

Published in: World Futures. The Journal of General Evolution, 59(7): 535-556.

# On the Fundamental Worldview of the Integral Culture Integrating Science, Religion, and Art: 2<sup>nd</sup> Part

Attila Grandpierre  
Konkoly Observatory  
H-1525 Budapest, P. O. Box 67, Hungary

## 4.1. The nature of philosophy and scientific worldview

Dilthey (1911) recognised that the most important question of philosophy is defining the main task of philosophy itself. Actually, this main task of philosophy has not been a settled question since the ancient Greeks. Let us make now an attempt to overcome this difficulty.

“Philosophy is the science searching and systemising the most general laws of nature, human society and evolution of thinking. (...) It is the life-concept, the worldview, the attitude forming a more or less coherent system of views on the outer world, on the facts and phenomena of life and their nature, aim and interpretation” (Dictionary of Hungarian Language, 1979, 817). It seems that in this definition concepts of philosophy and worldview are mixed. Plato formulated the first and most important mark of philosophy as being the study in which various special sciences are to be related together and understood as part of one system (Kneale, 1960, 756). Now if philosophy is the “cognition of the world” and if it is science that researches and systemises “the most general laws of nature, society and the evolution of thinking”, then philosophy should be based on these special sciences. Therefore, since fundamental sciences are concerned to three fundamental realms of reality, which are existence, life and consciousness (Grandpierre, 2001b), philosophy should be the unified science of the most general laws of physics, biology and psychology. *The very first foundation and basic task of philosophy is the integrative study and integration of the universal, ultimate ontological principles of physics, biology and psychology/sociology.*

But is it possible to build an integrated scientific picture from the specific sciences? Does there exist any scientific interdisciplinary method with the help of which one can obtain a world-picture of scientific validity? This is a really pressing task of present-day philosophy. Philosophy may become a universal science only if it will become able to cope with this task. And to fulfil this task seems not to be impossible, since actually, each of the three sciences mentioned seems to be based on only one, most general, ultimate principle. This is because the ultimate principle of physics is the principle of least action, or in a more modern term the action principle (Landau, Lifshitz 1974-1984); that of biology is the life-principle or Bauer-principle (Bauer, 1935); that of psychology/society is the principle of consciousness (Grandpierre, 2002a).

Therefore, philosophy is in the position of the most favourable case what would be possible. It should not concern the enormous range of expert knowledge in detail. It is enough to consider the three ultimate principles themselves. The transparent focusing of fundamental behaviour into ontological principles shows the extreme economy of Nature in packaging us the most concentrated knowledge in the most convenient way. All this means that the real essence of the world is recognised as having a principal nature (Grandpierre, 2001c,d, 2002b). This is already a result without an explicit additional effort, a result that was recognised in the ancient times in the idea of *archi*. These ultimate principles are all scientific principles. Therefore their study should be possible by a new scientific philosophy. *The proposal of this paper is that philosophy should concern to work out the unified science of these three principles.* If this will occur, philosophy will become purged from its awkwardness and confusion. This meta-scientific philosophy will be able to give us for the first time a scientific worldview instead of the present-day pseudo-scientific, materialistic worldview. We cannot regard a worldview as scientific if it ignores or directly refutes to acknowledge about any of the three ontological levels of the world. It is clearly unscientific to ignore the most important universal realities of the world when framing scientific worldview.

Integral science should raise inevitably three ultimate questions of worldview significance. These are:

- 1.) Does the Universe have exclusively material, or at the same time alive, and spiritual nature as well in its most fundamental aspects?
- 2.) How and when life originated?
- 3.) What is the most important mark of becoming Homo and what is the nature of Man?

Answers to these questions will determine the approach of scientific investigations, its methodology, and basically determine the world picture. Therefore, integration of sciences will make it necessary to consider all these three questions from all the three aspects of fundamental realities. Moreover, integration of sciences will give also an answer to our inquiry immediately. It is the scientific need for the concept of integral world picture, including physics, biology and psychology/sociology which leads in itself to the recognition that the Universe has to have a threefold nature: material, alive and spiritual as well. In the same way it is a consequence of this recognition that all these natures represent ultimate, universal, ontological principles. Having ontological and principal nature, life and consciousness are universal characteristics of the Universe as a whole. An additional consequence is that the nature of Man is bound to the realisation of the spiritual scientific principle. Therefore, the need for a scientific world picture directly transforms our views on science, philosophy, picture of Man and world picture.

Now worldview represents something more personal than the arising world picture. Worldview represents our personal and substantial relations developed to this three-layered world, to the cosmic, living and noetic/social kingdoms. This personal cosmic-natural-noetic/social relation is the basis of our personal conduct of life.

This new notion of scientific and integral philosophy may become able to solve the question of the philosophical significance of sciences and offer a new, more integral picture of science. Moreover, it is suitable for a more thorough foundation of philosophy. At the same time, it is able to offer a more solid basis for a scientific concept of world picture. This scientific world

picture makes it also possible to determine the relations that mankind would like to develop with the world. Therefore, the scientific integral picture of the world could serve as a scientific basis for the development of the science of worldview.

If our picture of philosophy becomes clearer, we can observe more transparently the role of world picture in the formation of our personal worldview. The dominating present-day worldview is based on natural sciences and its basis is the principle of inanimate matter. This basis seems to be incomplete and therefore to be not valid, since it does not involve neither the life principle which is independent from the material principle and self-contained (Grandpierre, 2002c), neither the principle of consciousness which is independent from both the above two ultimate principles. One can always formulate the essential insights in a clear and transparent manner. In the new world-picture developed on exact grounds, instead of the usual single material principle, three principles will be integrated, which together form Nature or Cosmos. As I see, one of the most important teachings of the success of material sciences is that the world is interpretable exactly only if our attention is focused not only to mere corporeal existence but extends also to find laws ruling the behaviour of the phenomena. If we want to explain their nature, “material things” should not be considered in themselves, in their mere material conditions, but in the context of their behaviour. This picture is at variance with the categorisation in which the world is divided into matter, living organisms and God. Similarly to the recognised fact that a non-exact notion of God cannot offer scientific explanation, a concretely undetermined life-force (as in vitalism) also lies outside of the scope of science. On the other hand, a scientific view which considers phenomena as merged together with their driving factors may become able to explain and forecast the behaviour of events, since it involves their drives through the ultimate principles. Existents should be regarded as united with their drives when one considers the laws present behind the realised events. This curiosity to foresee the behaviour made it possible to explore the most general conservation laws of physics, which are the consequences of action principle. In this way science is found to be implicitly transcending materialism as based on a materialistic method enlarged with a principal view. Science became successful by integrating into itself the principal factor. Now the here proposed integral scientific worldview emphasises also the bounds to life and consciousness besides matter, and therefore will modify the present-day dominant one-sided worldview substantially if it will reach wide range acceptance.

We may observe that when creating an integral world picture we enter into a direct relation with our personal worldview. This is because the more integral a world picture, the more thoroughly it may contribute to founding our worldview. Making the further step, we may note that world picture in its narrow sense concerns a static picture of the world. We may gain a more integral picture if we take into account the world from its beginning to its ultimate conditions. In this way we reach a more inclusive picture: the picture of the world-process. Similarly to the physical worldview, which is able to develop a picture about the origins and also about the future of the universe, we may develop a more integral material-organic-mental picture of the future development of the Universe on the basis of the integral cosmology. In determining the picture about the future of the Universe authentic art may be of help (see §3.1.). One can observe that the integral world-process-view offers immediately answers to some ultimate questions of our lives like “Where are we coming from? What is our place in the

Universe? What will happen with us after our earthly lives? Where are we going to?” The main questions of philosophy of religion are: “what is the ultimate source of things, the governing forces in the cosmos, the ultimate purpose(s) of the universe, and the place of man in this scheme” (Alston, 1967, 285). In this way we may recognise that the integral, universal world-process-view independently of our individual evaluations is in a yet unsuspected manner in a determinative relation to our personal worldview, too. And if the integral, scientific *worldprocess-picture* or *picture of Nature* involves in an exact way phenomena together with their driving factors, it should include besides the created world also the creative world (besides *natura naturata* also the *natura naturans*). It is just the requirement of science that makes it necessary to include the creative factors into our world picture. When the creative world is also included, the integral worldprocess becomes a complete picture of Nature, including besides the “outer” Nature also the “inner” nature in a scientific and coherent picture. The integral science therefore necessarily unifies our world picture and doing this, it may basically unify our scientific and religious world picture.

Now let us make the further step. What kind of universal and important step can come after the picture of Nature? Now we can turn towards the other pole of the world, and develop a picture of the Homo and society in this newly found natural basis (this integral naturalism is substantially different from material naturalism). We can develop a universal picture of man and society, which are also important constituents of our personal worldview. Similarly to the folk art arising from the natural creative power, from the genuine perception of the world, it is possible that natural art will be reborn on the basis of the integral, organic, natural world picture and picture of man. In this way we may observe the possibility of a scientifically valid, universal basis integrating science, religion and art: the natural world picture integrating static world picture, integral worldprocess-view, and picture of man and society. Making this step is a significant development towards the universal foundation of our personal worldview. Most of the elements of it which were told to belong to the realm of personal awkwardness by Modernism, unfold itself in a new insight telling that in the place of expected indifference and cosmic apathy we may find enormous cosmic, universal and natural powers waiting their realisations through our life’s actions.

All the above insights together do not tell us that our personal worldview is completely universal and independent from us. This is because the last element of our worldview is the picture of ourselves, being the self-picture. In our lives we should develop a comprehensive and valid self-picture. In the integral view the self-picture has to be based also on Nature, since our genes represent individual constellations of the genetic material of our parents and this combination is created again by Nature. From our personal genetic mindset through the step-by-step development of our spiritual maturing (involving also the wish to live a meaningful life) our natural instincts and drives urge us. Therefore, even in the aim to form a worldview we may find Nature as being the ultimate agent. In this Nature-based self-picture even the most personal feelings and emotions as well as the elements of individuality are ultimately manifestations of the spirit of Nature. We should become familiar with the idea – which may sound alien to the modern minds – that our most personal powers are the ones that are the most universal, like the love of life, truth and search for reason. Personality appears in the integral approach not as separateness and loneliness, but just the contrary: personality has strong

commitments to Nature, representing a calling that drives towards the most complete achievements of our inborn abilities. Our most personal interests of life are at the same time the interests of life and Nature as universal entities. Recognising this fact, we may observe that the metaphysical basis of close-minded selfishness is actually based on a falsified view and it is found in the realm of unnatural deviancies.

Now how could we understand the enormous variety of worldviews in face of the apparent unique and universal basis? Some people estimated the number of present-day worldviews as above 100 000, others held that every human being has different worldview. In contrast, what I am speaking of here is the fundamental, ultimate basis of possible worldviews. All worldviews are built on these same elements. Their main types differ in their ontological evaluation. Some holds that matter is the only important ultimate existent, others that God, others that ideas/spirit/mind, others that man/society; another categorisation is physics, biology, psychology/society and theology; another divides the existents into categories existents beyond material existence, the material universe, the living kingdom, nation, and personal man. Some regards the technical sphere as separate, some adds the moral sphere as separate; and some other divisions are earth-man-sky etc. (see Grandpierre, 2001c); anyhow, the ultimate elements are finite. Therefore, the basic structure of worldviews has some fundamental types. This means that all possible worldviews show types with simple basic structure based on the same finite set of fundamental elements.

But how and why these basic worldview types differ, if they have one universal source, Nature? To understand this problem, one should also build up another picture of non-natural factors influencing the constitution of our personal worldviews. It is important to realise that the only things, which are not natural in the world, are phenomena of the man-made world, i.e. society and its products. Necessarily, the first societies started in coherence and spiritual continuity with Nature. It is a later development that the newly created cultures turned against their sources, as well as against their internal and outer environment. This became possible only through massive social manipulation. Manipulation diversify people and created a myth that our identity is found in our separation and diversity from all other people and Nature. Therefore, the origin of such “sacred” dogmas goes back to manipulation. But if we want to understand why there exist such a rich zoo of antagonisms, we can realise that these antagonisms go back necessarily to some manipulation acting to divide society and atomise it. This makes it necessary to form a new type of picture: the picture of manipulation. We should integrate this picture of manipulation to our worldview, too.

All these different pictures of the world, world-process, Nature, Man, society, self and manipulation are pictures which may be explored and understand in an objective, inter-subjective way. This means that our societies, schools, and science can give us a definite help when teaching us with relevant information on these world-describing pictures. It is proposed here that at the formation of our character, in contrast to widespread views, we should not attempt to deviate anywhere from these pictures when forming an integrated whole worldview from them. Without manipulative elements we have to be able to find a universally acceptable and scientifically well-founded picture of the world, Nature, Man and society, and perhaps even on manipulation. The most personal picture, the self-picture should be also the strongest when

it is “real”, i.e. when it is coherent with our “outer” self-picture formed by other people as well as with our actual behaviour. We should not “deviate” anywhere towards awkwardness from reality to form the base of our personality, that is intimately related to our worldview, since it will threaten us with the growing influence of manipulation and personality disorders so “popular” nowadays. The basis of our unique personality is something real that is stronger than mere awkwardness, as it is given within us, - in our genes, bodily and spiritual inborn abilities.

For a scientific foundation of the manipulation-picture we need a scientific picture of history on the basis of integral natural, universal truth searching. At the turning points of human culture man drastically revisited our pictures on Nature and Man. These cultural turning points did not attempt so much to develop their exact basis than to express the more superficial interests, material needs and social realities. In this way, they offered a significant role to manipulation and subordination of the universal truth to local group interests. As Grandpierre K. Endre (1996, 2000) explored with the help of a thorough logical analysis, mankind lived from the era of becoming Homo for millions of years in the Magic Era and perceived the world’s cosmic, natural forces in harmony with Nature, man and society. It was shown (Grandpierre, 2001a) that this magic culture has been a high culture since it acknowledged about the ultimate principles (archi), which become subordinated to a one-sided view in the modern culture. Apparently, the origin of the idea of the first principles goes back to more than 7000 years (Lenormant, 1878/1999, 113; Ragozin, 1886, 195). Apparently, the magic culture decayed some 10 000 years ago and was replaced by the new Era of Power (Grandpierre, K. E., 1992). Varga (2001) in his landmark book founding the science of history of writing was able to show with the help of documents, pebble-writings, cave-writings and writings on everyday tools that mankind has a history of writing extending to more than 30 000 years. Our ancient writing was in some sense higher developed than the present one and writing was practised including practically by most people. We had a numerical system based on the number 20 that offered a much more transparent and suitable tool for easy counting than the modern decimal system. Even with large numbers all the operations were very easy and transparent. The way of life, accommodation and material culture, clothes had similarly a highly developed state in this extended “prehistorical” era. All these facts together show that a thorough study of history is inevitable for gaining fundamental insights for our worldview. In the basis of these newly found evidences we can state that the materialistic dogma about the “primitive state” of the “prehistoric cultures” is unfounded. Therefore, we obtain a new and more promising view on the origins, evolution and perspectives of our culture.

## **5.2. Science free from values or science with universal values?**

It is a fact that Man is a creature of Nature. On this basis, in contrary to the positivist, operationist, materialist view, universal agreement is available not only in the context of material objects. Without a proper and integral evaluation of the basis of our knowledge scientific research cannot proceed, since “progress” expresses valuation. Without a valuation attempting to proceed towards the most integral truth available, the progress of science will be narrowed down and this circumstance threatens the future of science. Creative scientific research is a process that has to be based necessarily on an evaluation of relevance, importance, direction of inquiry, a systematic ordering and selection between alternative approaches.

Therefore, the more deep is the inquiry, the more important role is played by creative recognition of the proper values to apply. Overly accommodation to materialistic norms leads to overspecialisation, fragmentation and decay of creativity, with a loss of the deep sources of progress. The result is a science more and more atomised that loses its genuine roots connecting it with substantial human cognition.

Contrary to widespread beliefs, science is not neutral to all values. From generally applied scientific values the most fundamental one is universal truth. Science philosopher János Farkas (1994, 155) in determining the concept of science recommends three factors at the basis of scientific research. At first, it is the “body of knowledge” which is the resulting summary of the cognitive processes (i.e., it is close to the world picture). Secondly, it is the “picture of knowledge” which considers the sources, aims, functions and legitimisation of knowledge. Thirdly, ideologies, values and norms influence our picture of knowledge and metaphysical thinking. In other words: values and norms play an important role in forming science. At the same time, all these three constituents of scientific research are in a direct relation to worldview. Merton (1973) in his theory of knowledge summed up the ethos, the combination of values and norms in four institutional requirements. These are i.) universality, ii.) community, iii.) freedom from bias of interests, iv.) the norm of organised scepticism. Lukes (1967) recognised two types of universal rationality: i.) the mark of truth, which distinguishes between truth and falseness, and ii.) the rules of logic.

Nielsen (1993) pointed out that “analytic philosophers expelled (or tried to expel) moralising and politicising from philosophy, in short, worldview”. In a discussion of four well-known Oxford philosophers in 1955 three of them resisted excluding worldview-considerations from philosophy. Nielsen points out that “philosophy is intimately linked with worldview and that a philosophy which sets such matters aside or treats them as marginal impoverishes itself”.

Intemann (2001) made a rigorous analysis of the claims that science should be neutral to moral values. His conclusions are the followings. “Science is clearly concerned with *empirical* claims. It is not clear, however, that this means science is only concerned with *descriptive* claims. There may be instances where value judgements can legitimately play a role in theory justification. This result would have implications for scientific methodology. First, good scientific methodology will not always require researchers to abstract away from all evaluative judgements. Sometimes we will need to rely on value judgements in taking something to be evidence for or against a theory. In these cases, it would be better for scientists to make sure that they have good reasons for these value judgements, rather than trying to remain neutral. In addition, if we recognise a case where scientists have implicitly relied on a value judgement in their theorising, we cannot immediately infer that it is a case of bad science. Rather, we must seek to determine whether the judgement was in fact relevant and, if so, whether it is justified.” Now if we consider that metaphysical foundations of materialistic science involve the presupposition of desanthropomorphism and complete inanimateness of the world including besides the physical realm also living kingdom and society, we do not find the basis of materialistic metaphysics as a justified one, especially in the biological and social sciences.

In a situation where atomisation and materialism tries to posit itself as a dominant, totalitarian view, there is a vital need for integration, and this integration needs the most universal truth available. A partial consideration may be satisfied with a partial relevance, but an integral, comprehensive consideration may be based only in relation to the universal, integral relevance. It is important that philosophy should be free of all biasing preconceptions, from all dubious and one-sided assumption in a rate as high as possible. Freeing ourselves from the selfish limits is a step ahead towards a more universal, inter-subjective truth. Unfortunately, modern science in its last centuries seems to depend on higher and higher rate from material interests. The established institutional forms of present day science seem to be one-sidedly biased towards allowing material influences even in the rules governing science. It did not happen without reason that “sociology of knowledge” was able to argue that science is more and more influenced by sociological factors. But allowing “class-interests” and group-interests to rule the development of science will destroy science since the primary field of natural sciences is Nature. Therefore, vital needs of science should act to free itself from serving the momentary material interests and proceed towards to serve the common good of society and mankind. The common good of mankind is necessarily bound to exploration of material, vital and spiritual truth. As a bridge on a river cannot build up following profit maximalisation without following first of all the laws of Nature since threatening consequences may arise, a society cannot serve the common good without recognising the importance of life and consciousness. It is a fact of Nature that we are bound to the survival of life, Nature, and Cosmos. Existence, life and consciousness naturally represent universal values, since the only thing that is universal in and around us is Nature. Existence, life and consciousness should represent ultimate, universal and central values of science. We should not accept uncritically the manipulative wish to free science from all values. Following these universal values will not threaten but strengthen science, making it more universal, effective and useful. Following universal values will not represent awkward prejudice but just the contrary: the epistemic coherence of the object and method of science in harmony with ontology.

Physical research actually represents something more than materialism when allowing the principal essentiality of nature what is expressed in the form of the least action principle. Moreover, physicist’s work in the process of creative research is based actually on the assumption of spiritual creativity of man. Therefore, materialism and physicalism actually represents also an inconsequent, unscientific self-contradiction in actual creative research. Materialism should not be regarded as a consequent all-inclusive thought system. If only objective processes would exist, i.e. processes without the influence of our collective or individual consciousness, any philosophy, involving materialism would be completely ineffective. Education, bringing up children, government of institutions, culture, and social role of politics would be all completely ineffective in an actually (and exclusively) material, completely objective world governed exclusively by the laws of physics. Social laws and morals should be erased as representing false illusions. Therefore, while the existence of law and responsibility falsify materialism as a social theory, materialism threatens societies with a totalitarian dominance of material interests. In comparison, the universal world picture, acknowledging about the significance of Nature, life, and man’s best aims, is able to supply universal moral views to support moral life of society.



Let us think our personal lives from our birth! At conception the chromosomes of our parents are combined in a unique way to form the material basis of our individual personality. Not only the chromosomes of our parents, but also the way of combining them to ours is determined not by social, but by natural forces. In the very first step of our development we found in a determinative yet philosophically not really recognised factor: Nature. Moreover, Nature does not stop its activity in our personal lives afterwards but accompanies all our lives lifelong. In each stage of our personal lives Nature stands by us with Her drives, suggestions, inspirations, help, intuition and direction.

This intimate natural process governs our birth, growth, maturing. This internal natural spiritual power drives out emotions, thoughts, and inspirations, forms our spiritual constitution, and motives us to learn to walk, speak and develop. Now if Nature would have a material or liberal nature, She should not decide in favour of one and definitely determined decision-tree of our development. In which ground could She prefer to urge us to walk instead of not-walk, speak instead of not-speak? The post-modern view is that each decision has equal right; none should be distinguished above the other possibility. Therefore, if Nature would be strictly materialistic, we could suffer from insurmountable defects. Actually, there is no reason to defend the view that children have equal right to walk and not-walk. The requirement of a consequent system free of values should state that the same number of children should learn to walk and not walk. But Nature is not materialistic, She is not free from universal values. Nature lives definitely with a pronounced directivity bringing up and developing our lives towards a completion as high as possible, deciding in every branch of decision-tree of our personal lives in favour of one direction: the natural one. This means that Nature represents a definite spirituality within us, especially in our curiosity, in our wish to live a meaningful life, in searching for the universal truth. Our natural internal inclinations are all genuinely the manifestations of this intimate natural power. We are free, but not all direction of inquiry has the same significance for our personal lives. Our internal, inborn inclinations, abilities, givenness, our internal natural direction are the ones that specify the natural basis of natural development of our lives. This does not mean that Nature governs all our personal decisions. Nature created us to be responsible beings. In maturing, we should act more and more consciously and participate in shaping our lives, to fulfil its optimal conditions, forming its structure, determining the relative weights of our motivations and make more and more precise the main direction of our lives.

Now how can we think about the materialist statement that living beings are merely physical systems? As Daniel Stoljar (2001) formulated: "Physicalism is the thesis that everything is physical, or as contemporary philosophers sometimes put it, that everything supervenes on the physical...Of course, physicalists don't deny that the world might contain many items that at first glance don't seem physical -- items of a biological, or psychological, or moral, or social nature. But they insist nevertheless that at the end of the day such items are wholly physical." But if living organisms, the psychic phenomena, moral and social processes have wholly physical nature, this would mean that only the laws of physics would govern live, psychic phenomena, moral decisions and social activity. But if this statement would be true, than we could not be responsible for our personal decisions and, instead of us, physical laws should take the responsibility. Therefore, I perceive that physicalism presents a dangerous proposition for our social future.

Harvard Genetics Professor Richard Lewontin, a Marxist formulated his attitude in the followings (Johnson, 1997). “We take the side of science in spite of the patent absurdity of some of its constructs, in spite of its failure to fulfil many of its extravagant promises of health and life, in spite of the tolerance of the scientific community for unsubstantiated just-so stories, because we have a prior commitment, a commitment to materialism. It is not that the methods and institutions of science somehow compel us to accept a material explanation of the phenomenal world, but, on the contrary, that we are forced by our a priori adherence to material causes to create an apparatus of investigation and a set of concepts that produce material explanations, no matter how counterintuitive, no matter how mystifying to the uninitiated. Moreover, that materialism is absolute...” Johnson (1997) observes that for scientific materialists “materialism comes first; the science comes thereafter”. Such a pre-scientific commitment to materialism seems to be dogmatic, and since dogmatism rejects critics, and openness to critics is one of the fundamentals of science, dogmatism is unscientific.

Materialism has been growing up from individual experiences in a more and more materialistic society and had become a “common view”. In the 19<sup>th</sup> century the successes of the mechanical science had an over-radiating influence and attracted philosophers and scientists who were eager for success. The unscientific attitude of attraction for success repressed the open-minded, critical analyse in the social level. The success-attracted scientists and philosophers extrapolated the materialist method to fields where it is not competent. At the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century materialism allegedly became dominant (Moser, Trout 1995). To evaluate this statement in a context, it is important to note that the New Encyclopaedia Britannica (1989) forms an opinion that “perhaps materialism is still in minority”. Comparing the two evaluations, should we think that in between 1989 and 1995 the situation changed and materialism became from a minority a majority? Such a view seems to be expressed by Vitzhum (1996), who states: “Today a majority of professional philosophers, at least in the English-speaking world, identify themselves as materialists of one kind or another”. We have to take into account the result of “opinion polls showing that only about 10 percent of Americans believe in a strictly materialistic evolutionary process” (Johnson, 1997). The discrepancy between these estimations may be resolved only with the assumption that the materialist 10 percent extends to philosophers, intellectuals, a significant part of highly educated people, the ones dominating universities and academies. This conclusion is strengthened by the survey of Ray (1996) showing that Modernist (a significant part of them have materialist views) represent less than 47 percent of the US population. Recognising the fact that materialist people dominate high education and they represent a minority in the whole population, we can observe that this situation threaten our future with a perspective that people educated on materialist grounds will be influenced more and more by materialism, and so a new form of dominance of minority over majority will be realised. Regarding the vigorousness of materialists to defend and propagate their views in the society as a whole, and recognising the social dangerousness of materialism as a worldview, we should not give up to develop, defend and strengthen our worldview and search more valid, exact foundations of worldview.

Dominant materialism claims the falseness of metaphysics in general. At the same time, as The New Encyclopedia Britannica (1989) writes: “The word Materialism has been used in modern

times to refer to a family of metaphysical theories (i.e., theories on the nature of reality)". This means that materialism itself is a metaphysical theory. Materialism is a species of realism, and realism is based on the metaphysical assumption that the contents of our mental events are transcendent and refer to a postulated "outer reality" behind the world of senses which exists "in itself" and which serves as a source of our perceptions. Materialism is the kind of realism, which denies the independent existence of mind, the very basis to which its metaphysics is built. Materialism becomes a speculative metaphysics when it rejects scientific investigation to consider if mind (and life) are or are not reducible to physics.

Materialism shows a more and more overt tendency for become a totalitarian metaphysics, despite of the still strong dispute on the reducibility or irreducibility of biology, psychology and sociology to physics. This totalitarian and one-sided metaphysical worldview applies a twofold measure when it rejects metaphysics and worldview in general as a legal notion. As Rohbeck (1999) noted, "By today's understanding philosophy and worldview are in contradiction. While philosophy is based on systematic doubt, critics and reflection, worldview is regarded as a pre-scientific, closed viewpoint". In the citation above (§1.4. Pedagogic Lexicon, 1997, 639) the worldview is not regarded neither as pre-scientific, nor as a closed viewpoint, but rather a starting point to our research which is under the control of the science, and a view that follows the developments of science and sums it, integrates it. Therefore, worldviews has openness with a similar degree to science. Rohbeck continues: "But the strict separation of philosophy and worldview is also problematic. The philosophy is not neutral to worldviews, at least at its selection of its ground directions and work out of its argumentation". Nowadays, with the dominating tendency of materialism even the concept of worldview is under attack. "In philosophy and science the notion of "worldview" is frequently put in a pejorative sense...Only through the analyse of the history of the concept may make it clear, why the unity, on which the concept of worldview is based, is regarded today in philosophy and science frequently as hopelessly disintegrated and why worldview is applied in public use frequently as a stigmatised concept (Bezeichnungsbegriff)" (Mies, 1999, 1733, 1734). We can form an assumption that since it is philosophy and science where materialism dominates, the materialists are the ones who feel that the time has come to suppress all the other worldviews and stigmatise all of its types in general. If people do not recognise that it is high time to look for exact grounds of worldview and when found, to defend it, the time may come soon when it is late to do it already. The charge raised against worldview may be considered and found in most cases to be due to one-sidedness and subordination of authentic research to group-interests. The materialist claim for neutrality in values is only a mask to cover the vigorous domination tendency of materialism to constrain societies to unconditional priority of material "values" of interests.

It is not really known but remarkable that the founder of the Anglo-Saxon philosophy, Hobbes (Leviatan, 1651) regarded politics and psychology as reducible to physics. Hobbes formed an opinion that "life is not anything else but movement of the limbs, and so the automata lives an artificial life. State is an artificial creature that in reality is an artificial man, Leviatan. The artificial psyche is the result of the uncontrolled dominance (of the State)" (cited in Russell, 1946, 458). It is also not really known that one of the first modern scientific society of the world, the British Royal Society was founded in the 1600s to realise just this materialist project. Henry Oldenburg, the first secretary of the Society, wrote about this plan in a letter to Spinoza

"In our Philosophical Society we allow a free flow, as much as our abilities allow, to the diligent experiences and observations, spending much time to prepare the History of Mechanical Arts, since we feel for sure, that the forms and qualities of things are explainable in the best way through the laws of Mechanics, and that all the effects of Nature are generated by movements, form, structure and their combinations". Economist Malthus (1776-1843) worked in that spirit when expressed that "Man is only an inert mass starting to function only if an outer power forces it to do that". Darwin wrote in the same vein in 1856: "What a book may be written by chaplain of the devil about the rude, thoughtless, ham-handed, vulgar and horribly cruel functioning of nature!"; and in 1858: "The whole of nature is in a war, one organism against the other, or against the environmental nature." Freud regarded the "subconscious" to be a mechanical force. Dawkins (1976) considers living beings as mere tools of the selfish and unsparring competition. It cannot be a mere accident that the British Royal Society elected Karl Marx, the ideologist largely responsible for one of the largest crimes committed ever against mankind, for making communism and socialism possible, which massacred more than hundred million of peoples (although mostly "only" peoples of Eastern and Central Europe and Asia), as the most eminent thinker of the last millennium in 2000.

In *How the Mind Works*, MIT professor Harold Pinker argues that the fundamental premise of ethics has been disproved by science. "Ethical theory," he writes, "requires idealisations like free, sentient, rational, equivalent agents whose behaviour is uncaused." Yet, "the world, as seen by science, does not really have uncaused events." "In other words, moral reasoning assumes the existence of things that science tells us are unreal" (Pearcey, 2000). "It's astonishing that anyone, especially an MIT professor, expressing simultaneously his commitments to ethical norms, would be capable of sustaining two such contradictory ideas. But in fact, it is quite common, says Phillip Johnson in *The Wedge of Truth* (2000). Since the Enlightenment, knowledge has split into two separate and often contradictory spheres: "facts" (science) versus "values" (ethics, religion, the humanities). One trouble with this division is that eventually one side comes to dominate. "This is the key to understanding why *America is embroiled in a culture clash today*", Johnson argues—"and why *moral and religious conservatives are losing*. The direction in intellectual history since the Enlightenment has been to grant science the authority to pronounce what is real, true, objective, and rational, while relegating ethics and religion to the realm of subjective opinion and nonrational experience." The picture painted about the "culture clash" may be related to Ray's (1996) recognition telling: "In the next two decades our world will either be dramatically better or dramatically worse. The one thing that cannot happen is just remaining "more of the same". Most trends of the past are simply not sustainable. The era of obvious steps to progress is gone, and we face the Great Divide. It really could go either way: Our future is not foreordained. We are at a tipping point in civilisation. This means we have to be ready to choose a good path. The quality of our "image of the future", and the quality of our creative efforts based on it, will determine which way our future develops over the next generation or two. All that is certain is that the stakes have been raised."

Now if accept the statement of Johnson (2000) that the "cultural clash" is already decided in favour of materialism/Modernism, we have to face with a new age in which the totalitarian materialist worldview will be even more pronouncedly realised. If our world was until now two

(or three) poled, organised around the centres of interests and values, material goods and moral goods, what will happen if this two-poled world will lose and a one-poled world will come? If the short-ranged interests will overcome above long-ranged values, humans will shrink even in a higher rate in all of their valuable dimensions, and will turn into a mere “working power”, “speaking tool”, a mechanical device producing and consuming material goods, a zombie. Many philosophers already consider as a proven fact that man is nothing else but a zombie, a mere corps without any significant, initiative internal world.

Ralph Metzner (1993) in his essay recognises, that the right for the domination of man over Nature “was rationalized through the well-known set of instructions from god to Adam and Eve, in the biblical Book of Genesis: “Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the Earth, and subdue it; and have dominion over...all the wild beasts that move upon the Earth.” (Gen. 1:28). Even though ecologically minded theologians in recent times have justly argued that “dominion” does not mean “domination-exploitation” but rather “wise stewardship or management”, like a gardener tending his garden, it cannot be denied that as a matter of historical fact, domination, control and exploitation have been Western humanity’s guiding values in relationship to nature.”

Richard Tarnas in his book “*The Passion of the Western Mind*” (1991, 373) realised that “the irony of the modern spiritual development is that thinking man meets one after the other to the Cartesian, Newtonian, Darwinian, Marxian, Freudian, behaviourist, genetical, neuro-physiological, socio-biological principles, and due to these principles his belief in its own rationality and freedom of his will gradually narrows down, until he cannot consider himself but an isolated and transient chance of the evolution of the material world”.

All the above-told messages do not touch the *individual* freedom of worldview. But one cannot be indifferent to the dangerous and threatening radical *social* consequences of materialism, especially if it becomes (or became) dominant at the most important governing organs and institutions of our societies. The situation is similar to an organism attacked by an illness, attempting to dominate over the whole organism, in its most vital parts, brain and heart. One cannot expect that organism give up and forbid its immune system to work until the illness will publicly accept the arguments of the organism proving undoubtedly the right of the organism to defend itself against the stigmatised view of the illness denying the wholeness and integrity of the organism. It is an urging task to work out the ways of social self-defence from the destructive *social* influences of dominant materialism.

### **5.3. On a few socially destructive effect of materialism**

Losonczy Ágnes in her book “Harmful-supporter society” (1989, 322) confirms the socially devastating consequences of materialism. “The experiences of history verify that individually and in communities man is able to realise enormous efforts – if it is worthwhile to do so. *Man can transcend his inertia fixed to the present, if he has aims, and if he regards these aims as possible to reach.* He can make steps through his limits, can step behind the constraints of the day and may expand his future, when forming it to a new shape. The state of purposelessness or living without a future represents a social and individual life-danger, since such men abandon

just the one that maintained and carried him forward. The importance of the aim is what gives human life a meaning. The significance of the struggle gives power and support, multiplying the abilities...It became a general phenomenon that everything what happens in the society takes place above the “head of the people”, without them, without asking them...Man defends his self-esteem and the integral nature of his self-respect, and this is the basis of the passion for life, its harm may cause illnesses...Money, titles, carrier, position, all the urging aims of society acts to follow this line, and rewards this behaviour... *it is the central role of material needs that is made to become the aim of society*...Psychic harms and distortions developed into a social rate are characteristic phenomena to nations and periods and many investigations found connections of social relations as causing illnesses.” The main cause of death and illnesses in present day societies is found in social relations, arising from the fact that society represses the natural human initiations, and instead of allowing them to develop, constrains human lives into unnatural, humiliating materialistic frames. We should recognise the killing and illness-causing role of social materialism.

Independent reports agree on the harmful sickening effects of present societies. “Almost 60% of the people in our society who feel sick have complaints not originating from an explicit physical illness” (Aerts et al., 1994, 5).

### **6.1. On the main tasks of the Integral Culture**

If the movement of the Integral Culture attempts to avoid the fate of New Age, it should become able to proceed and build up its own worldview. New Age was an occasional mixture of superficial esoterism, occultism, mysticism, globalism, New Science, self-help and alternative culture. Materialism is now the dominant systematic ontology among philosophers and scientists, and there are currently no established alternative ontological views competing with it” (Moser, Trout, 1995, ix). Now it is clear (see above) that our thoughts and mental decisions govern our actions. Moreover, *it is our worldview that governs our thoughts and decisions*. Therefore, if Integral Culture wants to realise its noble aims, it seems inevitable to work out its worldview in the most exact way. “Present-day man has clearly lost his former worldview and is groping after a new one” (Wisdom, 1975, 208). “Outside of science, sociologists seem to agree that the informed public feels intellectually, ethically and politically lost... Most of the macro-problems and micro-problems of our present time are directly or indirectly related to this situation of fragmentation...Today, many traditional world views are in tatters” (Aerts et al., 1994, 3, 4, 19). Most of the wide-ranged crisis are due to this worldview-crisis and cannot be resolved until the new worldview is formed and becomes accepted in a socially significant range.

### **6.2. The shattered state of our worldview in the present-day world**

On the basis of extended surveys conducted periodically throughout the 1990s (Ray, Anderson, 2000) moderns share many of the positive virtues and values typical of the U.S. population: being honest, the importance of family and education, belief in God, and a fair day’s pay for a fair day’s work. But they also have values and beliefs that distinguish them from the major alternative U.S. cultures. These include:

- Making or having a lot of money
- Climbing the ladder of success with measurable steps toward one's goal
- "Looking good" or being stylish
- Being on the top of the latest trends and innovations
- Being entertained by the media

For the most part, moderns believe that

- The body is much like a machine.
- Organizations, too, are very much like machines.
- Either big business or big government is in control and knows best.
- Bigger is better.
- What can be measured is what gets done.
- Analysing things into their parts is the best way to solve a problem.
- Efficiency and speed are the top priorities – time is money.
- Life can be compartmentalized into separate spheres: work, family, socializing, making love, education, politics, and religion.

Being concerned with spirituality and the inner dimensions of life, moderns believe, is "flaky" and immaterial to the real business of living.

One can see from these points, that moderns have neither an integrated world-picture, nor an integrated worldview. It seems that they are the closest to the worldview of materialism, but this may be dominant only in the fields of work, politics, and society. But any human being has one bodily-psychic organism with one fundamental vital force, which is the natural basis of our integrated existence. Every event, in which we participate, which "occurs" with us, is related by this fundamental vital force to the integrated ultimate natural-spiritual basis. The integration of events of our lives sets up continuously within us even when unnoticed (see e.g. Dilthey, 1911), but we are able to be aware to their development when we respect them and their sovereign activity. If we are able to be aware of their most important developments, we can be more active in living our lives and this additional activity is what makes us reasonable, integrated human beings. This aware integration of events of our lives is what makes us able to recognise and develop our inherent, natural worldview. Integration of our lives is the spiritual law of Nature's innermost drives. Integration of our lives into a reasonable whole is the human law of Nature.

All this means that counter-natural, materialist influences necessarily lead to stresses and alienation in our innermost lives. We can create coherent relations with ourselves only if we learn to respect ultimate foundations of our inner world. Separating our inner world into different compartments will have necessarily a side-effect of making the stressed and alienated inner states more permanent and to become more unaware and more insensitive of the real depth of our innermost world. Moreover, we should be careful and recognise that materialism in the actual social world posits itself to become more and more dominant, instead of allowing us to privately compartmentalised. This tendency has a threatening consequence that none can really escape the decision between being honest, loving family, accepting responsibility, respecting the most holy feelings and values of our lives and our world on the one side, and the

dominance of materialistic values on the other side. Only with inconsequent materialism and only on the surface can we maintain both system of values, the counter-natural materialistic and the natural ones. In our societies the consequent species of materialism, physicalism became more and more dominant, and – as Johnson formulated - *moral and religious conservatives are losing*. The private, home-use natural system of values is threatened for everybody, including materialists as well. The only real escape is to be aware and strive to formulate our real and vitally important system of values. Our worldview cannot remain in its characteristic, modern, shattered form, since it will us deprave and undermine to a level where western civilisation depraved present-day Neolithic cultures: to giving up sovereignty, to garbage-culture (the cult of invaluable objects of thrown-up remains of western high-technology, like coke-cans, unusable telephones etc.), to readily given, received and lowly directed trend of culture.

There is a growing need to work out spiritual system of values of societies we live in, and on this basis to work out a more suitable theory of guiding of our societies. The secondary, background role of spiritual system of values leads to de-valuation of human beings creating and maintaining societies. We should not allow this trend to continue, similarly as we cannot give up to direct our personal lives by outer, counter-interested social powers, since the ultimate responsibility belongs still to us. Responsibility concerns the judgement of our whole organism belonging to our integrated personality. The world-fact of responsibility and its integral nature does not allow us to let our life shatter into different compartments since it requires a whole man. The only alternative of integration is fragmentation, and a fragmentation that involves antagonism in its most determinative elements makes us ill and controversial.

### **6.3. On the main tasks of Integral Culture**

I propose that the following tasks may belong to the main tasks of Integral Culture:

- Working out a universal, integrated natural system of values and techniques how these values may become known and realised in our societies
- Search, development, critic and wide ranged agreement on the basis of cosmic-natural-historical worldview
- Clarification and publicly transparent presentation of the most determinative aspects of our societies
- Developing our problem-solving abilities also in fields of ultimate questions of life and society
- Consideration of the reality of the remarkably high rate of optimism within Cultural Creatives (35%, Ray, 1996)
- Exploration of reasons for the still high rate of pessimism of Cultural Creatives (65%) (Ray, 1996)
- Foundation and build up of a new, valuable and accumulating culture
- Take care about to overcome alienation, work out how we could feel ourselves at home in our societies, and made all the important social relations transparent for the public.

### **6.4. The fundamental values may become selected also from the following set of values:**



- Emotional and rational openness towards the deepest nature of the Universe, Nature, and towards our continuity with cosmos-living kingdom-history
- Respect of Nature, attitude towards the spirituality of Nature arising in our deepest natural emotions
- Universal respect of life
- Universal respect of man and man's inner world, integrating reason, emotion and intuition into a reason-full whole world
- Familiarity with our societies
- Openness to critic and improving feedback
- Development of reason-full attitude towards the ultimate foundations of our lives
- Priority of common goods and common long-time interests over momentary needs.

### **6.5. On the life-style values**

- Formation of natural communities and its social forums on the basis of natural curiosity towards questions touching our lives as a whole
- Formation of self-advancing circles and school networks
- Foundation and build up the religion of natural, integral way of life with communal holidays
- Expanding our knowledge of the world, nature, history, society, and self, making it substantial and integral
- Revitalisation of folk art, and support of natural, non-commercial art and its forums
- Distribution of our validated thoughts and values
- Strengthening people's control over alimentary, industrial and cultural products
- Work on the idea of a culture-state.

### **6.6. On the ultimate questions**

It is important to collect and answer the ultimate question of our lives. A preliminary list may be indicated as:

- Where are we (and the world) coming from?
- Where are we in the world (and world-process)?
- Where are we (together with the world) going?

### **6.7. On the most important decision in our lives**

I see as the most important decision in our lives the one which selects between the ultimate alternatives: to stand by Nature, Cosmos, Magical Man or to prefer the "other side", that of dominance of power, money, and materialism.

### **6.8. On fundamental social questions**

- To form a vital and realisable picture of a society which stands on the side of Nature, life and integral reason (including intuition, emotion, imagination and ratio)
- To estimate the available spiritual and economical forces of society
- Inform and involve the most wide public in knowing most important social knowledge
- Work out a picture of future for our natural societies

- Remove the inverted system of values and rewards characteristic of materialistic societies
- Helping the free, self-initiative, culturally creative organisations to reach a highly developed state.

### **7.1. About our communal tasks**

If we have a deeply penetrating worldview attempting to search the fundamental truths, it is more than a mere view: it is an intimate connection with our spiritual motherland that is Nature. This spiritual motherland is the one that called into existence our lives. This spiritual motherland is the one that exposed our lives to a natural brotherhood, to an unknown, yet to be explored community of our destination. The Common Field of Consciousness (Durkheim, 1899, Mumford 1970, Grandpierre 1995, 1997) is such a cosmic creative organising factor, which builds up by our deepest, most sacred convictions. Our lives are condemned to a deathly loneliness without a communal worldview, and to a mere nonsense without the realisation and effectuating the universal human truths. We cannot let the atomising world of interests, power, grinding every human life to insignificance in our societies to be effectuated against our best convictions. Instead, we can expect a helping power from a unified, universal, universally understandable, integral and exact worldview that is bound to our national and universal culture, traditions, continuity and values.

We can cope with our tasks only with common thinking, making our activities coherent and thinking together, also because our values can be effectuated only in social collaboration. Universal morality may be given for us only by a universal factor, which should be one and the same for the whole of mankind. We can find such universal factors in that realm of our internal world that is able to perceive the universal truths (the magic logic), and in the universal environment of mankind: the surrounding Life, Nature, and the Universe. The universality of our inner deepest realm is given by the universal human nature (Grandpierre, 1999). Our universally valid moral therefore should be based on Nature, and its value system should be Nature-centred.

There is no need to unify science, art and religion to the shape of any of their present forms. The world has more than one essence and one of them should not dominate on the others. But these essences create a united organism, in a creative connection driving the world to its most magic ultimate unfolding. What we need is to work out the common human, natural foundation of science, art and religion: the natural worldview. We need a worldview that may help us from the totalitarian influence of desanthropomorphism and brute materiality of present-day science, from reason-limiting dogmatic tendencies of religion, and from awkward, unsystematic, superficial character of art. We need a human science empathic to Nature, a religion true to reason and a systematic, co-operative, thorough art living in the deepest personal connection with Nature's reason and heart. Such a natural worldview could develop a science with controlled presuppositions. Natural science could study Nature in wider relations than superficial materialism can. Natural science could study and understand the why's of Nature. The study of Nature could reveal the human, vital and reason-full essence and meaning of Nature. We can achieve it if we create the until-now missing natural foundations of thinking. The natural soil and ultimate fountainhead of science, art and religion is the natural, integral

worldview. On this soil could science, art and religion reach vital, effective, truthful and rich blossoming true to their genuine natures.

We are born to be emotional, reasoned beings, and we can reach meaning of our lives and its effectuation only through our communal activity. In the context of well-organised alliance of material interests we will inevitably sink to become material, and behave like inert grains of dust. Atomised, material worldview suggests that our small affairs and guessed separation is more important than the solution of the concerns that can be effectuated only if we act together. The socially-economically dominant materialistic powers attempt to demoralise Man to a domesticated animal and disable thousand millions of people with higher and higher perfection. We do not see the fundamental problems of our own societies. We should effectuate to reach a social consensus on fundamental questions of our common destiny. We should effectuate clarification of communal and social fundamental questions universally to our whole community. It is advisable to regard, as the essence of Man, that Homo is able to recognise her/his life as a whole as a being with reason, and is able to effectuate her/his human values. If we would give up our fundamental human values, we resign ourselves to under-human life.

The tasks before us are not easy and it would be unusual if the movement of Integral Culture would take its tasks seriously. Therefore, we are faced with the challenge to escape from one of our most dangerous faults: inertia. But we have learned that *Man can transcend his inertia fixed to the present, if he has aims, and if he regards these aims as possible to reach* (Losonczy, 1989, 322).

### **6.3. Acknowledgements:**

The author wishes to express his deep thanks to his friends Annamaria Talas and Simon Nasht, who helped to check and correct the English of the text.

### **References:**

- Aerts, D., Apostel, L., De Moor, B., Hellemans, S., Maex, E., Van Belle, H. and Van der Veken, J. 1994, *World Views: from fragmentation to integration*. VUB Press, Brussels.
- Alston, W. P. 1967, *Philosophy of Religion, Problems of*. In: Edwards, P., Editor-in-Chief, *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, McMillan, New York, 285-289.
- Bartók, B. 1919, 1925/1981, *On the folk music*, Magvető, Budapest, 14, 30 (in Hungarian).
- Bauer, E. 1935, *Theoretical Biology*, Moscow-Leningrad, IEM, in Russian (1967, in Hungarian).
- Bergson, H. 1931, *Creative evolution*, Authorized translation by Arthur Mitchell, PH.D. New York, H. Holt and Company
- Bertalanffy, L. 1967, *Robots, men, and minds; psychology in the modern world*. New York, G. Braziller
- Boutroux, E. 1914, *Science and religion in the philosophy of the present era*, (in French) 1-5.
- Bunge, M. 1967, *Scientific Research*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg New York, Vol. 1, 291.
- Burt, E. A. 1952, *The metaphysical foundations of modern science*. Revised ed., Doubleday, New York.

- D'Adamo, A. J. 1997, *Science Without Bonds. A Synthesis of Science, Religion and Mysticism*, 18, also at [www.adamford.com/swb](http://www.adamford.com/swb)
- Dawkins, R. 1986, *The selfish gene*. Gondolat, Budapest,.
- Dictionary of Hungarian Language, 1979, *Philosophy*, Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest, II, 817 (in Hungarian).
- Dilthey, W. 1911/1968, *Worldviewslehre*. Abhandl. z. Philos. d. Philos. In: GS, Bd. VIII, Stuttgart/Göttingen.
- Diogenes Laertius, cca. B. C. 200/1958, *Lives of Eminent Philosophers*, transl. R. D. Hicks, Cambridge, MA., Vol. I, 3.
- Dodds, E. R. 1951, *The Greeks and the Irrational*. University of California Press, Berkeley, 146.
- Dolva, B. 1999, *Why should we reconcile science and religion?*  
<http://w1.451.telia.com/~u45105506/whatsapoint/>
- Durkheim, E. 1899/1960, *Le Suicide*, Presse Universitaire de France, Paris.
- Eliade, M. (Ed. in Chief), 1993, *Manicheism*, The Encyclopedia of Religion, Macmillan Publ. Co. New York
- Farkas, J. 1994, *Disputateous theories of knowledge*. Gondolat Kiadó, BME Szociológiai Tanszék, 155 (in Hungarian).
- Gáspár László, 1978, *Unified worldview: complex subject-matter*. Tankönyvkiadó, Budapest (in Hungarian).
- Gierke, O. 1881, *Das Deutsche Genossenschaftrecht*, Berlin
- Giussani, L. 1997, *Il senso religioso*, Rizzoli, Milano, 137.
- Glaserapp, Helmuth von, 1972, *Die fünf Weltreligionen*, Eugen Diedrichs Verlag, Düsseldorf, Köln, 141 (in the Hungarian edition)
- Gnoli, G. 1993, *Magi*, in: The Encyclopedia of Religion, M. Eliade, Editor in Chief, Macmillan Publ. Co. New York, 9: 79-81.
- Grandpierre, A. 1995, *Peak Experiences and the Natural Universe*, Invited Essay, World Futures, 44: 1-13.
- Grandpierre, A. 1997, *The Physics of Collective Consciousness*. World Futures, 48, 23-56.
- Grandpierre, A. 1999, *Man and Nature* (in Hungarian). Elixír, 1999 szeptember.
- Grandpierre, A. 2000, *The nature of the Universe and the ultimate organisational principle*, Ult. Real. Meaning, 23: 12-35.
- Grandpierre, A. 2001a, *Pythagoras and the Scythians*. Magyar Demokrata, 2001 augusztus 9, 16 (in Hungarian).
- Grandpierre, A. 2001b, *World logics*. Vár Ucca Műhely, 2001/2-3, 49-98 (in Hungarian).
- Grandpierre, A. 2001c, d, 2002b, *Mensch und Kosmos*, Hagia Chora, No. 9, 10, 11 (in German).
- Grandpierre, A. 2002a, *On the ultimate principle of man and society: the Principle of Consciousness*, in preparation.
- Grandpierre, A. 2002c, *The Fundamental Principles of Existence and the Origin of Physical laws*, Ultimate Reality and Meaning, 25: 127-147.
- Grandpierre, A. 2002d, *The Book of the Living Universe*. Válasz Könyvkiadó, Budapest, (in Hungarian).
- Grandpierre K. E. 1992: *The Buried Age of the World: The Magic Era*. Harmadik Szem, 1992 április (in Hungarian).

- Grandpierre K. E. 1996: *The Religion of Life* (in Hungarian). Titokfejtő Könyvkiadó, Budapest.
- Grandpierre K. E. 2000, *Collective Fields of Consciousness in the Golden Age*, *World Futures*, **55**, 357-379.
- Harman, W. H. 1991, *A Re-examination of the Metaphysical Foundations of Modern Science*, Research Report, Causality Project CP-1, Institute of Noetic Sciences, Sausalito, California, USA.
- Hársing, L. 1999, *Világnézet*, In: *Tudományelméleti kisenciklopédia*, Bíbor Kiadó, Miskolc, 209-210.
- Hartmann, N. 1933, *Deutsche Systematische Philosophie nach ihren Gestaltern*, Herrmann Schwarz.
- Heylighen, F. 2000, *Foundations and Methodology for an Evolutionary World View: A Review of the Principia Cybernetica Project*, *Foundations of Science*, **5**: 457-490
- Hinnels, J. R.: *Persian Mythology*, 1985, Newnes Books, a division of the hamlyn Publishing Group Limited, Middlesex
- Humbach, H. 1978, *Mithra in India and the Hinduized Magi*, in *Études mithraïques*, ed. by J. Duchesne-Guillemine, Tehran and Liege, 229-253.
- Kákosy, L. 1979, *The sons of Ré* (in Hungarian). Gondolat, 1979, 311.
- Kneale, W. C. 1960, *Philosophy and philosophical studies*, *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 756.
- Johnson, P. E. 1997, *The Unraveling of Scientific Materialism*, *First Things* 77:22-25, <http://www.firstthings.com/ftissues/ft9711/johnson.html>
- Kornis, Gy. 1933, *The man of the state. The consideration of the political psyche*. Franklin Társulat, 84 (in Hungarian).
- Intemann, K. 2001, *Science and Values: Are Value Judgments Always Irrelevant to the Justification of Scientific Claim?* *Philosophy of Science*, **68** (Proceedings), S506-S518.
- Ipolyi, A. 1854/1987, *Hungarian Myhology*, Európa Könyvkiadó, 1987, 1 (in Hungarian).
- Landau, L. D. and Lifshitz, E. M. 1959, *Course of Theoretical Physics*, Vols. 1-10, translated by J.B. Sykes and W. H. Reid, Pergamon Press, London
- Laszlo, E. 1995, *The Interconnected Universe*. World Scientific, Singapore
- Laszlo, E. 2001, *Macroshift. Navigating the transformation to a sustainable world*. Berrett Koehler Publishers, Inc. San Francisco, 141.
- Lexikon der Alten Welt, 1965, *Magi*, Artemis Verlag, Zürich and Stuttgart.
- Lenormant, F. 1878/1999, *Chaldean Magic*, Samuel Weiser, York Beach, Maine, 113.
- Losonczi, Á. 1989, *Harmful-supporter society*, Közgazdasági és Jogi Könyvkiadó, Budapest, 322. o.
- Lukes, S. 1967, *Some Problems about Rationality*. *Eur. J. Soc.* **8**: 247-264.
- Mae-Wan Ho 1998, *Organism and Psyche in a Participatory Universe*, in *The Evolutionary Outrider. The Impact of the Human Agent on Evolution*, *Essays in Honour of Ervin Laszlo* (D. Loye, ed.), pp. 49-65, Praeger
- Mallien, L. and Heimrath, J. 2001, *Can Geomancy Contribute to the Rise of Integral Culture?* *Call for Papers*, 2001; *Vier Fragen an die Geomantie*, *Hagia Chora*, No. 10, Was ist Geomantie? Teil 1, Herbst 2001, 18-20.
- McFarlain. T. J. 1997, *Integral Science: An overview*, 13<sup>th</sup> Annual Meeting of ANPA West, Stanford, California, USA
- Merton, R. K. 1973, *The sociology of science*, ed. N. Storer, New York, Free Press.

- Metzner, R. 1993, *The Split Between Spirit and Nature in Western Consciousness*, Noetic Science Review, 25: 4-9.
- Mies, Th. 1999, *Worldview*, in Enzyklopedia Philosophia, (Hg.) H. J. Sandkühler, 1733-1734.
- Moser, P. K. and Trout, J. D. 1995, *Contemporary Materialism, A Reader*, Routledge, London and New York, ix.
- Mumford, L. 1970, *The myth of the machine. The Pentagon of Power*. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., New York, 384 ff.
- Neutra, R. J. 1956/1979, *The internal and outer landscape*, in Kepes, G.: *The New Landscape in Art and Science*, Paul Theobald and Co., Chicago, 71-73.
- New Encyclopaedia Britannica 1989, *Materialism*,  
<http://www.britannica.com/search?query=materialism&ct=&fuzzy=N>
- Nielsen, K. 1993, *Philosophy and Worldview*, The Journal of Value Inquiry, 27: 179-186.
- Orgoványi Anikó 1998, *Művészet és természeti nevelés*, Új Pedagógiai Szemle, 1998/3.
- Oyzerman, T. 1970, *History of Philosophy – Metaphilosophy*. Kossuth, 170 (in Hungarian).
- Payutto, B. P. A. 1993, in *Toward Sustainable Science*, chap. *Towards a unity of science and religion*, 1999, online version, [http://www.budsir.org/Toward/2\\_religion\\_4.htm](http://www.budsir.org/Toward/2_religion_4.htm)
- Pearcey, N. 2000, *A New Foundation for Positive Cultural Change: Science and God in the Public Square*, Human Events, Access Research Network, Sept. 15, 2000,  
[http://www.arn.org/docs/pearcey/np\\_hewedgereview091200.htm](http://www.arn.org/docs/pearcey/np_hewedgereview091200.htm)
- Pedagógiai Lexikon, 1997, *Worldview*, főszerk. Báthory Zoltán, Falus Iván, Budapest, Kereben Könyvkiadó, III. kötet, 639 (in Hungarian).
- Ragozin, Z. A. 1886, *The Story of Chaldea*, G. P. Putnam's Sons, The Knickerbocker Press, New York and London, 195.
- Ray, P. H. 1996, *The Rise of Integral Culture*, Noetic Sciences Review, 37: 4-15.
- Ray, P. H., and Anderson, S. R. 2000, *The Cultural Creatives: How 50 Million People Are Changing the World*. Harmony Books, New York.
- Rohbeck, J. (Hg.) 1999, *Philosophie und Worldview*, red. P.-U. Philipsen, Dresden, Thelem bei w.e.b. Univ.-Verl.
- Russell, B. 1946, *A History of Western Philosophy*, George Allan & Unwin Ltd, London, 458.
- Sahtouris, E. 1999, *Earthdance: Living Systems in Evolution*  
<http://www.ratical.org/LifeWeb/Erthdnce/foreword.html>
- Schrödinger, E. 1961, *Science and Humanism, Physics in our Time*, Cambridge University Press, 51.
- Shils, E. 1997, *The virtue of civility*, Liberty Fund, Indianapolis, viii-ix.
- Stanley, T. 1731, *Historia Philosophiae*, III, Venetiis, 250.
- Stoljar, D. 2001, *Physicalism*, in Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy,  
<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/physicalism/>
- Tamási, Á. 1940/1990, *My Native Land*, Szépirodalmi könyvkiadó, Budapest, 40 (in Hungarian).
- Tarnas, R. 1991, *Passion of the Western Mind*, 373.
- The Worldviews Group, 1995, *Perspectives on the World: an Interdisciplinary Reflection*, VUB Press, Brussel.
- Varga, Cs. 2000, *The exploration of the 8<sup>th</sup> Art, or adventures in the universe*. Minores Alapítvány és Fríg Kft., Budapest, Sect. 11, 60-, (in Hungarian).

- Varga, Cs. 2001, *Sign Sign Sign, or the 30 000 years history of the ABC*. Frig Könyvkiadó, Budapest (in Hungarian).
- Vitzthum, R. C. 1996, *Philosophical Materialism*, Modern Library,  
[http://www.infidels.org/library/modern/richard\\_vitzthum/materialism.html](http://www.infidels.org/library/modern/richard_vitzthum/materialism.html)
- Weber, E. 1999, *Introduction*, *Foundations of Science*, **3**: 231-234.
- Whitehead, A. N. 1925/1967, *Science and the Modern World*, The Free Press, New York
- Wisdom, J. O. 1975, *Philosophy and Its Place in Our Culture*, Gordon and Breach Science Publishers, New York, 208.
- World Futures, 1997, special issue on collective consciousness, Vol. **48**.