



The Problematic of the Self, East and West

Author(s): Paul Mus

Source: *Philosophy East and West*, Vol. 9, No. 1/2, Preliminary Report on the Third East-West Philosophers' Conference (Apr. - Jul., 1959), pp. 75-77

Published by: [University of Hawai'i Press](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1397219>

Accessed: 17/02/2011 11:00

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=uhp>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



University of Hawai'i Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Philosophy East and West*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

from the sanctity of life itself. The distribution of surplus wealth is encouraged by commending voluntary gift and sacrifice. Voluntary poverty is extolled above royal affluence. The ideal of the bare economic minimum, leaving time and energy free for the cultivation of the moral and spiritual optimum, runs through and through, with all its good and bad consequences that characterize even contemporary India.

There is a constant reminder that the individual is the supreme consideration; his spiritual freedom is the supreme goal. Society, the State, and its political, legal, and economic organizations are but the means. The means should never be allowed to usurp the place of the end.

THE PROBLEMATIC OF THE SELF, EAST AND WEST

PAUL MUS

Born in the human environment of the Greek city-state, with an appeal to that part in man thanks to which he "can be a creator . . . governed by man-made law and human reason," Western civilization has achieved a fair amount of "philosophic self-consciousness"; while Indian philosophy, although by no means less important in the molding of the corresponding civilization, has remained comparatively more implicit in the religious, social, and political traditions (*dharma* in its multifarious senses) it had to integrate. Its aim has not been so much to make Indian civilization "conscious of itself" as "intentional of itself."

An immediate intentionality was thus established on religiously authenticated patterns of behavior, instead of having to take—as the West does—the detour of a conceptual discursivity. Syllogistic thinking was familiar to India, of course, and the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika school had specialized in it; but a more constructive instrument was found, at an early date, in what could be called an *emergence syllogism*—still a syllogism, as it connects a set of specified terms, but in a way that has little to do with the transition from a great to a small through a mean term. It bears to our syllogism about the same relation as the Sanskrit root *bhū*—"becoming"—to our commonly more static notation of "being" (Sanskrit, *as-*). Its binomial expression would approximate the well-known logistic equation: $A + B = B$.

This means, in lay language, that A is a member of B, so that there can

be no organic, living contact between B and A, between *a* B and *an* A, except within a given B. The illustration usually given is: femininity within humanity.

$F + H = H$ symbolizes the fact that adding F, i.e., all feminine beings, to H, i.e., all human beings, if we have in mind the reality underlying these words and do not indulge in a mere play on numerical figures, does not alter the total, H. The only difference is that the ancient Indian thinkers did not reduce this image to an abstract symbol but made use of it as a "concrete" instrument: in that way, it retained a greater power of persuasion and became one of the fundamental patterns (though, for that very reason, chiefly implicit) of Indian thinking as well as of Indian society. Man and woman (*striṇumāmsau*) "united as adjusted portions, by halves" (*ardhabṛṅgalam*), form a pattern analogous in many respects to the Chinese *yin yang*.

In our perspective of a conceptual universe, ready to be syllogistically processed, there may be, at first sight, little if any point in the redundant formula $A + B = B$. But one should not underestimate its powerful constructivity in a more nebular state of human affairs, such as we may imagine India to have known, at the philosophical and historical level of the later hymns and early Brāhmaṇas. What we find in our texts is already an integration, previous to which we have to imagine a situation where dispersed elements, not yet sorted and classified as such, still had to acquire a meaning, with corresponding specification and classification, by becoming adjusted to one another. Following lines strikingly similar, under cover of myth and metaphor, with our logic of the class "that is not a member of itself" or with our topology of the whole and its parts, etc., Indian philosophy would thus fully meet Dr. Schneider's requirement, that "philosophy originates in the problems of men and must return to them for its validation and justification." It may be said that the doctrine of the Self (*Ātman*), as integrating its belongings and dependents, has been a leading thread throughout one of the great adventures in human history, "Operation Hinduism"—the making of Hindu India. This new constellation did not "emerge" as an addition to but as integrative of what became accordingly its own elements.

For instance, in a word, the Western interpreters of the Puruṣa Sūkta hymn (*R.V. X.90*) have missed the fundamental distinction between *ṣṛṣṭi*, plain creation, to which belongs the *śūdra*, and with him the still unreclaimed extension of the world, and *atiṣṛṣṭi*, supercreation, to which, in the perspective of the Sūkta, the three other sociological elements are specifically referred, as shown by *4a-b*:

*With three quarters Puruṣa rose upward;
One quarter of him here came into being again . . .*

For sacrifice, regularly performed in and by the Aryan society, according to the Aryan way of life, and sacrifice alone carries the three regenerated classes (or castes) from plain, dispersed creation, where all are born to immortality in heaven (3 *c-d*) and thus, provisionally, to “fully authorized” social and juridical existence in this world (the Aryan way of life!).

The Puruṣa Sūkta, thus re-established in its inner intention and against its historical background, has, accordingly, strong claim to be considered the first Indian constitution.

It is an emergence syllogism (and at the same time an act of faith) turned true. It had fixed as its goal *Puruṣa*, an impersonation of the Aryan way of life, and this way of life was made feasible by a division of social labor, according to the possibilities offered by the times and the land, but significant only in its integrity. The different elements were thus each separately and reciprocally considered as pregnant of one another in an “emerging order”—a selective and constructive pattern that was to remain the life and soul of the Hindu world. The *Bṛhaddevatā* aptly describes it as *anyo'nyayomitva*, “mutual productivity”: collective and personal values are reconciled in it.

By its anticipation of some of our most evolved techniques of thinking, this solution is close to modern philosophy; a better appreciation of its practical relevance to the long and eventful history of India may help us to find in it some deep correspondence with our own—and still unsolved—cultural difficulties.

CHINESE LEGAL AND POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY

JOHN C. H. WU

This paper deals briefly with the Chinese ideas of (1) the foundations of political authority, (2) the relations between law and ethics, and (3) the goal of human society.

With reference to the first problem, the predominant view throughout the ages has been that the mandate of Heaven is the cornerstone of all political authority. Government is conceived of as a sacred trust for the