of good and evil. But that is the reason why so much depends on almost every outstanding individual even on small collective subject, and certainly on every outstanding achievement: even if only one work changes the opinions of a few thousand of influential people, then it can have the ultimate importance for some aspect of mankind's destiny. This is where the optimism lies since these actions constitute not only the mini-causes, but also the substance of the developmental tendencies. The fact that humans strongly wish for conciliation is in itself a symptom of the tendency for unification.

How to reconcile this - presently antagonized and full of tensions - world of ours? A traditional, yet well-tested method is dialogue: it assumes in its authenticity the recognition of the opponents equality. Yet such purely verbal recognition often was limited only to words, whereas the compromises - when achieved - were often broken when the particularistic, selfish interests prevailed.

Now, however, there emerges an ever increasing universalist interest which is absolutely superior: survival of mankind. Such implementation of one's own interest which leads to de-

struction, or even "only" to the undermining of universal interest, is an absurdity. If some future state "wins" a thermonuclear, biological, or chemical war, then its population will inevitably die after some time amid sufferings even worse, be cause longer.

Therefore this dialogue must be strengthened at present with the cooperation of all involved parties. Such cooperation - synergy - acquires in the present analysis the marked foundations in the tendency to interdependence, and primarily in the mutual complementariness of various modes of production as of "organic foundations" of the future universalistic society; finally, in the mutual and fascinating complementariness of cultures.

This is no longer dialogue of words - this is a dialogue of actions which co-create permanent results. It will be ever more strengthened by the external necessities: the logic of social existence, its truth, creation and meaning, nature and cosmos, will enforce on human species its cooperation so that it can survive. And the wisdom of this species will tell it that thanks to such cooperation it will solve not only the present problems, but also the future ones of ecology, demographics, energy, information - thus releasing the inexhaustible energies latent in harmonious community.

In the present situation peace does not equal quiet. On the contrary: it is an intense effort, a continuous and wise progress.

The attempt at a new definition of peace may provide the crowning of the above analysis. I formulate it as follows: true peace is a practice - based on universal order - of mutual recognition of collective subjects (social groups, nations,

states) which aspire at implementation of its essential just aspirations in the perspective of the co-created global community: of mankind-for-itself.

